

---

Date: Sun, 01 Sep 2002 17:19:34 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Rue Britannia: Diana's death tops poll (P Almond, UPI)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209011718300.3224-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

---

Copyright (C) 2002 News World Communications, Inc.

---

[asp.washtimes.com/printarticle.asp?action=print&ArticleID=20020831-22077556](http://asp.washtimes.com/printarticle.asp?action=print&ArticleID=20020831-22077556)

The Washington Times  
[www.washtimes.com](http://www.washtimes.com)

Published 8/31/2002

RUE BRITANNIA: DIANA'S DEATH TOPS POLL

Peter Almond

UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL

LONDON -- Britain's reputation as a land steeped in an appreciation of history has taken a hit with the publication of an opinion poll on what its masses consider the most important events of the past 100 years.

The top of the list of momentous events in British history excluded both World Wars, the collapse of the British Empire and the rise of the Beatles to stardom.

Instead, Britons said the death of Princess Diana -- five years ago today -- was the most significant event.

"This is a pretty shocking result," said Nick Barrett, historian and consultant to the UK History Channel, a British offshoot of the U.S. cable TV channel, which commissioned the poll.

"How Princess Diana's death gets rated the most significant event in British history in the past 100 years defeats me. But it shows how the impact of historical events is skewed toward more recent events where people's personal experiences come into play -- and particularly if they are recorded as moving images."

The same phenomenon clearly influenced a question on world history, in which the respondents ranked the September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States as more significant than the dropping of an atomic bomb on Hiroshima, Japan, in 1945, or Neil Armstrong's landing on the moon in 1969.

Age clearly affected the poll, as those with longer memories lent

greater significance to more distant events. For instance, while 41 percent of all respondents said the September 11 attacks were the most important event in world history, only 28 percent of those older than 65 thought so.

At the History Channel's U.S. headquarters in New York, Executive Vice President Abbe Raven said Americans were probably not that different from the British in their attitudes toward history.

"People look at history very much as it relates to their own lives, so more recent events will take on greater personal value," she said. "Many of the events have moving pictures, which help with recollection.

"I think Americans would move [the assassination of President] Kennedy higher up the list, and the moon walk without question. Nelson Mandela would probably come down a bit, and I think the Oklahoma bombing might well replace the Lockerbie disaster."

###

[asp.washtimes.com/printarticle.asp?action=print&ArticleID=20020831-22077556](http://asp.washtimes.com/printarticle.asp?action=print&ArticleID=20020831-22077556)

---

Copyright (C) 2002 News World Communications, Inc.

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Mon, 02 Sep 2002 11:24:48 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: LATimes POLL: Public Still Backs Military Move on Iraq  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209021123240.15584-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

---

Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times

---

[www.latimes.com/news/custom/timespoll/la-na-iraqpoll12sep02.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/custom/timespoll/la-na-iraqpoll12sep02.story)

September 2 2002

THE TIMES POLL

Public Still Backs Military Move on Iraq

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: BUT THAT MAJORITY SUPPORT BY AMERICANS WILL HOLD ONLY IF THE U.S. FIRST GETS THE SUPPORT OF RESISTANT ALLIES, SURVEY FINDS.

By DOYLE McMANUS  
TIMES STAFF WRITER

WASHINGTON -- After weeks of debate in foreign-policy circles, a solid majority of Americans continue to support military action to remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq, The Times Poll has found.

But most of those who support a strike against Iraq also want the United States to win support from allied nations before launching military action, the poll shows.

That poses a potential problem for the Bush administration, which has met resistance from such allies as Britain, France and Germany to its calls for forceful action to overthrow Hussein.

Still, the poll suggests that President Bush starts with a broad base of support from the American public as he makes the case for toppling Hussein.

The poll found that 59% of Americans believe the U.S. should take military action to remove Hussein from power; 29% were opposed; and 12% were unsure.

An even larger majority, 64%, said they would support a ground attack on Iraq if Bush decided to launch one, with 28% still opposed.

However, 61% of those who support military action said they believe the United States should attack Iraq only if the international community supports the move.

"I think we ought to get rid of Saddam Hussein, but it would be a terrible mistake to do it unilaterally," said Dewey Paugh, 65, a retired U.S. Postal Service manager in Columbus, Ga., who was one of the respondents to the poll. "I think it would just about ruin us in getting any help in the war on terrorism from the Arab nations."

The poll also found that support for war with Iraq might drop significantly if U.S. forces suffered significant casualties. When asked whether they would support a ground attack on Iraq if casualties were high, 45% said yes; 41% said no.

The poll's findings suggest that public support for military action against Hussein has diminished somewhat over the last six months. After Bush denounced Iraq as a major threat to U.S. security in his State of the Union address in January, The Times Poll and other surveys found that more than 70% of the public backed military action.

But even at 59%, the level of support for military action -- before the president has decided to send troops into battle -- is unprecedented, public-opinion experts say. Ever since the first opinion surveys were taken in the years before World War II, polls usually find most of the public opposed to military action before it begins.

"This is more conceptual support for military operations than we ever saw in the 1990s, when the Clinton administration was considering

intervention in the Balkans," noted Andrew Kohut of Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. "One of the real legacies of the Sept. 11 attack is that people are willing to accept the idea of preemptive military action."

Kohut said the poll's finding that most Americans want global support for any military action fits a more traditional pattern. "The public doesn't like the idea of going it alone," he said.

"Bush has a lot to work with here in terms of potential public support ... but it's not a done deal. He's going to have a hard time holding it if he doesn't have allied support, if he doesn't get support from Congress, if he doesn't touch all the bases."

The Times Poll also found that 60% of the public believes Bush is considering an attack against Iraq because he genuinely believes Hussein is a threat to U.S. security, against 27% who say the president is acting for political motives.

And a large majority, 79%, said they believe Hussein supports the Al Qaeda terrorist group that launched the Sept. 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. The Bush administration has charged that Hussein is linked to Al Qaeda, although little specific evidence of a connection has surfaced.

The poll found that 77% of the public believes that U.S. military action against Iraq is likely in the next year -- and 66% believe that if a war occurs, it will increase the likelihood of terrorism against Americans. Among those who support military action against Iraq, 61% believe it will increase the risk of terrorism but are apparently willing to run the added risk.

One of those is Kammi Vaux, 25, a financial counselor in Ogden, Utah. "I support going after Saddam Hussein," she said. "I think we should have handled it years ago." Asked whether she believed the U.S. should wait for support from other countries first, she said: "I'd like to, but I don't think it's going to happen. And if it doesn't happen, I still think we should go ahead."

The Times Poll also asked Americans how the events of Sept. 11 had affected their lives -- and most respondents said, in effect, "not much."

Asked whether their lives had changed, 47% said no; 36% said they had changed a little; and only 16% said they had changed a lot.

Asked whether life had returned to normal, 68% said yes; 14% said their lives hadn't changed in the first place; 13% said their lives have begun returning to normal; and 5% said they were still having difficulty getting back to normal.

A large majority, 64%, said they expect more terrorist attacks in the United States within the next six months.

Eighty-three percent said they are confident that the military can protect the country from terrorist attacks, and 68% said they are confident that the proposed Department of Homeland Security can protect

the country.

But respondents are divided over whether the Bush administration has responded clearly to the challenge of terrorism. Only 38% said Bush has "formulated a clear policy," while 55% said they thought the administration was "reacting to events as they happen."

Not surprisingly, the public's response to that question divided along partisan lines: 61% of people who identified themselves as Republicans said Bush had responded with a clear policy, while only 22% of Democrats agreed.

The public is also divided over whether the threat of terrorism justifies restrictions on traditional civil liberties. Overall, 49% said they believe some civil liberties should be surrendered, while 38% think the government may go too far in restricting liberties.

-----  
The Times Poll, directed by Susan Pinkus, interviewed 1,372 adults nationwide Aug. 22-25. The margin of sampling error is plus or minus 3 percentage points.

[www.latimes.com/news/custom/timespoll/la-na-iraqpoll2sep02.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/custom/timespoll/la-na-iraqpoll2sep02.story)

-----  
Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times  
-----

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Mon, 02 Sep 2002 11:41:52 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Poll Analysis: Action Against Iraq Finds Receptive Audience (LATimes)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209021139520.15584-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

-----  
Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times  
-----

[www.latimes.com/news/custom/timespoll/la-na-poll2sep02-473pa2an.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/custom/timespoll/la-na-poll2sep02-473pa2an.story)

September 2 2002

TIMES POLL

## Analysis: Arguments for Action Against Iraq Find a Receptive Audience

MOST AMERICANS' LIVES HAVE RETURNED TO NORMAL  
A YEAR AFTER THE SEPTEMBER 11TH ATTACKS.

By JILL DARLING RICHARDSON  
Times Poll Assoc. Director

There is substantial public support for the use of U.S. military force to remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq, according to the latest Los Angeles Times poll. Despite some fear that an attack on Iraq would increase the threat of terrorism against Americans at home and abroad and possibly lead to less stability in the Middle East, the Bush administration has found a receptive audience for its case against Saddam Hussein with the public at large, and especially with those who identify as Republican. However, most would like to see the U.S. act only with the support of the international community.

One year after the September 11th terrorist attack, Americans said their lives are returning to normal. However, many indicated their lives have changed since the attacks and a majority indicated that the change has contributed to their life being both better and worse than it was before.

### Iraq

Americans are following the public debate over the possibility of U.S. military action against Iraq with interest. Three out of four adults said they are following the news either very closely (31%) or somewhat closely (45%). The survey found the Bush administration's advocacy of an active U.S. military role in effecting a "regime change" in Iraq has resonated well with the public so far. By a margin of more than three to one (76% to 23%) Americans said they think that the United States should take military action to remove Saddam Hussein from power, with nearly half (47%) saying they feel strongly about it.

Arguments presented by the president and others as reasons for action are likewise finding a sympathetic audience among Americans. Six in 10 say they agree with the administration argument that Hussein must be removed from power because he is a threat to the United States, compared to 27% who see the threat of military action against Iraq as a political move. Nearly eight in 10 say they believe Saddam Hussein has supported Al Qaeda's terrorist activities, another charge which has been made by the administration. Other public figures have said there is little direct evidence that this is the case.

One argument against taking military action against Hussein is that it could lead to more tension in the Middle East. The survey found that while a portion of the U.S. public agrees, it is not an overwhelming concern. Just over two out of 10 said they believe that action against Iraq will act to stabilize the Middle East, and among that group, 86% are in favor of military action against Iraq. Nearly twice that many said it will destabilize the situation in the region, and that group is split 45% to 47% for and against the U.S. making a move. Another two in 10 believe it won't have an effect on the stability of the region one way or the other, and that group supports action by 61% to 25%, with nearly three in

10 not sure.

It is no surprise that those who identify with the party headed by the still popular President Bush would support military action against Iraq more strongly, and the survey shows this to be true. Seventy-three percent of self-described Republicans support taking military action (59% strongly support it), compared with 53% each of those who identify as Democrats (40% strongly) and independents (44% strongly).

Just over six in 10 overall also said they would specifically support the deployment of U.S. ground troops to attack Iraqi forces. That number dropped to 45% when asked if they would still support such an action if it would result in "substantial U.S. casualties." Nearly twice as many self-described Republicans (61%) as Democrats (32%) would support the use of ground troops even if substantial casualties resulted. A plurality of 42% of independents feel the same. Just under four in 10 of those who identify as a Democrat do not support the use of ground troops at all, compared with 12% of Republican identifiers and 34% of independents.

The sense that a U.S. attack on Iraq is imminent crosses all partisan lines, however. Three-quarters of adults overall, including 77% of Democrats, 75% of independents and 80% of Republicans said they think it is very or somewhat likely that the U.S. will move against Iraq sometime in the coming year.

Most Americans, however, indicated they are hoping that such action will happen only with the support of the nation's allies and partners. Nearly two out of three (65%) overall agreed with the statement, "The United States should take military action against Iraq only if that military action has the support of the international community." Three quarters of Democrats, seven in 10 independents and even half of Republicans indicated they would prefer that the U.S. not act alone.

One year later

Normal life has resumed for nearly seven in 10 Americans, up from the 54% who said life had returned to normal just two months after the attacks. In that Times Poll survey, conducted November 2001, 23% said they were not affected by the events, 15% indicated they were beginning to return to normal, 54% said they were okay again, and 7% indicated they were still having trouble. In the current survey, 14% said they had not been affected, 68% said they were okay now, 13% are getting there, and only 5% are still having trouble.

Three in 10 said life is better these days, while only 13% said it is worse. The majority (52%) said that changes in their lives are both better and worse. Ways that life is better for those who have seen improvements include being more aware and careful (28%), spending more time with family (17%), feeling more patriotic (13%) and having clearer priorities (12%.) Those that said life has become worse mentioned feeling more anxious these days (9%) or having to cope with increased security in the wake of September 11th.

Security is much on the minds of the American public. Just about two-thirds indicated they would not be surprised if there was another attack on the United States within the next six months and just under two

in five say their sense of personal safety has been shaken up to some extent.

The public is giving a somewhat tepid thumbs up to a bill which would create a new Department of Homeland Defense by combining federal agencies such as the Coast Guard, Secret Service and FEMA. The bill passed in the House but a version of it did not come up for a vote in the Senate before their summer recess. About three in 10 said they favor the proposal strongly and another three in 10 favor it somewhat. Twenty-seven percent said they were opposed, and 14% said they weren't sure.

If a new Department of Homeland Defense were created, it might add to the feeling of safety in the country -- more than two in three indicated that they would have at least some confidence that the new department would be able to protect the country from terrorist attacks. Americans continue to express a great deal of confidence in their military's ability to protect the country from terrorist attack. Eighty-three percent said they had some, or a lot, of confidence in the military, while 16% said not so much or none.

The survey found the public less confident in the Bush administration's leadership when it comes to fighting terrorism. More than half said they think the government is just reacting to events as they happen rather than formulating a clear policy for dealing with the war on terrorism.

#### How the Poll Was Conducted

The Times Poll contacted 1,372 Americans nationwide, including 1,163 registered voters, by telephone August 22-25. Telephone numbers were chosen from a list of all exchanges in the nation. Random-digit dialing techniques were used so that listed and unlisted numbers could be contacted. The entire sample was weighted slightly to conform with census figures for sex, race, age, education and region. The margin of sampling error for the entire sample and for registered voters is plus or minus 3 percentage points. For certain subgroups the error margin may be somewhat higher. Poll results can also be affected by other factors such as question wording and the order in which questions are presented.

[www.latimes.com/news/custom/timespoll/la-na-poll2sep02-473pa2an.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/custom/timespoll/la-na-poll2sep02-473pa2an.story)

---

Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Tue, 3 Sep 2002 07:45:35 -0400  
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <pjlavrakas@tvratings.com>  
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Cc: "'Empouliot@aol.com'" <Empouliot@aol.com>  
Subject: FW: Question from grad student  
MIME-Version: 1.0



X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

I received this query from a grad student at University of Alabama, and hope that someone on AAPORnet with more expertise than I on this topic area could be kind and respond to her. I mentioned to her the issue needing to secure parental consent. Thanks, PJJ

From: Empouliot@aol.com [mailto:Empouliot@aol.com]  
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2002 11:59 PM

I am a graduate student at the University of Alabama. I am doing research on children as respondents in survey research.

At this point I have found very little reference material on the use of children as respondents. Do you have any information on children as respondents? Do you design survey materials with children in mind? If you do, are the surveys constructed based on a median age or development level?

If you have any personal experience or reference material on children and survey research, I would appreciate hearing from you.

Thank you,

Eileen Pouliot, MSN, MPH

=====  
Date: Tue, 3 Sep 2002 11:52:28 -0400  
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: September 11, One Year Later: What's Ahead for an Altered Homeland  
Message-ID: <001c01c25361\$e9d5a0e0\$6901a8c0@mark>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook, Build 10.0.3416  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000  
X-Rcpt-To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

<http://www.brookings.edu/comm/events/20020905.htm>

Thursday, September 05, 2002  
7:30am - 11:30am  
Falk Auditorium  
The Brookings Institution  
1775 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

7:30 am Registration and Continental Breakfast  
8:00 am Keynote Speech by Paul Wolfowitz, Deputy Secretary of Defense  
8:45 am Panel I, Foreign Policy and International Scene  
10:00 am Panel II, The Domestic Scene

The September 11 terrorist attacks had a major impact on virtually every aspect of American life-foreign, defense, and intelligence policies; economic, budgetary, political, and societal consequences; security of the American homeland; and the way Americans conduct their day-to-day lives.

The Brookings Institution has spent much of the past year examining these and other implications of that terrible day. At this forum, Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz will deliver the keynote speech, leading Brookings scholars will explain their initial findings and discuss future challenges, and Andrew Kohut, director of the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, will announce the results of a new nationwide survey of how Americans' views on an array of issues have changed in the year since 9/11.

In addition to the survey and discussions, the panelists will respond to questions from the audience.

Scholars will speak on the following topics:

U.S. Relations with the Muslim World after 9/11: Paul Wolfowitz  
Welcome and introduction: Strobe Talbott  
Opinion survey results: Andrew Kohut  
Moderator: E.J. Dionne Jr.  
Overview: James Steinberg  
Globalization and trade: Lael Brainard  
The Middle East: Martin Indyk  
Military implications: Michael O'Hanlon  
Homeland security: Ivo Daalder  
Budget and spending: Peter Orszag  
Politics and elections: Tom Mann  
American daily life: Isabel Sawhill

---

Mark David Richards, PhD  
Senior Associate, Bisconti Research, Inc.  
2610 Woodley Place NW  
Washington, District of Columbia 20008  
Tel. 202. 347. 8822  
Fax. 202. 347. 8825  
mark@bisconti.com

---

Date: Tue, 03 Sep 2002 12:04:55 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu

From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>  
Subject: Cuomo likely to drop out  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="====\_9622876==\_ .ALT"

====\_9622876==\_ .ALT  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

=B6 ALBANY, N.Y. (AP) \_ A leading supporter of Andrew Cuomo's bid for the Democratic nomination for governor against state Comptroller H. Carl McCall said Tuesday the former federal housing secretary has decided to quit the race.

=B6 "It was very clear that he was getting out," said Albany Mayor Gerald Jennings after speaking to "some people close to the campaign." Jennings refused to identify those people.

=B6 Jennings' comments came after people familiar with the situation had told The Associated Press that talks were under way concerning a possible withdrawal by Cuomo from the race.

=B6 By Tuesday morning the talks involved former President Bill Clinton as well as aides to Cuomo and McCall, one campaign official with knowledge of the talks said.

=B6 There was no immediate comment from Clinton or the Cuomo campaign. A McCall campaign spokesman, Steven Greenberg, refused to comment. As a sign that something was afoot, both Cuomo and McCall canceled separate news conferences that had been scheduled for Tuesday.

=B6 The campaign official and others familiar with the talks, who spoke only on condition of anonymity, said the former federal housing secretary and elder son of former Gov. Mario Cuomo might quit the race as early as Tuesday and throw his support to McCall.

=B6 But the sources cautioned that Cuomo was asking for certain conditions to be met, including a high-profile role for him in the McCall campaign, before he would agree to leave the race. The comptroller was balking at agreeing in advance of Cuomo's possible withdrawal to any such conditions, the sources said.

=B6 With recent polls showing Cuomo trailing well behind McCall, a pre-primary endorsement of his rival could help the former Clinton cabinet member survive an electoral loss and maintain viability as a potential future gubernatorial candidate. The advantage to McCall would be no additional pre-primary attacks from Cuomo that could make the comptroller's race against Republican Gov. George Pataki more difficult.

=B6 Word of the possible withdrawal by Cuomo came as an independent statewide poll reported that with the Sept. 10 Democratic primary just a week away, McCall's lead over Cuomo had widened to more than 20 percentage points among likely Democratic voters.

=B6 The poll, from the Quinnipiac University Polling Institute, had McCall, the only black candidate ever elected to statewide office in New York, leading Cuomo, 47 percent to 25 percent, among the likely Democratic voters.

=B6 When those leaning toward one candidate or another were factored in, McCall led Cuomo, 53 percent to 31 percent. An Aug. 15 poll from Quinnipiac had McCall leading Cuomo, 47 percent to 31 percent, when likely voters and "leaners" were included.

=B6 The winner of the Democratic primary gets to challenge Pataki's bid for a third term.

=B6 The latest Quinnipiac telephone poll of 452 likely Democratic primary

voters was conducted Aug. 26-Sept. 1 and has a margin of error of plus or minus 5 percentage points.

=B6 "Cuomo hasn't moved since mid-August, while McCall racked up a few points," said Maurice Carroll, director of the polling institute. "Result: a widening gap."

=B6 While Carroll cautioned that "things can change a lot in the campaign's closing days," he also noted that McCall has "crossed the magic 50 percent mark" when voters leaning one way or another are included.

=B6 Statewide polls conducted by other campaigns not involved in the Democratic primary for governor have found similarly large leads for McCall in recent weeks.

=B6 The polls have consistently shown Pataki with big leads over both Democrats.

=B6 Cuomo, 44, entered the governor's race early last year with a lead in the polls over McCall. Cuomo quickly proved to be a more adept fund-raiser. The McCall camp laid Cuomo's early success to the name-recognition factor.

=B6 While Cuomo had served as his father's top political adviser for years, the race against McCall was the first as a candidate for the younger Cuomo. There were missteps along the way \_ the most visible in April when he complained that Pataki had ceded post-Sept. 11 leadership to then-Mayor Rudolph Giuliani. Cuomo said the governor had merely "held the leader's coat." Cuomo was roundly criticized for the remarks and even his father later said it had been a political mistake.

=B6 Meanwhile, McCall, 66, ran a fairly steady campaign focusing on his rise out of poverty, a lengthy resume that included a stint as a deputy ambassador to the United Nations and as a Citibank vice president, and his promise to improve education in the state.=B6

Warren J. Mitofsky  
140 Riverside Drive, Apt 18N  
New York, NY 10024

212 496-2945  
212 496-0846 FAX

email: mitofsky@mindspring.com  
http://www.mitofskyinternational.com

====\_9622876==\_ .ALT  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

```
* * * * *
*      ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED---      *
*      This post contains a forbidden message format      *
*      (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) *
*      This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT      *
*      If your postings display this message your mail program *
*      is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting *
* * * * *
```

====\_9622876==\_ .ALT--

=====  
Date: Tue, 03 Sep 2002 14:52:56 -0400

From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>  
Subject: New York State Sues Marketing Firm Over Collection of Student Data  
To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <000301c2537b\$1f5d82a0\$0d0a010a@leo>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-priority: Normal

New York State Sues Marketing Firm Over Collection of Student Data  
By ERIC HOOVER

New York's attorney general last week filed a lawsuit against a commercial list firm that allegedly deceived thousands of high-school students into supplying personal information in order to sell marketing data to retailers.

The lawsuit charges the New York-based Student Marketing Group with deceptive business practices and violations of consumer-protection laws for distributing surveys that allegedly purported to help students get scholarships for college.

According to the lawsuit, the survey forms -- which were sent to 1,800 schools in the state last year -- asked for a range of personal information, including religious affiliation, ethnic background, college preference, sports activities, and career goals. The forms included a cover letter stating that the information obtained through the surveys would be provided to financial-aid offices at universities and colleges nationwide, as well as to scholarship foundations.

"The company's ultimate goal was not to help students or to research educational issues," the attorney general, Eliot Spitzer, said. "Instead, the goal was to collect personal information about students and provide it to direct marketers."

SNIP

<http://www.studentmarketing.net/index.html>

--

Leo G. Simonetta  
Art & Science Group, LLC  
simonetta@artsci.com

=====  
Date: Tue, 3 Sep 2002 16:11:21 -0500  
Subject: Cuomo has dropped out  
Message-ID: <D5C7427E12C3B64695CB28E4831FE1A0597556@MAIL-04VS.atlarge.net>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Jason Boxt" <JBoxt@globalstrategygroup.com>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
X-OriginalArrivalTime: 03 Sep 2002 21:11:21.0789 (UTC)  
FILETIME=[741686D0:01C2538E]  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g83LBOI26594

Cuomo Quits New York Governor's Race  
Tue Sep 3, 2:36 PM ET  
By Ellen Wulfhorst

NEW YORK (Reuters) - Democrat Andrew Cuomo, trailing badly in recent polls, dropped out of the race for New York governor on Tuesday, saying he would not run a negative campaign against rival Carl McCall to regain ground ahead of next week's party primary.

Such a campaign would help guarantee a victory for incumbent Republic Gov. George Pataki, who is seeking a third term, Cuomo said at a news conference in Manhattan, with former U.S. President Bill Clinton at his side.

"If we were to now spend \$2 million this week on an acrimonious campaign, we would only guarantee a bloody and broke Democratic nominee, whoever won, and the ultimate success for Governor Pataki in November would be assured," he said. "Maybe we could win the battle, but we would lose the war.

"While it is harder for me to step back than to fight forward, today I step back and withdraw from the race," he said.

Cuomo, 44, had hoped to win the job his father, former New York Gov. Mario Cuomo, held for 12 years. Pataki defeated the elder Cuomo in an upset victory in 1994.

Pataki, a moderate-to-liberal Republican, is heavily favored in the general election and has raised a bigger war chest than either Democrat, according to polls.

Clinton, in whose administration Cuomo served as secretary of Housing and Urban Development, predicted this was not the end of Cuomo's political career.

"There are great virtues of being term-limited out, one of which is that you can commit candor," said Clinton, who left office in January 2001 after serving two terms in the White House, the most allowed by law.

"So I will make you a prediction. I am the only person standing on this stage whose political career is over," he said.

Cuomo and Clinton said they would throw their support behind McCall, 66, the state Comptroller. If elected, McCall would be New York's first black governor.

Cuomo said he had fallen behind in polls in July and his advisers had suggested his best option would be to "go negative" with campaign advertisements.

In a poll released on Tuesday, Cuomo trailed McCall by 22 points.

While Cuomo outpaced McCall in raising funds, many critics said the son of the former governor made a number of political missteps and seemed arrogant and overly ambitious.

McCall campaigned on Monday with New York Sen. Hillary Clinton ( news - web sites), the former first lady, and has been endorsed by the state's other U.S. senator, Charles Schumer.

The Democratic Party primary is slated for Sept. 10.

This was Andrew Cuomo's first bid for public office. He is married to Kerry Kennedy Cuomo, daughter of the late Sen. Robert Kennedy.

Cuomo's father, who became known around the world as governor of New York and often was praised for his eloquence, was considered as a likely Democratic candidate for president but never ran.

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

From: Warren Mitofsky [mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, September 03, 2002 12:05 PM  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Cuomo likely to drop out

ALBANY, N.Y. (AP) \_ A leading supporter of Andrew Cuomo's bid for the Democratic nomination for governor against state Comptroller H. Carl McCall said Tuesday the former federal housing secretary has decided to quit the race.

"It was very clear that he was getting out," said Albany Mayor Gerald Jennings after speaking to "some people close to the campaign." Jennings refused to identify those people.

Jennings' comments came after people familiar with the situation had told The Associated Press that talks were under way concerning a possible withdrawal by Cuomo from the race.

By Tuesday morning the talks involved former President Bill Clinton as well as aides to Cuomo and McCall, one campaign official with knowledge of the talks said.

There was no immediate comment from Clinton or the Cuomo campaign. A McCall campaign spokesman, Steven Greenberg, refused to comment. As a sign that something was afoot, both Cuomo and McCall canceled separate news conferences that had been scheduled for Tuesday.

The campaign official and others familiar with the talks, who spoke only on condition of anonymity, said the former federal housing secretary and elder son of former Gov. Mario Cuomo might quit the race as early as Tuesday and throw his support to McCall.

But the sources cautioned that Cuomo was asking for certain conditions to be met, including a high-profile role for him in the McCall campaign, before he would agree to leave the race. The comptroller was balking at agreeing in advance of Cuomo's possible withdrawal to any such conditions, the sources said.

With recent polls showing Cuomo trailing well behind McCall, a pre-primary endorsement of his rival could help the former Clinton cabinet member survive an electoral loss and maintain viability as a potential

future gubernatorial candidate. The advantage to McCall would be no additional pre-primary attacks from Cuomo that could make the comptroller's race against Republican Gov. George Pataki more difficult.

Word of the possible withdrawal by Cuomo came as an independent statewide poll reported that with the Sept. 10 Democratic primary just a week away, McCall's lead over Cuomo had widened to more than 20 percentage points among likely Democratic voters.

The poll, from the Quinnipiac University Polling Institute, had McCall, the only black candidate ever elected to statewide office in New York, leading Cuomo, 47 percent to 25 percent, among the likely Democratic voters.

When those leaning toward one candidate or another were factored in, McCall led Cuomo, 53 percent to 31 percent. An Aug. 15 poll from Quinnipiac had McCall leading Cuomo, 47 percent to 31 percent, when likely voters and "leaners" were included.

The winner of the Democratic primary gets to challenge Pataki's bid for a third term.

The latest Quinnipiac telephone poll of 452 likely Democratic primary voters was conducted Aug. 26-Sept. 1 and has a margin of error of plus or minus 5 percentage points.

"Cuomo hasn't moved since mid-August, while McCall racked up a few points," said Maurice Carroll, director of the polling institute. "Result: a widening gap."

While Carroll cautioned that "things can change a lot in the campaign's closing days," he also noted that McCall has "crossed the magic 50 percent mark" when voters leaning one way or another are included.

Statewide polls conducted by other campaigns not involved in the Democratic primary for governor have found similarly large leads for McCall in recent weeks.

The polls have consistently shown Pataki with big leads over both Democrats.

Cuomo, 44, entered the governor's race early last year with a lead in the polls over McCall. Cuomo quickly proved to be a more adept fund-raiser. The McCall camp laid Cuomo's early success to the name-recognition factor.

While Cuomo had served as his father's top political adviser for years, the race against McCall was the first as a candidate for the younger Cuomo. There were missteps along the way \_ the most visible in April when he complained that Pataki had ceded post-Sept. 11 leadership to then-Mayor Rudolph Giuliani. Cuomo said the governor had merely "held the leader's coat." Cuomo was roundly criticized for the remarks and even his father later said it had been a political mistake.

Meanwhile, McCall, 66, ran a fairly steady campaign focusing on his rise out of poverty, a lengthy resume that included a stint as a deputy ambassador to the United Nations and as a Citibank vice president, and his promise to improve education in the state.

Warren J. Mitofsky  
140 Riverside Drive, Apt 18N  
New York, NY 10024

212 496-2945  
212 496-0846 FAX

email: mitofsky@mindspring.com  
http://www.mitofskyinternational.com



=====  
Date: Tue, 03 Sep 2002 21:05:32 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: POLL: US 'was partly to blame' for terror attacks (S Humes-Schulz  
FT.com)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209032102570.26212-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

-----  
(C) Copyright The Financial Times Limited 2002  
-----

[news.ft.com/servlet/ContentServer?pagename=FT.com/StoryFT/  
FullStory&c=StoryFT&cid=1028186246464&p=1012571727088](http://news.ft.com/servlet/ContentServer?pagename=FT.com/StoryFT/FullStory&c=StoryFT&cid=1028186246464&p=1012571727088)

Last Updated: September 4 2002 0:17

US 'was partly to blame' for terror attacks

A majority of Europeans think that US foreign policy is partially to blame for the September 11 terrorist attacks on New York and Washington.

By Stacy Humes-Schulz in Washington

A survey of American and European attitudes towards foreign relations found that 55 per cent of respondents from six European countries agreed that US policy had contributed to the attacks.

The poll also found widespread public support within the US for an invasion of Iraq, with 75 per cent of American respondents in favour of using military force to overthrow Saddam Hussein and incite regime change.

But both European and American respondents were cautious about the US entering Iraq alone, with 65 per cent of Americans and 60 per cent of Europeans urging the US to gain allied support and approval from the United Nations.

A mere 10 per cent of Europeans would support US military action in Iraq without backing from the UN and allies.

The survey of 9,000 Europeans and Americans was jointly undertaken by the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations (CCFR) and the German Marshall Fund of the United States (GMF).

The findings also showed that terrorism is a concern for more Americans than Europeans, with 91 per cent of those polled in the US citing

international terrorism as a critical threat and only 65 per cent of Europeans identifying it as extremely important.

"The tragedy of September 11 has created a seismic shift in US public attitudes about the world and America's place in it," said Marshall M. Bouton, president of CCFR.

But a majority of Americans, 52 per cent, think that the US should remain the only world superpower, while 65 per cent of Europeans said that the European Union should become a superpower similar to the US. Only 33 per cent of Americans agreed.

###

---

(C) Copyright The Financial Times Limited 2002

---

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Wed, 4 Sep 2002 10:41:38 -0400  
From: "Patrick Murray" <pkmurray@rci.rutgers.edu>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
References: <D5C7427E12C3B64695CB28E4831FE1A0597556@MAIL-04VS.atlarge.net>  
Subject: Job Announcement (Project Assistant New Jersey)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
    boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_0040\_01C253FF.A6175CB0"  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----\_NextPart\_000\_0040\_01C253FF.A6175CB0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Project Assistant

This position provides support to the Center Director and senior =  
research staff in the daily management of on-going survey research =  
projects. Manages data collection activities and acts as a liaison with =  
data collection sites. Trains and supervises interviewing staff. =  
Organizes and supervises the editing, coding and data entry activities. =  
Develops data analysis and management files and runs tabulations. =  
Assists with research proposals, questionnaires, and reports.=20

Requires a bachelor's degree in a social science and two years of =  
experience in project coordination or an equivalent combination of =

relevant education and/or experience. Excellent oral and written = communication skills and computer literacy including facility with = MSWord, Access, Excel, PowerPoint, and SPSS as well as experience in = social science research methods are necessary. A master's degree and = experience with public policy and/or evaluation research is desirable.

Job offers excellent benefits and a collegial atmosphere. Attention to = detail (i.e. quality control) is extremely important.

Interested applicants may reply to me via email or fax (732-932-1551) or = mail.

---

Patrick Murray  
Associate Director, Star-Ledger/Eagleton-Rutgers Poll  
Senior Research Analyst, Center for Public Interest Polling  
Eagleton Institute of Politics  
Rutgers University  
185 Ryders Lane  
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0040\_01C253FF.A6175CB0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*  
\* This post contains a forbidden message format \*  
\* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*  
\* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \*  
\* If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
\* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0040\_01C253FF.A6175CB0--

=====  
Date: Wed, 4 Sep 2002 08:13:18 -0700  
From: "H. Stuart Elway" <hstuart@elwayresearch.com>  
To: "'AAPORNET'" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Reporting "unacceptable" behavior  
Message-ID: <NGBBJPLPNIOPHCGJNAEOEIIACJAA.hstuart@elwayresearch.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0012\_01C253EA.ECF00200"  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.3018.1300

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0012\_01C253EA.ECF00200  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Colleagues,

Is there evidence, experience or literature to indicate whether people will more or less forthcoming about their own socially unacceptable behavior if the question asks them to report what they think "other people" or their neighbors do? The behavior in question is disposal of household hazardous waste.

H.Stuart Elway, Ph.D.  
Elway Research, Inc.  
206/264-1500  
www.elwayresearch.com

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0012\_01C253EA.ECF00200  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*  
\* This post contains a forbidden message format \*  
\* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*  
\* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \*  
\* If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
\* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0012\_01C253EA.ECF00200--

=====  
Date: Wed, 04 Sep 2002 08:25:39 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Poll Shows Europeans Conditionally Back US on Iraq (C. Marquis,  
NYTimes)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209040824530.23586-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

-----  
Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company  
-----

[www.nytimes.com/2002/09/04/international/europe/04POLL.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/04/international/europe/04POLL.html)

September 4, 2002

POLL SHOWS EUROPEANS CONDITIONALLY BACK U.S. ON IRAQ

By CHRISTOPHER MARQUIS

WASHINGTON, Sept. 3 -- In a new poll, 6 out of 10 Europeans said they

would favor an American-led invasion of Iraq if the United States first receives the support of allies and the United Nations.

The Europeans' conditional support for an attack against Iraq, which contrasts with the misgivings voiced by their political leaders, is one of a series of findings indicating that ordinary Europeans and Americans have a strikingly similar world view.

"Despite recent press reports of rising anti-Americanism in Europe and an impending trans-Atlantic split," the report with the poll said, "at the public level, Europeans are in broad agreement when it comes to the war on terrorism, Iraq and a host of other international issues."

The poll, which was conducted by the German Marshall Fund of the United States and the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, recorded the views of a 6,001 Europeans, randomly selected and divided evenly among six countries: Britain, France, Germany, Poland, Italy and the Netherlands. The sampling error is plus or minus three percentage points. In the United States, Harris Interactive sampled 2,862 people by phone, with a similar margin of error.

Majorities of those who responded on both sides of the Atlantic to the polls, which were conducted in June and July, rated as an "extremely important" threat the possibility that Iraq will develop weapons of mass destruction, with 58 percent of Europeans and 86 percent of Americans expressing that view.

About 1 in 4 Europeans said the United States should not invade Iraq at all, compared with 1 in 10 who said the United States should attack even if it has to act alone.

The 60 percent of Europeans urging the United States to act in concert with other nations is close to the American response of 65 percent. The Dutch (70 percent) and the British (69 percent) were slightly more hawkish than the Germans (56 percent) and Poles (53 percent).

Despite the similarities, Europeans are more critical of President Bush's handling of Iraq, with only 21 percent of those polled giving the president a favorable rating, compared with 32 percent of Americans. The most critical were the French, with 81 percent rating the president's actions either "fair or poor," followed by the British (77 percent) and the Germans (74 percent).

Slightly more than half of Europeans polled said American foreign policy is partly to blame for the Sept. 11 attacks, and 47 percent had a favorable view of the Bush administration's response.

Significantly, Europeans join Americans in placing international terrorism at the top of their list of threats to their nations' vital interests, though the Europeans (65 percent) tend to view the danger with less intensity than Americans (91 percent.)

On other issues, the Europeans polled were slightly more concerned than Americans about global warming (50 percent to 46 percent), but they were less worried than Americans about the spread of Islamic fundamentalism, (49 percent to 61 percent).

Europeans polled also were much less inclined than Americans to see China as an important threat (19 percent to 56 percent).

###

[www.nytimes.com/2002/09/04/international/europe/04POLL.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/04/international/europe/04POLL.html)

-----  
Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company  
-----

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Wed, 04 Sep 2002 10:30:11 -0500  
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)  
X-Accept-Language: en,pdf  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Age/Race Census Data  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Can anyone direct me to a site showing age within race by state? I would prefer data for counties if available.

Thanks.

=====  
Date: Wed, 4 Sep 2002 08:59:02 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Robert Eisinger <eisinger@lclark.edu>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Not getting full messages  
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.4.10.10209040857560.10219-100000@hood.lclark.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Apologies for posting this to everyone.  
I am receiving headings, but not getting messages.  
Am I alone?  
Best,  
Robert Eisinger

=====  
Date: Wed, 4 Sep 2002 12:00:42 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>  
X-X-Sender: pmeyer@login8.isis.unc.edu  
To: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>  
cc: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Age/Race Census Data  
In-Reply-To: <3D7626FC.48CC331@marketsharescorp.com>

Message-ID:

<Pine.A41.4.44+UNC.0209041158390.19016-100000@login8.isis.unc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Census Bureau's projections for the population of voting age show age by race by state. Here is the address for 2000. I don't know what happened to 2002:

<http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/voting/proj00/tab01.txt>

```
=====
Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Voice: 919 962-4085    Fax: 919 962-1549
Cell: 919 906-3425    URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer
=====
```

On Wed, 4 Sep 2002, Nick Panagakis wrote:

```
> Date: Wed, 04 Sep 2002 10:30:11 -0500
> From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Age/Race Census Data
>
> Can anyone direct me to a site showing age within race by state? I would
> prefer data for counties if available.
>
> Thanks.
>
>
>
```

```
=====
Date: Wed, 4 Sep 2002 12:05:03 -0400
From: Pamela Ficca <FICCAP1@WESTAT.com>
To: "'eisinger@lclark.edu'" <eisinger@lclark.edu>, aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: Not getting full messages
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
```

SAME HERE

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

```
From: Robert Eisinger [mailto:eisinger@lclark.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 11:59 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Not getting full messages
```

Apologies for posting this to everyone.  
I am receiving headings, but not getting messages.

Am I alone?  
Best,  
Robert Eisinger

---

Date: Wed, 04 Sep 2002 12:06:35 -0400  
From: Will Lester <wlester@ap.org>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.79 [en] (Windows NT 5.0; U)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: FICCAP1@WESTAT.com  
CC: "'eisinger@lclark.edu'" <eisinger@lclark.edu>, aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Not getting full messages  
References:  
<15104802790BD411A2C100D0B73EA33C03D9CC2D@remailnt3-re01.westat.com>

How about sending aapor messages in the same format as these two, which are legible?

w-

Pamela Ficca wrote:

>  
> SAME HERE  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Robert Eisinger [mailto:eisinger@lclark.edu]  
> Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 11:59 AM  
> To: aapornet@usc.edu  
> Subject: Not getting full messages  
>  
> Apologies for posting this to everyone.  
> I am receiving headings, but not getting messages.  
> Am I alone?  
> Best,  
> Robert Eisinger

---

Date: Wed, 4 Sep 2002 12:23:00 -0400  
From: "Caplan, James R , ,DMDCEAST" <Caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: Not getting full messages  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

What I'm getting is the following:

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*  
\* This post contains a forbidden message format \*  
\* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*



\* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \*  
\* If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
\* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

Jim Caplan

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

From: Will Lester [SMTP:wlester@ap.org]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 12:07 PM  
To: FICCAP1@WESTAT.com  
Cc: 'eisinger@lclark.edu'; aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Not getting full messages

How about sending aapor messages in the same format as these two,  
which  
are legible?

w-

Pamela Ficca wrote:

>  
> SAME HERE  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Robert Eisinger [mailto:eisinger@lclark.edu]  
> Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 11:59 AM  
> To: aapornet@usc.edu  
> Subject: Not getting full messages  
>  
> Apologies for posting this to everyone.  
> I am receiving headings, but not getting messages.  
> Am I alone?  
> Best,  
> Robert Eisinger

=====  
Date: Wed, 4 Sep 2002 10:19:35 -0700  
From: "Denise Bauman" <DBauman@gilmore-research.com>  
To: <eisinger@lclark.edu>, <aapornet@usc.edu>  
References: <Pine.SOL.4.10.10209040857560.10219-100000@hood.lclark.edu>  
Subject: Re: Not getting full messages  
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

I have the same problem. I've copied two messages below from last year that address what seems like the same issue. It sounds as if some people do not have their e-mail set to print in plain text and AAPORNET does not print other formats. This means it is a problem with the sender not the receiver.

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

From: "Robert Eisinger" <eisinger@lclark.edu>

To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 08:59  
Subject: Not getting full messages

Apologies for posting this to everyone.  
I am receiving headings, but not getting messages.  
Am I alone?  
Best,  
Robert Eisinger

-----  
Most email software allows an option to send plain or formatted text to be set for individual entries in the user's address book, overriding the program's overall options or preferences settings.

To avoid your messages being truncated by the AAPORNET list manager, set this to plain text on the AAPORNET entry in your email program address book.

In Netscape 4.7x, you would uncheck the box for "Prefers to receive rich text (HTML)" on the address card.

In Outlook or Outlook Express, you would check the box for "Send E-Mail in plain text only" on the address card.

Other programs should have something along these lines.  
Jan Werner  
jwerner@jwdp.com

-----  
Nick Panagakis wrote:

I am probably the last person on this listserve who should be offering technical advice, but in Netscape, under Preferences, choose Formatting.

There is choice between "use HTML editor to compose messages " and "use plain text editor to compose messages". Click the latter.

Is that the solution for Netscape?

If so, others might provide the solution for Outlook, etc.

Apparently, this applies to the message only. After making this change, I can still send HTML pages of news stories, pictures, whatever to recipients other than this listserve so you won't have to switch back and forth.

Nick

> JAnnSelzer@aol.com wrote:

>

> \* \* \* \* \*  
\* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*  
\* This post contains a forbidden message format \*  
\* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*  
\* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \*  
\* If your postings display this message your mail program \*

\* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

=====  
Date: Wed, 4 Sep 2002 09:20:13 -0700  
From: "Uyeda, Mary" <Muyel07@HCA.WA.GOV>  
To: "'Caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil'" <Caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil>, aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: Not getting full messages  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

me too

Mary K. Uyeda, Ph.D.  
Health Policy, Research & Development  
360-923-2738  
muyel07@hca.wa.gov

-----Original Message-----  
From: Caplan, James R , DMDCEAST [mailto:Caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 9:23 AM  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: Not getting full messages

What I'm getting is the following:

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*  
\* This post contains a forbidden message format \*  
\* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*  
\* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \*  
\* If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
\* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

Jim Caplan

-----Original Message-----  
From: Will Lester [SMTP:wlester@ap.org]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 12:07 PM  
To: FICCAP1@WESTAT.com  
Cc: 'eisinger@lclark.edu'; aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Not getting full messages

How about sending aapor messages in the same format as these two,  
which  
are legible?

w-

Pamela Ficca wrote:

>  
> SAME HERE  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Robert Eisinger [mailto:eisinger@lclark.edu]  
> Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 11:59 AM  
> To: aapornet@usc.edu  
> Subject: Not getting full messages  
>  
> Apologies for posting this to everyone.  
> I am receiving headings, but not getting messages.  
> Am I alone?  
> Best,  
> Robert Eisinger

---

Date: Wed, 04 Sep 2002 17:25:33 +0100  
From: "Worc" <Worc@mori.com>  
To: <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>, <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: Poll Shows Europeans Conditionally Back US on Iraq (C.  
Marquis, NYTimes)  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g84GUDI01379

And, thanks James, the poll was carried out by Harris Interactive in the US and by MORI International in Europe, by telephone except in Poland where it was carried out face to face.

We'll have full details up on our web site today (if not before!)

Bob Worcester

Robert M. Worcester  
Chairman, MORI  
32 Old Queen Street  
London SW1H 9HP  
(44)207 222 0232 Tel  
(44)207 227 0404 Fax  
worc@mori.com

>>> James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu> 04/09/02 16:25:39 >>>

September 4, 2002

POLL SHOWS EUROPEANS CONDITIONALLY BACK U.S. ON IRAQ

By CHRISTOPHER MARQUIS

WASHINGTON, Sept. 3 -- In a new poll, 6 out of 10 Europeans said they would favor an American-led invasion of Iraq if the United States first receives the support of allies and the United Nations.

The Europeans' conditional support for an attack against Iraq, which contrasts with the misgivings voiced by their political leaders, is one of a series of findings indicating that ordinary Europeans and Americans have a strikingly similar world view.

"Despite recent press reports of rising anti-Americanism in Europe and an impending trans-Atlantic split," the report with the poll said, "at the public level, Europeans are in broad agreement when it comes to the war on terrorism, Iraq and a host of other international issues."

The poll, which was conducted by the German Marshall Fund of the United States and the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, recorded the views of a 6,001 Europeans, randomly selected and divided evenly among six countries: Britain, France, Germany, Poland, Italy and the Netherlands. The sampling error is plus or minus three percentage points. In the United States, Harris Interactive sampled 2,862 people by phone, with a similar margin of error.

Majorities of those who responded on both sides of the Atlantic to the polls, which were conducted in June and July, rated as an "extremely important" threat the possibility that Iraq will develop weapons of mass destruction, with 58 percent of Europeans and 86 percent of Americans expressing that view.

About 1 in 4 Europeans said the United States should not invade Iraq at all, compared with 1 in 10 who said the United States should attack even if it has to act alone.

The 60 percent of Europeans urging the United States to act in concert with other nations is close to the American response of 65 percent. The Dutch (70 percent) and the British (69 percent) were slightly more hawkish than the Germans (56 percent) and Poles (53 percent).

Despite the similarities, Europeans are more critical of President Bush's handling of Iraq, with only 21 percent of those polled giving the president a favorable rating, compared with 32 percent of Americans. The most critical were the French, with 81 percent rating the president's actions either "fair or poor," followed by the British (77 percent) and the Germans (74 percent).

Slightly more than half of Europeans polled said American foreign policy is partly to blame for the Sept. 11 attacks, and 47 percent had a

favorable view of the Bush administration's response.

Significantly, Europeans join Americans in placing international terrorism at the top of their list of threats to their nations' vital interests, though the Europeans (65 percent) tend to view the danger with less intensity than Americans (91 percent.)

On other issues, the Europeans polled were slightly more concerned than Americans about global warming (50 percent to 46 percent), but they were less worried than Americans about the spread of Islamic fundamentalism, (49 percent to 61 percent).

Europeans polled also were much less inclined than Americans to see China as an important threat (19 percent to 56 percent).

###

[www.nytimes.com/2002/09/04/international/europe/04POLL.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/04/international/europe/04POLL.html)

---

Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company

---

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Disclaimer

This e-mail is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of MORI Limited.

If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please either notify the MORI Systems Helpdesk by telephone on 44 (0) 20 7347 3000 or respond to this e-mail with WRONG RECIPIENT in the title line.

=====  
Date: Wed, 4 Sep 2002 13:10:06 -0400  
From: "Hembroff, Larry" <Larry.Hembroff@ssc.msu.edu>  
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: RE: Not getting full messages  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.10)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

I have this problem for some messages from AAPORnet but not for all. In fact, some of J. Beniger's message have the problem but others from him do not. I haven't changed my settings at all so I don't think my settings are the problem.

-----

From: Denise Bauman [SMTP:DBauman@gilmore-research.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 1:20 PM  
To: eisinger@lclark.edu; aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Not getting full messages

I have the same problem. I've copied two messages below from last year that address what seems like the same issue. It sounds as if some people do not have their e-mail set to print in plain text and AAPORNET does not print other formats. This means it is a problem with the sender not the receiver.

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

From: "Robert Eisinger" <eisinger@lclark.edu>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 08:59  
Subject: Not getting full messages

Apologies for posting this to everyone.  
I am receiving headings, but not getting messages.  
Am I alone?  
Best,  
Robert Eisinger

-----  
Most email software allows an option to send plain or formatted text to be set for individual entries in the user's address book, overriding the program's overall options or preferences settings.

To avoid your messages being truncated by the AAPORNET list manager, set this to plain text on the AAPORNET entry in your email program address book.

In Netscape 4.7x, you would uncheck the box for "Prefers to receive rich text (HTML)" on the address card.

In Outlook or Outlook Express, you would check the box for "Send E-Mail in plain text only" on the address card.

Other programs should have something along these lines.  
Jan Werner  
jwerner@jwdp.com

---

Nick Panagakis wrote:

I am probably the last person on this listserve who should be offering technical advice, but in Netscape, under Preferences, choose Formatting.

There is choice between "use HTML editor to compose messages " and "use plain text editor to compose messages". Click the latter.

Is that the solution for Netscape?

If so, others might provide the solution for Outlook, etc.

Apparently, this applies to the message only. After making this change, I can still send HTML pages of news stories, pictures, whatever to recipients other than this listserve so you won't have to switch back and forth.

Nick

> JAnnSelzer@aol.com wrote:

>

```
> * * * * *
*      ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED---      *
*      This post contains a forbidden message format      *
*      (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) *
*      This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT      *
*      If your postings display this message your mail program *
*      is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting *
* * * * *
```

---

Date: Wed, 4 Sep 2002 14:10:10 -0400  
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>  
To: <mail@marketsharescorp.com>, <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: Age/Race Census Data  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3



I believe that is available in the Woods and Poole (www.woodsandpoole.com) "Complete Database" CD-ROM. It's a little pricey for the whole deal, but they custom produce files when, say, you need something less than all 3,091 US counties.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
Voice (610) 408-8800  
Fax (610) 408-8802  
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Date: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 11:30 AM  
Subject: Age/Race Census Data

>Can anyone direct me to a site showing age within race by state? I would  
>prefer data for counties if available.

>  
>Thanks.  
>  
>  
>  
>

---

Date: Wed, 4 Sep 2002 11:02:08 -0700  
Subject: Re: Not getting full messages  
Message-ID: <20020904.110601.1516.19.datafordecisions@juno.com>  
X-Mailer: Juno 5.0.27  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Juno-Line-Breaks: 0-3,5-57  
From: J Schriber - Data For Decisions <datafordecisions@juno.com>

Me too

Jacquie Schriber

On Wed, 4 Sep 2002 12:23:00 -0400 "Caplan, James R , ,DMDCEAST"  
<Caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil> writes:

> What I'm getting is the following:

>  
> \* \* \* \* \*  
> \* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*  
> \* This post contains a forbidden message format \*  
> \* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*  
> \* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \*  
> \* If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
> \* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
> \* \* \* \* \*

> Jim Caplan

>  
>

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Will Lester [SMTP:wlester@ap.org]  
> Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 12:07 PM  
> To: FICCAP1@WESTAT.com  
> Cc: 'eisinger@lclark.edu'; aapornet@usc.edu  
> Subject: Re: Not getting full messages  
>  
> How about sending aapor messages in the same format as these  
> two,  
> which  
> are legible?  
>  
> w-  
>  
> Pamela Ficca wrote:  
> >  
> > SAME HERE  
> >  
> > -----Original Message-----  
> > From: Robert Eisinger [mailto:eisinger@lclark.edu]  
> > Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 11:59 AM  
> > To: aapornet@usc.edu  
> > Subject: Not getting full messages  
> >  
> > Apologies for posting this to everyone.  
> > I am receiving headings, but not getting messages.  
> > Am I alone?  
> > Best,  
> > Robert Eisinger  
>  
>  
>  
>

Jacquelyn B. Schriber, Ph.D.  
Data For Decisions - 1100 E. Route 66 - Glendora, CA 91740-3771  
Phone 626.963.7662 Fax 626.963.7663

-----  
This e-mail & attachments are for the intended recipient(s) and contains confidential information. Unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited; please contact the sender by e-mail and destroy all copies of the original.

=====  
Date: Wed, 04 Sep 2002 14:46:27 -0400  
From: Colleen Kay Porter <cporter@hp.ufl.edu>  
Reply-To: cporter@hp.ufl.edu  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.61 (Macintosh; I; PPC)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: "address service" timing  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

A question for folks in the continental U.S....

About how long does it take for the bulk of address corrections to come back when a first class letter is sent out with "address correction requested"?

Thanks so much for your input. I am writing a work plan for a project that I will NOT be managing, and I want to give them somewhat realistic timelines :)

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter  
Project Coordinator  
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. G1-016  
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

```
=====
Date: Wed, 04 Sep 2002 15:42:48 -0500
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en,pdf
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
CC: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Age/Race Census Data
References:
<Pine.A41.4.44+UNC.0209041158390.19016-100000@login8.isis.unc.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
```

Phil sent me a link which gives age within race by state.

Thanks Phil.

Philip Meyer wrote:

```
>
> Census Bureau's projections for the population of voting age show age by
> race by state. Here is the address for 2000. I don't know what happened to
> 2002:
>
> http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/voting/proj00/tab01.txt
>
> =====
> Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism
> University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
> Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549
> Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer
> =====
>
> On Wed, 4 Sep 2002, Nick Panagakis wrote:
>
> > Date: Wed, 04 Sep 2002 10:30:11 -0500
```

> > From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>  
> > To: aapornet@usc.edu  
> > Subject: Age/Race Census Data  
> >  
> > Can anyone direct me to a site showing age within race by state? I would  
> > prefer data for counties if available.  
> >  
> > Thanks.  
> >  
> >  
> >

---

Date: Wed, 04 Sep 2002 14:54:55 -0700  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: victoria albright <albright@field.com>  
Subject: Scanning equipment question  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Hi!

A colleague is looking for recommendations for scanning equipment. She plans to conduct about 6-7 surveys a year with 100 to 1000 respondents each time. The surveys will be relatively short (would be 2-7 pages if in normal self-administer format).

Any recommendations?

Best regards, -Vicky

Victoria A. Albright ( Albright@Field.com )  
VP/Research Director  
Field Research Corporation  
222 Sutter Street, 2nd floor  
San Francisco, CA 94108  
415 392 5763

---

Date: Wed, 4 Sep 2002 18:08:35 -0500  
From: "Rick Weil" <fweil@cox.net>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
References:  
<Pine.A41.4.44+UNC.0209041158390.19016-100000@login8.isis.unc.edu>  
Subject: Re: Age/Race Census Data  
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 5.50.4807.1700  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Here's a page I bookmarked a couple years ago (still worked just now):  
"County Population Estimates by Age, Sex, and Race-Hispanic Origin  
1990-1999:" [http://eire.census.gov/popest/archives/county/co\\_casrh.php](http://eire.census.gov/popest/archives/county/co_casrh.php) . I  
don't know if there is anything more recent; I remember having trouble  
locating this one.

Rick Weil

Frederick Weil  
Department of Sociology  
Louisiana State University  
Baton Rouge, LA 70803  
tel. 225-578-1140  
fax 225-578-5102  
fweil@lsu.edu

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

From: "Philip Meyer" <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>  
To: "Nick Panagakis" <mail@marketsharescorp.com>  
Cc: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 11:00 AM  
Subject: Re: Age/Race Census Data

Census Bureau's projections for the population of voting age show age by  
race by state. Here is the address for 2000. I don't know what happened to  
2002:

<http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/voting/proj00/tab01.txt>

=====  
Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549  
Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: [www.unc.edu/~pmeyer](http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer)  
=====

On Wed, 4 Sep 2002, Nick Panagakis wrote:

> Date: Wed, 04 Sep 2002 10:30:11 -0500  
> From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>  
> To: aapornet@usc.edu  
> Subject: Age/Race Census Data  
>  
> Can anyone direct me to a site showing age within race by state? I would  
> prefer data for counties if available.  
>  
> Thanks.  
>  
>  
>

=====  
Date: Wed, 4 Sep 2002 20:34:57 EDT  
From: RSSIPresMelodyR@aol.com  
Message-ID: <157.138d80c5.2aa800b1@aol.com>  
Subject: Re: Not getting full messages  
To: FICCAP1@WESTAT.com, eisinger@lclark.edu, aapornet@usc.edu  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Mailer: AOL 7.0 for Windows US sub 10512

<PRE>Me too.

=====  
Date: Wed, 4 Sep 2002 21:03:44 -0400  
Subject: Re: Not getting full messages  
Message-ID: <20020904.215100.-513649.5.jelinson@juno.com>  
X-Mailer: Juno 5.0.15  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary=--\_\_JNP\_000\_0e33.06c0.0ee6  
X-Juno-Line-Breaks: 9-6,7,9-55,56-32767  
From: Jack Elinson <jelinson@juno.com>

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.

-----\_\_JNP\_000\_0e33.06c0.0ee6  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Me , too.

On Wed, 4 Sep 2002 12:23:00 -0400 "Caplan, James R , ,DMDCEAST"  
<Caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil> writes:

> What I'm getting is the following:

>  
> \* \* \* \* \*  
> \*            ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED---            \*  
> \*            This post contains a forbidden message format            \*  
> \*            (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting)    \*  
> \*            This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT        \*  
> \*            If your postings display this message your mail program   \*  
> \*            is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting   \*  
> \* \* \* \* \*

> Jim Caplan

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Will Lester [SMTP:wlester@ap.org]  
> Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 12:07 PM  
> To: FICCAP1@WESTAT.com  
> Cc: 'eisinger@lclark.edu'; aapornet@usc.edu  
> Subject: Re: Not getting full messages

> How about sending aapor messages in the same format as these  
> two,

> which  
> are legible?  
>  
> w-  
>  
> Pamela Ficca wrote:  
> >  
> > SAME HERE  
> >  
> > -----Original Message-----  
> > From: Robert Eisinger [mailto:eisinger@lclark.edu]  
> > Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 11:59 AM  
> > To: aapornet@usc.edu  
> > Subject: Not getting full messages  
> >  
> > Apologies for posting this to everyone.  
> > I am receiving headings, but not getting messages.  
> > Am I alone?  
> > Best,  
> > Robert Eisinger  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

-----\_\_JNP\_000\_0e33.06c0.0ee6  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*  
\* This post contains a forbidden message format \*  
\* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*  
\* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \*  
\* If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
\* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

-----\_\_JNP\_000\_0e33.06c0.0ee6--

=====  
Date: Thu, 05 Sep 2002 08:26:34 -0400  
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>  
Subject: RE: Age/Race Census Data  
In-reply-to: <3D767031.7B1EE187@marketsharescorp.com>  
To: mail@marketsharescorp.com  
Cc: "Aapornet@Usc. Edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <KLEOLNOOPOCIGAODMGOHAEKFDIAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-priority: Normal

Hi Nick!

Don't use the projections, use the 2000 Census. Everyone now acknowledges the projections were terrible. The 2000 projections do not include the 2000 Census results, which were vastly different than the projections in many states.

See this column I wrote about the estimates.

<http://www.gothamgazette.com/demographics/may.02.shtml>

Also in the Philadelphia Inquirer some Census Bureau person said "to take them with a grain of salt."

Through the Census Bureau's American Factfinder you can get exactly what you want, including by county or even more detailed down to the Block Group or even block.

<http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html>

Andy Beveridge

> -----Original Message-----

> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of

> Nick Panagakis

> Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 4:43 PM

> To: Philip Meyer

> Cc: aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: Re: Age/Race Census Data

>

>

> Phil sent me a link which gives age within race by state.

>

> Thanks Phil.

>

> Philip Meyer wrote:

> >

> > Census Bureau's projections for the population of voting age show age by

> > race by state. Here is the address for 2000. I don't know what happened to

> > 2002:

> >

> > <http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/voting/proj00/tab01.txt>

> >

> > =====

> > Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism

> > University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

> > Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549

> > Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: [www.unc.edu/~pmeyer](http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer)

> > =====

> >

> > On Wed, 4 Sep 2002, Nick Panagakis wrote:

> >

> > > Date: Wed, 04 Sep 2002 10:30:11 -0500

> > > From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@marketsharescorp.com](mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com)>

> > > To: aapornet@usc.edu



> > > Subject: Age/Race Census Data  
> > >  
> > > Can anyone direct me to a site showing age within race by state? I  
would  
> > > prefer data for counties if available.  
> > >  
> > > Thanks.  
> > >  
> > >  
> > >  
>  
>  
>

=====  
Date: Thu, 5 Sep 2002 16:14:17 -0400  
From: "Patrick Murray" <pkmurray@rci.rutgers.edu>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
References: <D5C7427E12C3B64695CB28E4831FE1A0597556@MAIL-04VS.atlarge.net>  
<004301c25421\$2d587120\$0700a8c0@CPIP.RUPRIV.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Job Announcement (Project Assistant New Jersey)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
    boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_001F\_01C254F7.48FC8840"  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----\_NextPart\_000\_001F\_01C254F7.48FC8840  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Sorry for duplicate posting (apparently message was truncated for some =  
folks)

-----  
Project Assistant  
This position provides support to the Center Director and senior =  
research staff in the daily management of on-going survey research =  
projects. Manages data collection activities and acts as a liaison with =  
data collection sites. Trains and supervises interviewing staff. =  
Organizes and supervises the editing, coding and data entry activities. =  
Develops data analysis and management files and runs tabulations. =  
Assists with research proposals, questionnaires, and reports.=20

Requires a bachelor's degree in a social science and two years of =  
experience in project coordination or an equivalent combination of =  
relevant education and/or experience. Excellent oral and written =  
communication skills and computer literacy including facility with =  
MSWord, Access, Excel, PowerPoint, and SPSS as well as experience in =  
social science research methods are necessary. A master's degree and =  
experience with public policy and/or evaluation research is desirable.

Job offers excellent benefits and a collegial atmosphere. Attention to = detail (i.e. quality control) is extremely important.

Interested applicants may reply to me (with resume) via email or fax = (732-932-1551) or mail.

Patrick Murray  
Associate Director, Star-Ledger/Eagleton-Rutgers Poll  
Senior Research Analyst, Center for Public Interest Polling  
Eagleton Institute of Politics  
Rutgers University  
185 Ryders Lane  
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_001F\_01C254F7.48FC8840  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*  
\* This post contains a forbidden message format \*  
\* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*  
\* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \*  
\* If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
\* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_001F\_01C254F7.48FC8840--

=====  
Date: Thu, 5 Sep 2002 16:58:06 -0400  
From: "Patrick Murray" <pkmurray@rci.rutgers.edu>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: Job Announcement (Project Assistant New Jersey) (Last try)  
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 5.50.4807.1700  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

My apologies to those of you for whom this is the third posting. I've removed my v-card and set this message to plain text. If you don't get it this time, then you'll just have to miss out on this wonderful employment opportunity.

-----  
Project Assistant  
This position provides support to the Center Director and senior research staff in the daily management of on-going survey research projects. Manages data collection activities and acts as a liaison with data collection sites.  
Trains and supervises interviewing staff. Organizes and supervises the editing, coding and data entry activities. Develops data analysis and management files and runs tabulations. Assists with research proposals,

questionnaires, and reports.

Requires a bachelor's degree in a social science and two years of experience in project coordination or an equivalent combination of relevant education and/or experience. Excellent oral and written communication skills and computer literacy including facility with MSWord, Access, Excel, PowerPoint, and SPSS as well as experience in social science research methods are necessary. A master's degree and experience with public policy and/or evaluation research is desirable.

Job offers excellent benefits and a collegial atmosphere. Attention to detail (i.e. quality control) is extremely important.

Interested applicants may reply to me (with resume) via email or fax (732-932-1551) or mail.

Patrick Murray  
Associate Director, Star-Ledger/Eagleton-Rutgers Poll  
Senior Research Analyst, Center for Public Interest Polling  
Eagleton Institute of Politics  
Rutgers University  
185 Ryders Lane  
New Brunswick, NJ 08901

---

Date: Thu, 05 Sep 2002 10:13:41 -0400  
To: pmeyer@email.unc.edu, Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>  
Subject: Re: Age/Race Census Data  
Cc: aapornet@usc.edu  
In-Reply-To: <Pine.A41.4.44+UNC.0209041158390.19016-100000@login8.isis.unc.edu>  
References: <3D7626FC.48CC331@marketsharescorp.com>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
          boundary="====\_137728310==\_ .ALT"

-----\_137728310==\_ .ALT  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

The Census Bureau is not doing this for 2002.

At 12:00 PM 9/4/02 -0400, Philip Meyer wrote:

> Census Bureau's projections for the population of voting age show age by  
> race by state. Here is the address for 2000. I don't know what happened to  
> 2002:

>  
>       <http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/voting/proj00/tab01.txt>  
>

---

> Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  
> University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

>Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549  
>Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

>=====

>

>

>On Wed, 4 Sep 2002, Nick Panagakis wrote:

>

>> Date: Wed, 04 Sep 2002 10:30:11 -0500

>> From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>

>> To: aapornet@usc.edu

>> Subject: Age/Race Census Data

>>

>> Can anyone direct me to a site showing age within race by state? I would

>> prefer data for counties if available.

>>

>> Thanks.

>>

>>

>>

Warren J. Mitofsky  
140 Riverside Drive, Apt 18N  
New York, NY 10024

212 496-2945  
212 496-0846 FAX

email: mitofsky@mindspring.com  
http://www.mitofskyinternational.com

-----=\_137728310=\_ .ALT  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*  
\* This post contains a forbidden message format \*  
\* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*  
\* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \*  
\* If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
\* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

-----=\_137728310=\_ .ALT--

=====  
Date: Thu, 05 Sep 2002 09:24:34 -0500  
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)  
X-Accept-Language: en,pdf  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Tribune Polls  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Below are results of Chicago Tribune Polls we did that ran earlier this week. The Gov race story featured "before and after" measurement of voter preference; i.e., before and after distinguishing Jim from George Ryan.

Before distinguishing Jim Ryan from George Ryan it was: Blagojevich, 49%; Ryan, 32%; Skinner, 4%; Other, 3%; undecided, 14% - Blagojevich leading by 17 points.

After distinguishing Jim from George Ryan it was: Blagojevich, 45%; Ryan, 35%; Skinner, 3%; Other, 2%; undecided, 15% - Blagojevich now leading by 10 points.

The "after" question was: "In telephone polls, people sometimes mistake the name JIM RYAN for GEORGE RYAN. GEORGE RYAN was Secretary of State when truckers' licenses were sold for bribes. Illinois Attorney General JIM RYAN is the Ryan who is now the candidate for Governor in November. After considering this and the election were held today, for whom would you vote...10b. If you really HAD TO DECIDE today, do you lean more toward..."

(The links below will expire this weekend.)

Blagojevich Rides Ryan name Woes

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/chi-0209020070sep02.story>

Economy Pulls Down Bush's Ratings

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/chi-0209030194sep03.story>

Madigan Holds On To Her Lead

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/chicago/chi-0209030234sep03.story>

=====  
Date: Fri, 06 Sep 2002 09:04:45 -0500  
From: Don Ferree <gferree@ssc.wisc.edu>  
Subject: Re: Tribune Polls  
In-reply-to: <3D77691B.2476C27D@marketsharescorp.com>  
X-Sender: gferree@ssc.wisc.edu  
To: mail@marketsharescorp.com, aapornet@usc.edu  
Message-id: <4.1.20020906083100.00caf580@ssc.wisc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from QUOTED-PRINTABLE to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id g86E4hI18753

I suspect the results of the Tribune Poll may overstate the impact of confusion -- without denyng its possibiity.

As I understand it, everyone was first given the choice without any attempt to differentiate Ryans, then a followup question (quoted by Nick) tried to do this, the preference question was re-asked, including an "if you had to make up your mind" prompt. It is not clear to me from either the story or Nick's note whether or not the "leaning" prompt was part of the first question as well, or whether the reported "after" figures were with or

without leaners. This is important information.

But ignoring this, I would think that any question similar in form to this -- even without the link to the "other Ryan" -- where one says, oh "by the way you may not have known that candidate B sometimes eats chocolate ice cream,t, but when you do consider that, how would you vote now?" is likely to boost support for B. This would probably hold unless the information is blatantly negative, since it implies that the information might make a difference and focuses particularly on candidate B.

A "cleaner" measure of the effect of confusion might have been to do a split half where the preference question was randomly preceded by an introduction crafted to make the distinction between Ryan's while saying something neutral about Skinner and Blagojevich. One could then look at the "pre-clarified" versus non-pre-clarified choice. (Admittedly, each based on only half the sample). If one is worried about the impact of the clarification on subsequent questions, one could include it AFTER the preference in the other half, maybe even asking something to gauge if respondents claimed to have been aware of it.

Certainly, however, the Tribune is to be commended for trying to address this problem.

I do have one more observation. Nick kindly included links to the story (and others) in his posting. However, when I followed them, I discovered that one must "register" with the Trib to see stories. I for one would be more comfortable if this were not necessary, or if a copy could be posted outside the normal retrieval system. I understand that this may be a problem, and might operate to make it harder for AAPORNETers to pass on information, but offer the observation for what it is worth.

Don

At 09:24 AM 09/05/2002 -0500, Nick Panagakis wrote:

>

>Below are results of Chicago Tribune Polls we did that ran earlier this >week. The Gov race story featured "before and after" measurement of >voter preference; i.e., before and after distinguishing Jim from George >Ryan.

>

>Before distinguishing Jim Ryan from George Ryan it was: Blagojevich, >49%; Ryan, 32%; Skinner, 4%; Other, 3%; undecided, 14% - Blagojevich >leading by 17 points.

>

>After distinguishing Jim from George Ryan it was: Blagojevich, 45%; >Ryan, 35%; Skinner, 3%; Other, 2%; undecided, 15% - Blagojevich now >leading by 10 points.

>

>The "after" question was: "In telephone polls, people sometimes mistake >the name JIM RYAN for GEORGE RYAN. GEORGE RYAN was Secretary of State >when truckers' licenses were sold for bribes. Illinois Attorney General >JIM RYAN is the Ryan who is now the candidate for Governor in November. >After considering this and the election were held today, for whom would >you vote...10b. If you really HAD TO DECIDE today, do you lean more >toward..."

>

>(The links below will expire this weekend.)

>  
>Blagojevich Rides Ryan name Woes  
><http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/chi-0209020070sep02.story>  
>  
>Economy Pulls Down Bush's Ratings  
><http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/chi-0209030194sep03.story>  
>  
>Madigan Holds On To Her Lead  
><http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/chicago/chi-0209030234sep03.story>  
>

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

---

Date: Fri, 6 Sep 2002 10:38:50 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>  
X-X-Sender: pmeyer@login8.isis.unc.edu  
To: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>  
cc: "Aapornet@Usc. Edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: RE: Age/Race Census Data  
In-Reply-To: <KLEOLNOOPOCIGAODMGHAEKFDIAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>  
Message-ID:  
<Pine.A41.4.44+UNC.0209061036100.34342-100000@login8.isis.unc.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Maybe that's why Census dropped the election-year projection for 2002. I have used those for validating polls for 20 years and am sorry to see them go. Does anybody know if they are dropped permanently or just until they can use the 2000 census as a base for the projections?

---

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549  
Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: [www.unc.edu/~pmeyer](http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer)

---

On Thu, 5 Sep 2002, Andrew A. Beveridge wrote:

> Date: Thu, 05 Sep 2002 08:26:34 -0400  
> From: Andrew A. Beveridge <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>  
> To: mail@marketsharescorp.com  
> Cc: "Aapornet@Usc. Edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
> Subject: RE: Age/Race Census Data  
>  
> Hi Nick!  
>

> Don't use the projections, use the 2000 Census. Everyone now acknowledges the  
> projections were terrible. The 2000 projections do not include the 2000  
Census  
> results, which were vastly different than the projections in many states.  
>  
> See this column I wrote about the estimates.  
>  
> <http://www.gothamgazette.com/demographics/may.02.shtml>  
>  
> Also in the Philadelphia Inquirer some Census Bureau person said "to take  
them  
> with a grain of salt."  
>  
> Through the Census Bureau's American Factfinder you can get exactly what  
you  
> want, including  
> by county or even more detailed down to the Block Group or even block.  
>  
> <http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html>  
>  
>  
> Andy Beveridge  
>  
>> -----Original Message-----  
>> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of  
>> Nick Panagakis  
>> Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 4:43 PM  
>> To: Philip Meyer  
>> Cc: aapornet@usc.edu  
>> Subject: Re: Age/Race Census Data  
>>  
>>  
>> Phil sent me a link which gives age within race by state.  
>>  
>> Thanks Phil.  
>>  
>> Philip Meyer wrote:  
>>>  
>>> Census Bureau's projections for the population of voting age show  
age by  
>>> race by state. Here is the address for 2000. I don't know what  
happened to  
>>> 2002:  
>>>  
>>>  
<http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/voting/proj00/tab01.txt>  
>>>  
>>> =====  
>>> Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  
>>> University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
>>> Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549  
>>> Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: [www.unc.edu/~pmeyer](http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer)  
>>> =====  
>>>  
>>> On Wed, 4 Sep 2002, Nick Panagakis wrote:  
>>>



> > > > Date: Wed, 04 Sep 2002 10:30:11 -0500  
> > > > From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>  
> > > > To: aapornet@usc.edu  
> > > > Subject: Age/Race Census Data  
> > > >  
> > > > Can anyone direct me to a site showing age within race by state? I  
would  
> > > > prefer data for counties if available.  
> > > >  
> > > > Thanks.  
> > > >  
> > > >  
> > > >  
> > > >  
> >  
> >  
> >  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

=====  
Date: Fri, 06 Sep 2002 10:05:21 -0500  
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)  
X-Accept-Language: en,pdf  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: Don Ferree <gferree@ssc.wisc.edu>  
CC: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Tribune Polls  
References: <4.1.20020906083100.00caf580@ssc.wisc.edu>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

1. Of course, the "lean" question was asked in both questions. Here is the first question set: 9a. Candidates for Illinois Governor in November are....DEMOCRAT Rod Blagojevich (bla-GOY-ya-vich), REPUBLICAN Jim Ryan, and Libertarian Cal Skinner. If that election was held today, for whom would you vote...(SHUFFLE NAMES BELOW) 9b. If you really HAD TO DECIDE today, do you lean more toward...(SHUFFLE NAMES)

2. As for a split-sample, I think when N=600 this option is questionable.

Moreover - and you have to know a little about Illinois politics for this - George Ryan has held three offices over the past 20 years - Lt. Governor, Secretary of State, and Governor. He came under fire for licenses-for-bribes while he was Secretary of State which came to light in 1999-2000. The name "Ryan" has become associated with so many offices I don't think only describing Jim (who is now AG) is any guarantee that he is not the "bad" Ryan.

In order to determine what this name confusion is costing JIM in votes, I believe it is essential to identify \*both\* Ryans including George's connection to the CDL scandal and show that \*Jim is not George\*.

Describing Jim only is not enough. As for the ice cream comparison, I believe my descriptors are neutral statements. George's connection with the scandal is well-known. In April his favorability ratio was 19% favorable/59% unfavorable.

(BTW, in 1994 when George was running for his second term as SOS and Jim was first elected AG, the Ryan name was a \*plus\*. Jim ran stronger when his AG race preceded the SOS race (normal ballot order) than in the sample split with the SOS race ahead of AG.)

3. I feel the same way Don does about registration. Didn't want to bother the entire list with the full story. I will send Don the text of the story in a separate message.

Nick

Don Ferree wrote:

>

> I suspect the results of the Tribune Poll may overstate the impact of  
> confusion -- without denying its possibility.

>

> As I understand it, everyone was first given the choice without any  
attempt

> to differentiate Ryans, then a followup question (quoted by Nick) tried to  
> do this, the preference question was re-asked, including an "if you had to  
> make up your mind" prompt. It is not clear to me from either the story or  
> Nick's note whether or not the "leaning" prompt was part of the first  
> question as well, or whether the reported "after" figures were with or  
> without leaners. This is important information.

>

> But ignoring this, I would think that any question similar in form to this  
> -- even without the link to the "other Ryan" -- where one says, oh "by the  
> way you may not have known that candidate B sometimes eats chocolate ice  
> cream,t, but when you do consider that, how would you vote now?" is likely  
> to boost support for B. This would probably hold unless the information  
is

> blatantly negative, since it implies that the information might make a  
> difference and focuses particularly on candidate B.

>

> A "cleaner" measure of the effect of confusion might have been to do a  
> split half where the preference question was randomly preceded by an  
> introduction crafted to make the distinction between Ryan's while saying  
> something neutral about Skinner and Blagojevich. One could then look at  
> the "pre-clarified" versus non-pre-clarified choice. (Admittedly, each  
> based on only half the sample). If one is worried about the impact of the  
> clarification on subsequent questions, one could include it AFTER the  
> preference in the other half, maybe even asking something to gauge if  
> respondents claimed to have been aware of it.

>

> Certainly, however, the Tribune is to be commended for trying to address  
> this problem.

>

> I do have one more observation. Nick kindly included links to the story  
> (and others) in his posting. However, when I followed them, I discovered  
> that one must "register" with the Trib to see stories. I for one would be  
> more comfortable if this were not necessary, or if a copy could be posted  
> outside the normal retrieval system. I understand that this may be a

> problem, and might operate to make it harder for AAPORNETers to pass on  
> information, but offer the observation for what it is worth.  
>  
> Don  
>  
> At 09:24 AM 09/05/2002 -0500, Nick Panagakis wrote:  
> >  
> >Below are results of Chicago Tribune Polls we did that ran earlier this  
> >week. The Gov race story featured "before and after" measurement of  
> >voter preference; i.e., before and after distinguishing Jim from George  
> >Ryan.  
> >  
> >Before distinguishing Jim Ryan from George Ryan it was: Blagojevich,  
> >49%; Ryan, 32%; Skinner, 4%; Other, 3%; undecided, 14% - Blagojevich  
> >leading by 17 points.  
> >  
> >After distinguishing Jim from George Ryan it was: Blagojevich, 45%;  
> >Ryan, 35%; Skinner, 3%; Other, 2%; undecided, 15% - Blagojevich now  
> >leading by 10 points.  
> >  
> >The "after" question was: "In telephone polls, people sometimes mistake  
> >the name JIM RYAN for GEORGE RYAN. GEORGE RYAN was Secretary of State  
> >when truckers' licenses were sold for bribes. Illinois Attorney General  
> >JIM RYAN is the Ryan who is now the candidate for Governor in November.  
> >After considering this and the election were held today, for whom would  
> >you vote...10b. If you really HAD TO DECIDE today, do you lean more  
> >toward..."  
> >  
> >(The links below will expire this weekend.)  
> >  
> >Blagojevich Rides Ryan name Woes  
> ><http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/chi-0209020070sep02.story>  
> >  
> >Economy Pulls Down Bush's Ratings  
> ><http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/chi-0209030194sep03.story>  
> >  
> >Madigan Holds On To Her Lead  
> >  
> ><http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/chicago/chi-0209030234sep03.story>  
> >  
> >  
> 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

=====  
Date: Fri, 6 Sep 2002 11:07:41 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>  
X-X-Sender: pmeyer@login8.isis.unc.edu  
To: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>  
cc: "Aapornet@Usc. Edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: RE: Age/Race Census Data

In-Reply-To:  
<Pine.A41.4.44+UNC.0209061036100.34342-100000@login8.isis.unc.edu>  
Message-ID:  
<Pine.A41.4.44+UNC.0209061102241.34342-100000@login8.isis.unc.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

If I may be forgiven for answering my own question ...

Just called the Bureau of the Census and learned that they dropped the projections this year because they didn't have time to update the base to the 2000 census. As Andy says, raw 2000 is a better estimate of 2002 than a projection from 1990.

The Bureau projections will be back for the 2004 election. It wasn't a budget-cut issue.

And it was suggested that we can do our own projections by applying the 1990s rate of change to the 2000 column. Though, as Andy has pointed out in his good column, that's probably not a good idea for New York.

=====  
Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549  
Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer  
=====

On Fri, 6 Sep 2002, Philip Meyer wrote:

> Date: Fri, 6 Sep 2002 10:38:50 -0400 (EDT)  
> From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>  
> To: Andrew A. Beveridge <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>  
> Cc: "Aapornet@Usc. Edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
> Subject: RE: Age/Race Census Data  
>  
> Maybe that's why Census dropped the election-year projection for 2002.  
> I have used those for validating polls for 20 years and am sorry to see  
> them go. Does anybody know if they are dropped permanently or just until  
> they can use the 2000 census as a base for the projections?  
>

> =====  
> Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  
> University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
> Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549  
> Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer  
> =====

>  
>  
> On Thu, 5 Sep 2002, Andrew A. Beveridge wrote:  
>  
>> Date: Thu, 05 Sep 2002 08:26:34 -0400  
>> From: Andrew A. Beveridge <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>  
>> To: mail@marketsharescorp.com  
>> Cc: "Aapornet@Usc. Edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
>> Subject: RE: Age/Race Census Data

> >  
> > Hi Nick!  
> >  
> > Don't use the projections, use the 2000 Census. Everyone now  
acknowledges the  
> > projections were terrible. The 2000 projections do not include the 2000  
Census  
> > results, which were vastly different than the projections in many  
states.  
> >  
> > See this column I wrote about the estimates.  
> >  
> > <http://www.gothamgazette.com/demographics/may.02.shtml>  
> >  
> > Also in the Philadelphia Inquirer some Census Bureau person said "to  
take them  
> > with a grain of salt."  
> >  
> > Through the Census Bureau's American Factfinder you can get exactly what  
you  
> > want, including  
> > by county or even more detailed down to the Block Group or even block.  
> >  
> > <http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html>  
> >  
> >  
> > Andy Beveridge  
> >  
> > -----Original Message-----  
> > > From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf  
Of  
> > > Nick Panagakis  
> > > Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 4:43 PM  
> > > To: Philip Meyer  
> > > Cc: aapornet@usc.edu  
> > > Subject: Re: Age/Race Census Data  
> > >  
> > >  
> > > Phil sent me a link which gives age within race by state.  
> > >  
> > > Thanks Phil.  
> > >  
> > > Philip Meyer wrote:  
> > > >  
> > > > Census Bureau's projections for the population of voting age show  
age by  
> > > > race by state. Here is the address for 2000. I don't know what  
happened to  
> > > > 2002:  
> > > >  
> > > >  
<http://www.census.gov/population/socdemo/voting/proj00/tab01.txt>  
> > > >  
> > > > =====  
> > > > Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  
> > > > University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
> > > > Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549



effective neutrality. Indeed, my point is that many questions of the form, "but wait, think about this, and NOW what do you think" may result in some change of answers even among those who had not mistakenly had an impression of one candidate, and thus that the difference observed may contain a certain (unclear) overstatement of the real impact of mistaken identity.

At 10:05 AM 09/06/2002 -0500, Nick Panagakis wrote:

>  
>1. Of course, the "lean" question was asked in both questions. Here is  
>the first question set: 9a. Candidates for Illinois Governor in  
>November are....DEMOCRAT Rod Blagojevich (bla-GOY-ya-vich), REPUBLICAN  
>Jim Ryan, and Libertarian Cal Skinner. If that election was held today,  
>for whom would you vote...(SHUFFLE NAMES BELOW) 9b. If you really HAD TO  
>DECIDE today, do you lean more toward...(SHUFFLE NAMES)  
>  
>2. As for a split-sample, I think when N=600 this option is questionable.  
>  
>Moreover - and you have to know a little about Illinois politics for  
>this - George Ryan has held three offices over the past 20 years - Lt.  
>Governor, Secretary of State, and Governor. He came under fire for  
>licenses-for-bribes while he was Secretary of State which came to light  
>in 1999-2000. The name "Ryan" has become associated with so many offices  
>I don't think only describing Jim (who is now AG) is any guarantee that  
>he is not the "bad" Ryan.  
>  
>In order to determine what this name confusion is costing Jim in votes,  
>I believe it is essential to identify \*both\* Ryans including George's  
>connection to the CDL scandal and show that \*Jim is not George\*.  
>Describing Jim only is not enough. As for the ice cream comparison, I  
>believe my descriptors are neutral statements. George's connection with  
>the scandal is well-known. In April his favorability ratio was 19%  
>favorable/59% unfavorable.  
>  
>(BTW, in 1994 when George was running for his second term as SOS and Jim  
>was first elected AG, the Ryan name was a \*plus\*. Jim ran stronger when  
>his AG race preceded the SOS race (normal ballot order) than in the  
>sample split with the SOS race ahead of AG.)  
>  
>3. I feel the same way Don does about registration. Didn't want to  
>bother the entire list with the full story. I will send Don the text of  
>the story in a separate message.  
>  
>Nick  
>  
>Don Ferree wrote:  
>>  
>> I suspect the results of the Tribune Poll may overstate the impact of  
>> confusion -- without denyng its possibiity.  
>>  
>> As I understand it, everyone was first given the choice without any  
>> attempt  
>> to differentiate Ryans, then a followup question (quoted by Nick) tried  
>> to  
>> do this, the preference question was re-asked, including an "if you had  
>> to  
>> make up your mind" prompt. It is not clear to me from either the story  
>> or

>> Nick's note whether or not the "leaning" prompt was part of the first  
>> question as well, or whether the reported "after" figures were with or  
>> without leaners. This is important information.  
>>  
>> But ignoring this, I would think that any question similar in form to  
this  
>> -- even without the link to the "other Ryan" -- where one says, oh "by  
the  
>> way you may not have known that candidate B sometimes eats chocolate ice  
>> cream,t, but when you do consider that, how would you vote now?" is  
likely  
>> to boost support for B. This would probably hold unless the information  
is  
>> blatantly negative, since it implies that the information might make a  
>> difference and focuses particularly on candidate B.  
>>  
>> A "cleaner" measure of the effect of confusion might have been to do a  
>> split half where the preference question was randomly preceded by an  
>> introduction crafted to make the distinction between Ryan's while saying  
>> something neutral about Skinner and Blagojevich. One could then look at  
>> the "pre-clarified" versus non-pre-clarified choice. (Admittedly, each  
>> based on only half the sample). If one is worried about the impact of  
the  
>> clarification on subsequent questions, one could include it AFTER the  
>> preference in the other half, maybe even asking something to gauge if  
>> respondents claimed to have been aware of it.  
>>  
>> Certainly, however, the Tribune is to be commended for trying to address  
>> this problem.  
>>  
>> I do have one more observation. Nick kindly included links to the story  
>> (and others) in his posting. However, when I followed them, I discovered  
>> that one must "register" with the Trib to see stories. I for one would  
be  
>> more comfortable if this were not necessary, or if a copy could be posted  
>> outside the normal retrieval system. I understand that this may be a  
>> problem, and might operate to make it harder for AAPORNETers to pass on  
>> information, but offer the observation for what it is worth.  
>>  
>> Don  
>>  
>> At 09:24 AM 09/05/2002 -0500, Nick Panagakis wrote:  
>> >  
>> >Below are results of Chicago Tribune Polls we did that ran earlier this  
>> >week. The Gov race story featured "before and after" measurement of  
>> >voter preference; i.e., before and after distinguishing Jim from George  
>> >Ryan.  
>> >  
>> >Before distinguishing Jim Ryan from George Ryan it was: Blagojevich,  
>> >49%; Ryan, 32%; Skinner, 4%; Other, 3%; undecided, 14% - Blagojevich  
>> >leading by 17 points.  
>> >  
>> >After distinguishing Jim from George Ryan it was: Blagojevich, 45%;  
>> >Ryan, 35%; Skinner, 3%; Other, 2%; undecided, 15% - Blagojevich now  
>> >leading by 10 points.  
>> >  
>> >The "after" question was: "In telephone polls, people sometimes mistake



>> >the name JIM RYAN for GEORGE RYAN. GEORGE RYAN was Secretary of State  
>> >when truckers' licenses were sold for bribes. Illinois Attorney General  
>> >JIM RYAN is the Ryan who is now the candidate for Governor in November.  
>> >After considering this and the election were held today, for whom would  
>> >you vote...10b. If you really HAD TO DECIDE today, do you lean more  
>> >toward..."  
>> >  
>> >(The links below will expire this weekend.)  
>> >  
>> >Blagojevich Rides Ryan name Woes  
>> ><http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/chi-0209020070sep02.story>  
>> >  
>> >Economy Pulls Down Bush's Ratings  
>> ><http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/chi-0209030194sep03.story>  
>> >  
>> >Madigan Holds On To Her Lead  
>> >  
>> ><http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/chicago/chi-0209030234sep03.story>  
>> >  
>> >  
>> 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  
>

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

---

Date: Fri, 06 Sep 2002 10:51:21 -0500  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@marketsharescorp.com](mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com)>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)  
X-Accept-Language: en, pdf  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: [aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)  
Subject: Name Confusion -more  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

This is our year for potential name confusion.

We are also covering the Durbin-Durkin race for Senate. In this and other questions (see below) we include first \*and\* last names throughout the questionnaire - even in the answer choices when sometimes only last names are given. I think this is legitimate. First and last names are included on the ballot and in campaign advertising. If we did otherwise,

we could be faulted for creating confusion.

8a. Candidates for U.S. Senate in November are....DEMOCRAT Dick Durbin, REPUBLICAN Jim Durkin, and Libertarian candidate Steven Burgauer (BURG-hour). If that election was held today, for whom would you vote... (SHUFFLE NAMES BELOW)

...Jim Durkin? -1 (SKIP TO Q 9a)  
...Dick Durbin? -2 (SKIP TO Q 9a)  
...Steven Burgauer? -3 (SKIP TO Q 9a)  
(DON'T READ) OTHER CANDIDATE -4 (SKIP TO Q 9a)  
(DON'T READ) UNDECIDED -5 (ASK Q 8b)  
(DON'T READ) REFUSED -6 (SKIP TO Q 9a)

There is not much confusion between these names. In the April poll, 75% knew that Durbin "was currently a U.S. Senator from Illinois", 6% thought Durkin was, 18% didn't know and 1% said neither. Not a perfect question, but at least we know that Durbin - and not Durkin - enjoys the advantage of incumbency.

The third race we are covering in which first and last name ID is important is the race for Attorney General. The Democrat is Lisa Madigan, the daughter of Mike Madigan who has held the offices of Democratic state party chair and house speaker (except for 2 years) for over 20 years.

Nick

.

=====  
Date: Fri, 6 Sep 2002 12:12:31 -0400  
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: FYI: The Power of Polls  
Message-ID: <001401c255c0\$34a89360\$6901a8c0@mark>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
 charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook, Build 10.0.3416  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000  
X-Rcpt-To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

Editorial/Op-Ed  
The New York Times

September 6, 2002

The Power of Polls

To the Editor:

Re "Cuomo Quits Race and Backs McCall for Governorship" (front page, Sept. 4): Andrew M. Cuomo gave a concession speech. H. Carl McCall gave a victory speech. As Mr. Cuomo himself joked, wasn't this supposed to

happen next week, after the results of the Democratic primary became known?

It is indeed a sad day when polls, rather than the ballot box, decide an election. We might as well just cancel elections and let the media choose our public officials.

DAVID STAUM

Brooklyn, Sept. 4, 2002

---

Date: Fri, 6 Sep 2002 14:02:26 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>  
X-X-Sender: pmeyer@login8.isis.unc.edu  
To: "Aapornet@Usc. Edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Census projections  
Message-ID:  
<Pine.A41.4.44+UNC.0209061400210.34342-100000@login8.isis.unc.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

If I may be forgiven for answering my own question ...

Called the Bureau of the Census and learned that it dropped the projections this year because there wasn't time to update the base to the 2000 census. As Andy says, raw 2000 is a better estimate of 2002 than a projection from 1990.

The Bureau projections will be back for the 2004 election. It wasn't a budget-cut issue.

And it was suggested that we can do our own projections by applying the 1990s rate of change to the 2000 census. Though, as Andy has pointed out in his good column, that's probably not a bright idea for New York.

---

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549  
Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: [www.unc.edu/~pmeyer](http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer)

---

---

Date: Sat, 7 Sep 2002 13:03:19 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>  
X-X-Sender: pmeyer@login9.isis.unc.edu  
To: "Aapornet@Usc. Edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Projections of the voting age population  
Message-ID:  
<Pine.A41.4.44+UNC.0209071259430.16410-100000@login9.isis.unc.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Please excuse my redundant postings on this topic. Mine is one of the  
obsolecent email systems that interprets only about half of the  
conversation on this site. Trust me, it's the system that is senile, not  
me (I think).

=====  
Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549  
Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer  
=====

=====  
Date: Sat, 07 Sep 2002 14:59:45 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: <toc>--Markle: A Foundation Travels Far From Sesame Street  
(NYTimes)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209071457140.19154-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

-----  
Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company  
-----

[www.nytimes.com/2002/09/06/business/06MARK.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/06/business/06MARK.html)

September 6, 2002

A FOUNDATION TRAVELS FAR FROM SESAME STREET

By JIM RUTENBERG

For much of the last century the Markle Foundation methodically built a  
reputation in education, culminating with its role in helping to start  
"Sesame Street." With a tiny staff, it attracted little publicity and  
hardly a whiff of controversy.

Five years ago, that began to change with the arrival of its new  
president, Zoë Baird. Several years after her nomination for United  
States attorney general was scuttled over disclosures that she employed  
an illegal immigrant as a nanny and failed to pay Social Security taxes,  
Ms. Baird promised to remake Markle, which was once run by the banker J.  
P. Morgan Jr.

She vowed to turn the foundation into the conscience of the Internet, a

force for good in children's media, health care and democracy itself. And do it in a hurry. In a break with the past, Ms. Baird promised to spend \$100 million, or more than half of Markle's entire \$187 million endowment, in just three to five years.

Ms. Baird has certainly left her mark. But whether it is a good or a bad one is the subject of debate in the philanthropic world. Her board supports her, but many of those who worked for her do not. Ms. Baird has raised Markle's profile, but some of her most promoted projects have gone nowhere. So far, she has managed to spend only \$40 million -- far short of her goal of \$100 million because, her critics say, she can be indecisive, sometimes backing projects only to abandon them. As for the money Markle has spent, nearly half has gone to administrative costs, including salaries, consultants and public relations.

"They're missing in action," said Jeff Chester, executive director of the Center for Digital Democracy, a public-interest advocacy group. He said that despite Markle's promises, the group had not done enough to represent the public in major Internet governance issues. "For the most part, the foundation seems to be doing nothing more than serving in a P.R. effort for Ms. Zoë Baird."

Ms. Baird disagrees. "We are trying to change a lot, and very fast," she said in an interview. "That's going to ruffle some feathers and that's O.K. I don't think we've hurt anybody. I think we've helped a lot of people, and I think we'll help a lot more."

Ms. Baird has had her share of accomplishments, including creating highly regarded task forces on national security and health. Supporters also praise her impressive intellect and enviable contacts with Fortune 500 executives and top government officials.

"She's taking risks to effect significant change," said Scott Harshbarger, chief executive of Common Cause, which has worked with Markle on Internet issues. James L. Barksdale, the former Netscape chief executive, says Ms. Baird is "highly regarded by people from all walks and she's been a pleasure to work with." But she is clearly feeling some pressure.

On Aug. 22, Julia Moffett, one of Ms. Baird's most trusted deputies and a former communications official in the Clinton White House, resigned under pressure after the foundation discovered that she had inflated her expense reports. She had previously been admonished for improperly charging personal expenses to the foundation.

Under Ms. Baird, Markle's staff of 43 has been shaken by the departure of 33 employees, most of whom she has replaced. Some of those who left complained of what they called paralyzing micromanagement and an obsession with image. "I felt like I was working in a dysfunctional organization that couldn't deliver on promises," said Steven Weber, a former senior adviser at Markle.

Edith C. Bjornson, a former Markle vice president, added, "The Markle Foundation no longer enjoys the respect and sterling reputation that it had for years."

Markle recently began asking some departing employees, none of whom had

legal disputes, to agree in writing as part of their severance agreements not to speak out against the foundation. And staff members are instructed not to speak to Markle board members without first talking to Ms. Baird's deputy. Should any "inadvertent contact" with the board occur outside the building, staff members must send Ms. Baird an e-mail message "describing your encounter."

"I would resign from the board if I knew the executive director had set that policy," said Daniel Borochoff, president of the American Institute of Philanthropy, a watchdog organization in Bethesda, Md. "It does make you think, 'What is she trying to hide here?'"

Markle officials say they have nothing to hide, noting that employees are sometimes invited to join Ms. Baird in meetings with the board. Most of those employees are happy, they added, and staff turnover has its benefits. "A degree of staff change can be healthy for the organization, bringing in fresh ideas," said a spokesman, Peter Kerr. Written pledges not to speak against the foundation simply make good business sense, he added.

Any change in an old-line institution can be chafing to some. And keeping score in philanthropy -- where results may not be immediately apparent -- is hard. Also, the Internet business world Markle has pledged to influence has struggled since its boom several years ago.

Even so, the criticism of Ms. Baird is noteworthy because it emanates from not just former employees, but also from outside groups that are usually loath to criticize potential sources of financing.

Milton L. Mueller, an associate professor at Syracuse University who received a grant from Markle to study Internet issues, faults the foundation for a "lack of organization."

Spending by Markle officers has also been a source of criticism. While attending conferences, Ms. Baird or Ms. Moffett, her former chief planner, stayed at expensive hotels, including the Landmark London, the Imperial in Tokyo and the Chateau Marmont on Sunset Boulevard in Hollywood. And Markle paid nearly \$10,000 to lodge a consultant for a month in the Royalton in New York.

That kind of spending is frowned upon by some nonprofit groups and charity watchdog organizations. "They're not supposed to do deluxe stuff," said Pablo Eisenberg, a founder of the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, an advocacy group.

Mr. Kerr, the Markle spokesman, said the foundation did not have time to find cheaper housing for the consultant. He also said that Markle officials stayed at high-priced hotels because conferences were usually held at them and that stricter travel guidelines were put in place last October. Ms. Moffett, who once ran the press office at NBC News, was rebuked for charging personal expenses to the foundation, including sea planes to the Hamptons; purchases at Saks Fifth Avenue; and a visit to Fifi La Roo, a spa in East Hampton, according to expense records and interviews with Markle officials.

Though that money was eventually paid back, Ms. Moffett resigned after Markle later determined she had also inflated expense accounts by about

\$1,000, Mr. Kerr said. The inquiry by Markle into Ms. Moffett's spending was in response to questions raised by The New York Times.

Mr. Kerr also said administrative costs were rising because Markle was changing from primarily a grant-making foundation with a small staff into one that needed more resources to run its own programs.

Ms. Baird's tenure contrasts sharply with that of her low-key predecessor, Lloyd N. Morrisett, who is revered in the philanthropic world for helping to create the Children's Television Workshop.

Mr. Morrisett transformed Markle, founded by the coal baron John Markle and his wife, Mary, from an endowment that primarily gave money to medical education to one that focused on "the educational uses of the mass media."

But some board members wondered whether Markle was getting all the credit it deserved.

With Mr. Morrisett's retirement in 1998, the appointment of Ms. Baird, a former lawyer for Aetna and General Electric, gave Markle more prominence in corporate America and on Capitol Hill.

"Just because of her stature we felt that she could lead the program better than any of the other candidates," said Joel L. Fleishman, the chairman of Markel, who strongly supports Ms. Baird.

Ms. Baird, who earned a base salary last year of \$432,000, attracted a well-credentialed staff, and paid them well. Before Ms. Baird, Markle's best-paid staff member earned \$117,000 a year. Now Markle dangles annual salaries of \$225,000 and up, substantially more than some similarly endowed New York foundations. Ms. Baird also moved Markle to bigger offices in Rockefeller Center, budgeting \$2.1 million for architectural, design and equipment upgrades, records show.

Right away, Ms. Baird wanted projects that could quickly put Markle back on the media map, former staff members said. She found one in Oxygen Media.

Markle said it would join with Oxygen, a cable television and Internet network for women started by the former president of Nickelodeon, Geraldine Laybourne, in partnership with, among others, Oprah Winfrey. Markle agreed to spend \$3.5 million on a project called Oxygen/Markle Pulse that would poll women on major issues, then post results on a Web site.

"Why would you give \$3.5 million of philanthropic money to somebody who had just raised hundreds of millions of dollars?" asked a former senior staff member.

Ms. Baird said she simply wanted to encourage a private company to act in the public interest. Markle spent \$660,000 before the Web site was dismantled, partly because Oxygen changed its Internet strategy. Ms. Baird said the project would soon be revived in a different form.

Markle also pledged \$2 million to the Advertising Council for spots encouraging parents to use the Internet with their children. But after

Markle spent \$220,000 and many hours of staff time, that project died when Markle and the Advertising Council could not agree on what the advertisements would say.

The same fate befell a \$3 million project with Consumers Union that would have helped parents evaluate interactive media for children. Markle spent \$150,000 before deciding that project lacked impact.

"Initiatives seemed to fall into a black hole and nothing seemed to come of them," said Mr. Weber, the former Markle adviser.

Andrew Blau, an Internet policy expert, said he quit Markle in disappointment. "It was very hard to do the things I was excited about," Mr. Blau said.

Ms. Baird said it was better to stop a project that was not working than to continue it. "If people felt they had to go back to the drawing board and rethink something because it didn't meet our standards, I'm certainly not troubled by that," she said.

Besides, Ms. Baird said, Markle has had plenty of successes. It took the lead in financing and overseeing the first public elections for a major Internet governing body, the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers. During the 2000 presidential campaign, it won praise for building a network of Web sites that educated voters about the election.

Also, to help developing countries better use technology, the federal government picked Markle to represent American nonprofit groups on a task force of government, companies and nonprofit interests from around the world. Markle is doing similar work with the United Nations.

In the health field, Ms. Baird has assembled a panel to hasten the use of the Internet by hospitals, patients and insurers.

Still, not everyone is impressed.

"With enough money anyone can start a task force and get people together," Mr. Weber, the former adviser, said. "What matters is what the product is."

And Markle critics bemoan what they see as the foundation's lagging interest in its legacy of helping children's media. Although Ms. Baird said the foundation was only reassessing its mission, partly because the toy companies it wanted to work with were suffering in the bad economy, the foundation has dismissed two of its three staff members working in children's media.

"The sense I got was that the kids' program didn't offer the opportunity for high-profile, sexy policy making," said Douglas Rushkoff, a novelist who often writes about the Internet and has been an adviser to Markle on children's projects. Mr. Rushkoff, who said Markle treated him well, believes that the children's program could not compete with new efforts like a task force on technology and national security.

"It didn't seem like a program capable of generating the kind of profile and buzz of an antiterrorism team," he said.



###

[www.nytimes.com/2002/09/06/business/06MARK.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/06/business/06MARK.html)

---

Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Sun, 08 Sep 2002 09:01:24 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Poll Finds Unease on Terror Fight, War on Iraq (NYTimes)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209080900050.27557-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

---

Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company

---

[www.nytimes.com/2002/09/08/politics/08POLL.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/08/politics/08POLL.html)

September 8, 2002

Poll Finds Unease on Terror Fight and Concerns About War on Iraq

By ADAM CLYMER and JANET ELDER

Americans increasingly doubt that their government has done enough to protect them against terrorist attacks and are convinced, despite misgivings, that there will be a war against Iraq, the latest New York Times/CBS News poll shows. Majorities do not want war without Congressional and allied support first and a clear explanation from President Bush.

One year after the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, about half of the public said the Bush administration did not have a clear plan to fight terrorism, and nearly as many said they felt somewhat uneasy and not safe from another terrorist attack.

A quarter of the public, but a third of those in the Northeast, said they feared an attack in their area. One American in 10 said the administration had made "a lot of progress" in eliminating terrorist threats from nations besides Afghanistan.

The survey portrayed a hesitant nation with a sense of inevitability and little of the eager combativeness that surrounded the reaction to

the bombing of terrorist targets in Afghanistan last year. A large majority said it expected the American forces to "end up fighting against Iraq."

One-fourth said Iraq presented such a grave threat that the United States should act now, while two-thirds said the nation needed to wait for support from its allies. Another big majority said Mr. Bush should get Congressional approval before making war.

The troubled answers about the campaign against terrorism at home and abroad conveyed a similar fatalistic, slightly cranky mood. A year ago, three-fifths of Americans said the government had done enough to protect them against another terrorist attack; now two-fifths do. That drop in confidence was mirrored in follow-up interviews.

Mary Wool, a retired store owner in St. Louis, said she objected to "the whole thing at airports, going through your luggage." She said: "I don't think they are serious. It's just harassment and to make people think they are doing something."

Such worries highlighted the importance of President Bush's speech to the United Nations on Thursday, in which he plans to set forth his reasons for regarding Iraq as an international menace. Sixty-four percent of the 937 adults interviewed by telephone last Monday through Thursday said the Bush administration had not clearly explained its position. Even 57 percent of those who said they thought an attack was needed now expressed that sentiment.

Mr. Bush's overall approval rating remains strong. Sixty-three percent said they approved of his handling of his job as president. That still represented a drop from 70 percent in mid-July and the mid-80's recorded last fall and winter. That rating was accompanied by a sharp drop in approval of his handling of foreign policy, to 54 percent from 68 percent in July, and by slight declines in support for his handling of the economy and the war on terrorism. The poll's margin of sampling error was plus or minus three percentage points.

The respondents said they thought the Bush administration was making "some" progress rather than "a lot" on goals Mr. Bush had set out for the war on terrorism. These goals included closing terrorist camps and establishing a stable government in Afghanistan, eliminating terrorist threats from other countries, making air travel safe and improving America's image in the Arab world.

Capturing or killing Osama bin Laden remains a benchmark of sorts for success in Afghanistan. Three-quarters of the poll's respondents said they think he is still alive; 61 percent said the United States will not have won the war in Afghanistan unless he is captured or killed.

The survey did not test political attitudes in depth, but offered some troubling signs for the president's party in the midterm elections.

Thirty-seven percent of all respondents said they trusted the government to make the right decisions all or most of the time, down from 55 percent, the highest measure in decades, recorded last October in the first flush of support for the beginning of the war on terrorism. Another political indicator showed a steady negative, as 43

percent said the nation was going in the right direction while 49 percent said it was seriously "off on the wrong track."

A generic question about how registered voters planned to vote for representatives in November showed a statistically insignificant Democratic edge of 41 percent to 37 percent, a gap too small to foretell results in the three dozen or so closely contested House races. But among voters 45 and older, who make up about three-fifths of the off-year electorate, Democrats did much better.

The public is ambivalent over the issue of a pre-emptive attack of the sort urged by Vice President Dick Cheney and Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld.

Half the respondents were asked whether the United States should attack "another country" if that country did not attack first, and 47 percent opposed such an attack, while 41 percent favored it if the United States thought that country might launch an attack.

The other half were asked the same question, but with the word "Iraq" used instead of "another country." Then 61 percent favored a pre-emptive strike and 26 percent opposed it. The margin of sampling error for each group was plus or minus five percentage points.

One respondent, Tom Tully of Columbus, Ohio, said, "Every day we wait to attack, Saddam is building more chemical weapons, and some sources say he already has nuclear weapons." Mr. Tully, 35, an unemployed computer engineer, said: "If not now, when? Might as well do it now than later when it gets more difficult."

But Leona Miller, 75, a retired nurse and real estate agent in Bremerton, Wash., said: "I oppose the attack on Iraq. George Bush is on a vendetta started by his father. It is getting-even stuff."

Support for a war declined when the public was offered other alternatives or considerations. Fifty-six percent cautioned delay so that the United Nations could try to get weapons inspectors back in Iraq. When asked if they would favor war if it would last "months or even years," 49 percent favored a war and 44 percent opposed it.

Sixty-two percent said the president "should have to get the approval of Congress before taking military action against Iraq." Among those 65 and older, or old enough to recall World War II, 74 percent said Congressional approval was required. Still, the 62 percent figure was down from the 71 percent who said so in a CBS News poll early in August.

Women and the elderly were least enthusiastic about war. For example, while 27 percent of the public said the nation should go to war now without waiting for allied support, 21 percent of women and 10 percent of people 65 and older took that view.

The Sept. 11 attacks have not passed out of mind. Three-fifths of the public said they thought about them at least once a week, and a third said they talked about them that often.

Two out of five respondents said their lives had changed since the terrorist attacks, and four out of five said the country had changed.

David Lechner, 47, a printer in Huntingburg, Ind., spoke of both changes, saying: "When I watched the trade center come down, tears ran down my face. It hit home that I'm no different from the rest of the people. I am conscious of it daily; it doesn't just come and go. But it made the nation 10 times stronger than it was. There is unity and strength."

Cheryl Krusinski, the wife of an Air Force captain, was teaching second grade in Washington a year ago. "They told us to lock our classrooms, that Washington was being attacked," Ms. Krusinski said. She said talking to her students, one of whom lost his father in the attack on the Pentagon, was "emotional," and she continually relived the experience. She said that day had re-emphasized the importance of her husband's occupation. "I know he'll be going and that has big emotional impact, but I realize it's for a greater purpose, to protect our country."

The view that the government had not done enough to protect Americans against terrorism held fairly steady across various demographic groups. Monica Sanders, 21, a college student from Modesto, Calif., said that airport security alone was not enough. "All other forms of transportation should be checked," she said. "There are terrorists in the country who could do something on a highway or a train."

Vic Stinnett, 35, a welder in Mountain Home, Idaho, said, "The government could do things like background checks on people who go in and out of the country." He added, "A thumbprint or fingerprint scan would be a good idea."

Louise Steward, 67, a retired bank worker in Tampa, Fla., said: "The only way we would feel more secure would be to clean up all of Iraq and all of Afghanistan. We need to get our troops out there and clean up the mess. That is what the government should do: mop it up."

###

[www.nytimes.com/2002/09/08/politics/08POLL.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/08/politics/08POLL.html)

---

Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Sun, 8 Sep 2002 18:51:46 -0400 (EDT)  
From: rusciano@rider.edu  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: NYTimes.com Article: Bush Aides Set Strategy to Sell Policy on Iraq  
Message-Id: <20020908225146.7B88CC432@email4.lga2.nytimes.com>

This article from NYTimes.com  
has been sent to you by rusciano@rider.edu.

It's amazing to think that at one time we were shocked that political consultants would try to sell us a President....

Frank Rusciano

rusciano@rider.edu

## Bush Aides Set Strategy to Sell Policy on Iraq

September 7, 2002

By ELISABETH BUMILLER

WASHINGTON, Sept. 6 - White House officials said today that the administration was following a meticulously planned strategy to persuade the public, the Congress and the allies of the need to confront the threat from Saddam Hussein.

The rollout of the strategy this week, they said, was planned long before President Bush's vacation in Texas last month. It was not hastily concocted, they insisted, after some prominent Republicans began to raise doubts about moving against Mr. Hussein and administration officials made contradictory statements about the need for weapons inspectors in Iraq.

The White House decided, they said, that even with the appearance of disarray it was still more advantageous to wait until after Labor Day to kick off their plan.

"From a marketing point of view," said Andrew H. Card Jr., the White House chief of staff who is coordinating the effort, "you don't introduce new products in August."

A centerpiece of the strategy, White House officials said, is to use Mr. Bush's speech on Sept. 11 to help move Americans toward support of action against Iraq, which could come early next year.

"Everybody felt that was a moment that Americans wanted to hear from him," said Karl Rove, Mr. Bush's chief political adviser. Sept. 11 will also be a time, Mr. Rove said, "to seize the moment to make clear what lies ahead."

Toward that end, in June the White House picked Ellis Island in New York Harbor, not Governors Island, as the place where President Bush is to deliver his Sept. 11 address to the nation. Both spots were considered, White House advisers said, but the television camera angles were more spectacular from Ellis Island, where the Statue of

Liberty will be seen aglow behind Mr. Bush.

"We had made a decision that this would be a compelling story either place," said Dan Bartlett, the White House communications director. "We sent a team out to go and look and they said, 'This is a better shot,' and we said O.K."

In the same way, Mr. Bush's Sept. 11 remarks, about 10 minutes in length, are to serve as the emotional precursor for a tougher speech about Iraq that the president is to deliver to the United Nations General Assembly the following day.

"The fact is, there's a pretty abysmal relationship between Saddam Hussein and the United Nations," said Mr. Bartlett, who added that Mr. Hussein had flouted "everything the U.N. has stood for."

"The president is going to be very direct and articulate a history of defiance," Mr. Bartlett said.

Both speeches are in final drafts, although Mr. Bush spent time reviewing the United Nations speech on Thursday night on Air Force One as he returned to Washington from Indiana. "He's trimming it up so it's in his cadence," Mr. Rove said.

The Sept. 12 speech, a half hour or less in length, was written by a team that included Mr. Bush's chief speechwriter, Michael Gerson; Condoleezza Rice, the national security adviser; Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld; and Secretary of State Colin L. Powell. The Sept. 11 speech was written by Mr. Gerson and Karen P. Hughes, the former counselor who still closely advises Mr. Bush from Texas.

On Capitol Hill, meanwhile, the administration has begun a full-scale lobbying campaign. On the day after Labor Day, the opening of Washington's political new year, Mr. Bush summoned a skeptical Congressional leadership to the White House to enlist their support for action against Iraq. The next day two dozen senators from both parties were invited to the Pentagon to discuss Iraqi policy with Vice President Dick Cheney, Mr. Rumsfeld and George J. Tenet, the director of central intelligence.

Later in the day, Mr. Cheney and Mr. Tenet gave evidence on Iraqi military capacity to the top four Congressional leaders, some of whom have said the administration has provided no proof that the threat from Mr. Hussein is imminent.

"That was thought of as a necessary step, as was having the leadership down, as was the necessity of providing a higher level of intelligence," Mr. Rove said.

Another senior administration official said the White House

lobbying campaign on Capitol Hill would include not-so-subtle mentions of the regrets experienced by those lawmakers, like former Senator Sam Nunn, who did not vote for the 1991 "use of force" resolution before the Persian Gulf war.

The White House wants a resolution approving the use of force in Iraq to be approved in the next four to five weeks.

"In the end it will be difficult for someone to vote against it," the administration official said.

White House officials said they began planning more intensively for the Iraq rollout in July. Advisers consulted the Congressional calendar to figure out the best time for Iraq hearings while Ms. Hughes, even as she was driving back to Texas, discussed with Mr. Bush the outlines of his Sept. 11 speech.

By August, with Congress out of town and the United Nations not convening until September, White House officials decided to wait out the month, even as final planning continued by phone between advisers in Washington and at Mr. Bush's ranch in Texas.

"There was a deliberate sense that this was not the time to engage in his process," Mr. Rove said. "The thought was in August the president is sort of on vacation."

White House officials refused to say today whether Mr. Bush would build on his United Nations speech and directly address the nation about his planned course in Iraq. "Stay tuned," Mr. Bartlett said.

But some Republicans said that a speech to the nation was inevitable and necessary.

"At some time, they're going to have to talk directly to the people," said Michael K. Deaver, President Ronald Reagan's longtime communications strategist. "Because I think that people expect to hear from their commander in chief."

But Mr. Deaver, who helped create the stage for Mr. Reagan's 1980 presidential announcement speech in Battery Park, with the Statue of Liberty as a backdrop, said the White House had done well in setting the agenda after a chaotic August.

"They have had a history of doing it their way, and doing it very well from a communications standpoint," Mr. Deaver said. "Once they get started, and once it is clearly part of a strategic plan, it moves well."

<http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/07/politics/07STRA.html?ex=1032525505&ei=1&en=cf816def180867c3>

HOW TO ADVERTISE

-----  
For information on advertising in e-mail newsletters or other creative advertising opportunities with The New York Times on the Web, please contact [onlinesales@nytimes.com](mailto:onlinesales@nytimes.com) or visit our online media kit at <http://www.nytimes.com/adinfor>

For general information about NYTimes.com, write to [help@nytimes.com](mailto:help@nytimes.com).

Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company

=====  
Date: Tue, 10 Sep 2002 09:56:33 -0400  
From: dawn.v.nelson@census.gov  
Subject: privacy detector systems (how do CATI centers handle them?)  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Cc: janis.l.brown@census.gov  
X-Mailer: Lotus Notes Release 5.0.7 March 21, 2001  
Message-ID: <OF9C21F495.F2A24417-ON85256C30.0049DA47@tco.census.gov>  
X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on LNHQ08MTA/HQ/BOC (Release 5.0.8 |June 18, 2001) at 09/10/2002 09:56:34 AM  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

I am posting the following query on behalf of a colleague who is not an AAPOR member.

Please address all replies to me ([dawn.v.nelson@census.gov](mailto:dawn.v.nelson@census.gov)) and I will forward them to her.

Thank you,  
Dawn

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

Dear AAPORnet:

I am interested in learning how call centers handle privacy detector systems.

I've been given a copy of AAPOR's Standard Definitions (they suggest a final code of "unknown eligibility, non-interview), but I am interested in understanding what interim codes organizations assign and how they handle these privacy detectors.

I understand that some call centers assign privacy detectors an interim code of "answering machine," while others assign an interim code of "refusal by proxy."



So, I thought I would consult the experts on AAPORnet:

1. What interim outcome code do you assign when reaching a privacy detector system?
2. How do you handle these cases (e.g., treat like a refusal? treat like an answering machine? what type of follow-up is given to these cases)?

Thank you for your assistance.

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 10 Sep 2002 10:05:14 -0400  
Subject: 60% Favor National ID System In Harris Poll.  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Message-ID:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F9603940C@CMPA01.smallbusiness.local>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Howard Fienberg" <HFienberg@stats.org>  
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g8AE6XI08249

A Harris Poll of 2,203 adults, conducted over August 26-September 3  
(+/- 3%), shows:

- \* 60% favor adoption of a national ID system for all US citizens; 29% are opposed; 11% don't know.
- \* 58% favor "expanded camera surveillance on streets and in public places"; 33% are opposed; 9% don't know.
- \* 42% favor "law enforcement monitoring of Internet discussions in chat rooms and other forums"; 45% are opposed; 13% don't know.
- \* 32% favor "expanded government monitoring of cellphones and e-mail to intercept communications"; 55% are opposed; 13% don't know.

-----  
Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) hfienberg@stats.org  
<http://www.stats.org>

=====  
Date: Tue, 10 Sep 2002 10:42:42 -0400  
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>  
Subject: RE: 60% Favor National ID System In Harris Poll.  
In-reply-to:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F9603940C@CMPA01.smallbusiness.local>  
To: "'AAPORNET (E-mail)'" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <006801c258d8\$522c2440\$0d0a010a@leo>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)  
Content-type: multipart/mixed;  
boundary="Boundary\_(ID\_/drzVD9Sy3t5aiuGG4GfGg)"  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-priority: Normal  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator: 0000000056CF883E3D1ED6119D5B0001032C191AA4887D00

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

--Boundary\_(ID\_/drzVD9Sy3t5aiuGG4GfGg)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Most of these numbers have actually dropped a bit since Harris' first post attack polls.

Support of the adoption of National ID system was 68% in September 2001 - now 60%

Expanded surveillance was 63% - now 58%

Monitoring Internet was 63% - now 42%

Monitoring internet and email was 54 - now 32%

>From [http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris\\_poll/index.asp?PID=325](http://www.harrisinteractive.com/harris_poll/index.asp?PID=325)

--

Leo G. Simonetta  
Art & Science Group, LLC  
simonetta@artsci.com

> -----Original Message-----

> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu

> [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of

> Howard Fienberg

> Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2002 10:05 AM

> To: AAPORNET (E-mail)

> Subject: 60% Favor National ID System In Harris Poll.

>

>

> A Harris Poll of 2,203 adults, conducted over August

> 26-September 3 (+/- 3%), shows:

> \* 60% favor adoption of a national ID system for all US  
> citizens; 29% are opposed; 11% don't know.

> \* 58% favor "expanded camera surveillance on streets and  
> in public places"; 33% are opposed; 9% don't know.

> \* 42% favor "law enforcement monitoring of Internet  
> discussions in chat rooms and other forums"; 45% are opposed;  
> 13% don't know.  
> \* 32% favor "expanded government monitoring of cellphones  
> and e-mail to intercept communications"; 55% are opposed; 13%  
> don't know.

>  
>  
>  
> -----  
> Howard Fienberg  
> Senior Analyst  
> The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
> 2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
> Washington, DC 20037  
> (ph) 202-223-3193  
> (fax) 202-872-4014  
> (e) hfienberg@stats.org  
> http://www.stats.org  
>  
>  
>

--Boundary\_(ID\_/drzVD9Sy3t5aiuGG4GfGg)  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*  
\* This post contains a forbidden message format \*  
\* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*  
\* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \*  
\* If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
\* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

--Boundary\_(ID\_/drzVD9Sy3t5aiuGG4GfGg)--  
--Boundary\_(ID\_/drzVD9Sy3t5aiuGG4GfGg)--  
--Boundary\_(ID\_/drzVD9Sy3t5aiuGG4GfGg)--

=====  
Date: Tue, 10 Sep 2002 10:48:20 -0400  
From: "Raghavan Mayur" <mayur@technometrica.com>  
To: "ape" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Cc: "Clare Sherlock" <csherlock@technometrica.com>,  
"tatiana" <tkoudinova@technometrica.com>,  
Subject: First Look At U.S. Consumer Confidence for September 2002  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/related;  
boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_000D\_01C258B7.94712E20";  
type="multipart/alternative"  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2919.6600  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----\_NextPart\_000\_000D\_01C258B7.94712E20  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*  
\* This post contains a forbidden message format \*  
\* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*  
\* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \*  
\* If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
\* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

-----\_NextPart\_000\_000D\_01C258B7.94712E20";--

=====  
Date: Tue, 10 Sep 2002 10:59:50 -0400  
From: "Raghavan Mayur" <mayur@technometrica.com>  
To: "ape" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Cc: "Clare Sherlock" <csherlock@technometrica.com>,  
"tatiana" <tkoudinova@technometrica.com>,  
Subject: First Look At U.S. Consumer Confidence for September 2002  
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 5.00.2919.6600  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

The following three stories by our media partners describe the first peek at U.S. consumer confidence for Septmeber.  
~Mayur, TIPP/TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence

>From the September 10, 2002 edition -  
<http://www.csmonitor.com/2002/0910/p02s02-usec.htm>  
1

Doubts on economy grow  
After months of faltering growth - and confidence - spending is key to upturn.  
By David R. Francis | Staff writer of The Christian Science Monitor

While the US economy appears to be on the mend, Americans have become more worried about its course.  
A decline in consumer confidence, and doubts in particular about where the economy will be in six months, show up in a new Christian Science Monitor/TIPP poll.

The reasons are as close as the nearest newspaper,

with its often unsettling news these days. The Bush administration hammers on its proposal to invade Iraq. Stock market prices plunge - and soar - repeatedly. The economic recovery sputters. A few analysts even talk about a double-dip recession. The federal budget has returned to deficits, probably for years ahead.

A volatile economic mood

"There are unbelievable, incredible mood swings," says Raghavan Mayur, president of TIPP, a unit of TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence in Oradell, N.J.

As TIPP surveyors quizzed 914 consumers nationwide last week, they found sentiment bouncing up and down with prices on the stock market. The component indicating consumers' outlook for six months ahead dropped 0.7 percentage points to 54.9 - still positive territory.

"US consumer confidence is pretty volatile," says Mr. Mayur.

Yet so far, the recovery continues - though at a more moderate pace than is usual for the first year after a recession.

Economists expect the rate of growth in the nation's real output of goods and services in the current quarter to triple the slow 1.1 percent annualized rate in the second quarter to a 3.3 percent rate - or better.

Spending fuels recovery

"There is no double-dip in prospect," maintains Jack Lavery of Lavery Consulting Group in Washington Crossing, N.J. But, he notes, "paranoia abounds."

Supported by consumer spending, the economy has grown at an average 3 percent rate for the past three quarters. One key element has been car sales. They reached 18.7 million units in August, the second-best month in history. But sales at major retail chains were up a slim 1.1 percent from a year ago.

Some economists are suspicious that the fast pace of auto sales, supported by zero-percent financing, cannot continue. They are hoping business-capital investment will kick in if auto sales slow.

Last Friday's employment numbers indicate the recovery is not jobless, though also not a vigorous job-creator. Non-farm payroll employment

rose 39,000 in August, about what was expected.

That growth occurred in the public sector - in governments, not in private business. But July's employment gain was revised upward to 67,000 new workers from 6,000. The unemployment rate in August dipped to 5.7 percent from 5.9 percent the month before.

Noting that consumer spending accounts for two-thirds of economic activity, Mayur sees consumer confidence volatility as not portending well for the economy. But he admits the daily swings in mood restrain his ability to foresee the future.

Copyright 2002 The Christian Science Monitor. All rights reserved.

For permission to reprint/republish this article, please email [copyright@csps.com](mailto:copyright@csps.com)

-----

Feature Story

Tuesday, September 10, 2002

Confidence Weakening As Anxious Consumers Mull Outlook, Finances

BY IBD STAFF

INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY

The public has lost a little more faith in the economy and in President Bush's handling of it, according to a new IBD/TIPP Poll, the first peek at consumer sentiment moving into September.

Americans' outlook for the next six months has fallen back near its pre-Sept. 11 low, the poll found, and their opinion of Bush's economic stewardship has dropped to its lowest mark since October 2001.

Sentiment readings are getting harder to gauge, however, as they are buffeted by the ups and downs of the stock market.

The latest poll of 914 adults began the day after Labor Day, when the Dow Jones industrial average plunged 355 points. It wrapped up on Sunday, two days after the market rallied on improved job figures.

The IBD/TIPP Economic Optimism Index fell and rose accordingly during the week.

At week's end, it stood at 54.9 vs. 55.6 in August. A score above 50 shows optimism, below 50 pessimism and 50 neutral.

Most of the early September drop was due to the component that measures how consumers feel about the economy's prospects six months from now. It slipped to 50.5 from 52.9 in August, a loss of 4.6%.

Benign Neglect?

The other two components of the overall index - measuring how consumers feel about federal economic policies and their own personal finances - were up and down about 1%, respectively.

"Though the 0.7-point loss in the overall index appears benign, we saw an unusual mood swing as the polling progressed, the movements reflecting the (stock) market behavior," said Raghavan Mayur, president of TIPP, a unit of TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence and IBD's polling partner.

"Looking at the index on a longer time frame, we were hovering in the 60's in the first six months of this year. But since July, we have stayed around 55.

"Only Republicans and those in the age group 18 to 24 stay solidly in the mid-60s, at 66.3 and 65.0, respectively," Mayur noted. "Democrats cut through 50 to 47.0, first time in the past 12 months."

Demographic Slice

Of the 24 key demographic groups, 11 cut through 50 on the six-month outlook, indicating pessimism. Northeasterners, Democrats and the 65-plus age group showed the biggest month-to-month losses.

"Is a double-dip recession in the offing? The data are hardly reassuring," Mayur said. "The unusual volatility does not portend well, and the daily swings restrain our ability to see a clear visibility for the future.

"One thing is certain. The market is impacting consumer confidence more than (vice versa), and on a long-term basis we have lost some ground. A stable market can go to help a long way."

As for the president, a majority of Americans (55%) think his administration is spending too much time on the war on terrorism and needs to give more attention to boosting the economy, while 43% don't think so.

The share of Americans who give the president an A or B on his handling of the economy has steadily declined from 55% in January to 39% this month, similar to 37%, the pre-Sept. 11 rating one year

ago.

"Republicans trust Bush with the economy," said Mayur, "but Democrats and independents are not too happy."

Independent voters showed the biggest decline. While 51% gave the president an A or B in January, just 31% do so now. Democrats giving high grades on Bush's handling of the economy fell to 22% from 34% in January. Republicans dropped to 68% from 79%.

--

Editorial

Where's The Pony?

INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY

And we scoured the wires. Administration officials were all over the place with comments about everything from Iraq to steel duties. But other than some offhand remark by the president's press secretary, nary a word about the August drop in the jobless rate to 5.7% from 5.9% the month before and the creation of 39,000 jobs on top of July's 67,000.

Imagine that kind of news breaking on Bill Clinton's watch. He'd be on it like a . . . well, we won't go there. And you can be sure his spinmeisters would be working overtime.

For this administration, the biggest economic news in weeks was treated like a nonevent. What are we - and, more important, the American public - to make of such silence?

The best explanation we can come up with is that the White House reacted to the employment figures in much the way we did. That is, while headed in the right direction, they fell far short of what's needed to keep up with a growing labor force - and way short of what we've seen coming out of past recessions.

The markets, of course, saw things differently. Stocks rallied and the bond market sold off - that's the usual response to bullish economic news. Equity investors love it, and bond investors start to wring their hands over looming inflation.

Even if the improvement were only iffy and tentative, you'd think someone would be out front with the administration's take, offering us some analysis of where we stand, if not hope that the



nation is on the right track. A president has to be cheerleader in chief, in addition to commander in chief.

No one was less adept at articulating policy than the first President Bush. He was well-known for not having, or at least not being able to explain, "the vision thing." He seemed just as inept with what he once referred to as "the fiscal stuff."

The current president and his team seem no less tongue-tied. Maybe that's why we heard so little from them on a day like Friday. Better off letting a brief rebound in stocks do the cheerleading. But such silence only puts distance between these economic stewards and the man in the street, with whom they are not connecting.

How else to explain polls such as ours, detailed on today's front page? Though the data have turned volatile, we are finding that the public's confidence in the economy is faltering once again.

More to the point, 55% of Americans think the Bush White House spends too much time on the war on terrorism and too little on the economy. The number of Americans who give the president high marks for his handling of the economy is back at pre-Sept. 11 levels.

That's not where we'd want to be right now if we were cheerleader in chief and facing a midterm election where both houses of Congress hang in the balance.

Part of Ronald Reagan's genius was knowing how to make us feel better even when things didn't look so encouraging. He often spoke of the inner 4-year-old who, when shown into a room full of manure, would start digging enthusiastically because he knew that somewhere in there must be a pony.

If this administration is so horse-sure the economy is coming around, it's time to saddle up.   
i;½ Investor's Business Daily, Inc. 2002.

---

Date: Tue, 10 Sep 2002 11:13:12 -0400  
From: "Raghavan Mayur" <mayur@technometrica.com>  
To: "ape" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Cc: "Clare Sherlock" <csherlock@technometrica.com>, "tatiana" <tkoudinova@technometrica.com>, Subject: American Opinion on Iraq  
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 5.00.2919.6600  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

The two stories below by our media partners  
describe American opinion on Iraq  
~Mayur, TIPP/TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence

from the September 09, 2002 edition -  
<http://www.csmonitor.com/2002/0909/p01s03-uspo.htm>  
1

Bush to lay out Iraq-war case

Speeches this week to nation and the UN are seen  
as vital to building global and US support for an  
attack.

By Francine Kiefer | Staff writer of The Christian  
Science Monitor

WASHINGTON - After a summer in which the White  
House appeared to be marching alone toward an  
invasion of Iraq, the administration is beginning  
to make its case systematically to the American  
public, Congress, and the world.

The communications offensive may face its most  
critical test this week as President Bush  
addresses first the nation - on the anniversary of  
Sept. 11 on Wednesday - and then the United  
Nations on Thursday. Both will be key moments for  
his newfound campaign to build support for  
dispossessing Iraq of weapons of mass  
destruction - and of Saddam Hussein.

By stepping up its PR campaign, the administration  
is becoming a participant in a rare phenomenon in  
history: in effect, a global town meeting over one  
nation's war planning. In the past, such debates  
often revolved around whether the US should get  
involved in a conflict already under way. This  
time it's over one nation's plans to launch a  
preventive strike against another.

Yet some experts say if there's a lesson that  
history provides on the best way to go into a  
war - any kind of war - it's that enlisting the  
support of the American people, and increasingly  
the world, matters. Bush is "doing the necessary  
thing, because politically, how can you survive if  
you run against public opinion?" says Robert  
Dallek, a presidential historian at Boston

University. Nonetheless, "He really has to get the international community on board first, and that's a very difficult sell."

Indeed, the American public may need less convincing than Washington's overseas allies and doubters on Capitol Hill. Preliminary results of a Monitor/TIPP poll, concluded Saturday, indicate that the public at least shares the president's views on the urgency and seriousness of the Iraqi threat.

Some 73 percent of those polled said it was either "somewhat" or "very important" for the US to take military action within the next six months to remove Mr. Hussein from power. Even if a new round of UN inspections begins, 68 percent of Americans believe regime change in Iraq would still be necessary, the poll found.

"The public is already with the president," says Raghavan Mayur, president of TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence/TIPP, which conducted the survey. "But they still want the Bush administration to go through the motions ... of getting approval from Congress and support from the UN Security Council and our allies."

Even just trying to be consultative can be helpful to a president. It is part of the process of "making a case" that presidents such as Lyndon Johnson (Vietnam) and Harry Truman (Korea) didn't do, historians say.

For now, British Prime Minister Tony Blair appears to be the only foreign leader backing Bush in his desire to remove Hussein from power. Mr. Blair said at Camp David Saturday that the Iraqi threat is "real" and a "policy of inaction" is irresponsible.

Yet he is believed to be counseling the president about the importance of going through the UN to garner international support. Whether Bush will push for one last attempt at UN-sponsored weapons inspections in Iraq, or, like his father, seek a UN Security Council resolution for military action, remains unclear.

A UN resolution would be a tall order. The Russians say an unprovoked attack on Iraq would violate international law. The Chinese contend that American use of force would destabilize the region. Both countries have veto power on the UN Security Council.

In making his case here and abroad, analysts say,

the president must answer a multitude of questions: What proof is there of Iraq's intent to use its weapons of mass destruction, and what weapons does it have? What happens after Saddam Hussein is removed? Why the need to take care of it now?

The administration is beginning to answer some of the questions, though often in generalities. On Sunday, Secretary of State Colin Powell said on Fox News, "We have facts, not speculation" that Hussein has chemical and biological weapons, and is working to get nuclear armaments. He said Iraq presents a danger to the US "right now."

Not surprisingly, the administration is saying little about the potential loss of life, or economic cost, of carrying out an attack. Vice President Dick Cheney, appearing on NBC's "Meet the Press" yesterday, said he didn't think military intervention would be "that tough a fight." But he did acknowledge that "we clearly would have to stay for a long time...It would be very costly."

Some believe the administration is going to have to be more forthcoming. "It requires an odd combination of candor, honesty, ability to present the evidence - not just hyperbole - and frankly the president hasn't done that good a job," says retired Maj. Gen. Robert Scales, who wrote a history of the Gulf War.

Still, for all the fuss about convincing the world, Bush may have already made up his mind. As one government official, who requested anonymity, puts it: The debate is over. It is simply a matter of Bush touching all the bases.

. Gail Russell Chaddock contributed to this report.

Copyright 2002 The Christian Science Monitor. All rights reserved.

For permission to reprint/republish this article, please email [copyright@csps.com](mailto:copyright@csps.com)

-----

Americans Back Iraq Attack, But Still Want The Evidence

BY BRIAN MITCHELL  
INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY

In the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, the U.S. made its case before the U.N. with circles and arrows on big blow-ups of aerial photos. See the

missiles. See the launchers. See the Soviet ships in the harbor.

A few circles and arrows might help on Wednesday, Sept. 11, when President Bush takes his case to the American people. They might come in handy on Thursday, too, when Bush speaks to the U.N.

The latest IBD/TIPP poll finds that Americans strongly favor war with Iraq to topple Saddam Hussein. But half would like to see more evidence of Saddam's support for terrorists. And almost nobody wants the U.S. to go it alone.

"Bush may have already successfully crossed the important first step of winning American public support," said Raghavan Mayur, president of TIPP, a unit of TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence, IBD's polling partner.

"Despite their support, the public wants the president to cross the 't's and dot the 'i's. They would like to see him get some backing from the U.N. Security Council, Congress, Western nations and Arab countries," Mayur said.

Three out of four Americans polled say it's important to take out Saddam in the next six months. As many as 60% say he's an "immediate threat" to the U.S. And 68% say weapons inspections aren't enough: Saddam still must go.

But in keeping with what Mayur says, a large percentage says it is "extremely important" that Bush win the backing of Congress, the U.N. Security Council and Western allies.

On a scale of 1 to 7, only 4% rate approval by Congress as not important (1 to 3), 88% rate it important (5 to 7) and 57% say it is "extremely important."

Meanwhile, 85% rate the backing of Western nations like Britain and Canada important; 10% say it is not.

And 79% say U.N. Security Council approval is important; 11% say it is not.

Also, 70% say the backing of Arab nations like Saudi Arabia and Kuwait is important; 19% say it is not.

Britain is the sole member of the U.N. Security Council to openly back the U.S. on Iraq. France, Russia and China have all held back, as have non-Council allies Germany and Canada.

Polls in Europe show most Europeans, like most Americans, would support the U.S. if the U.N. approves. That means that a go-ahead could hinge on how well Bush makes his case before the U.N.

Americans are evenly split on whether the link between Iraq and terrorism is strong enough to go to war: 48% say it's enough to go after Saddam, 45% say they need more evidence.

"While Americans are convinced that Saddam himself is a threat to American interests, if removing Saddam is cast as a part of war of terrorism, a large share of Americans may want to see the administration offer more evidence," Mayur said.

Support for war with Iraq varies little by region, age, gender, parenthood or investor status.

Only party affiliation shows much difference.

Republicans are the hawks this time: 75% consider Iraq an "immediate threat" to the U.S. vs. 54% of Democrats and 55% of independents.

As many as 62% of Republicans are convinced the case has been made that Iraq's support for terrorism justifies a second Gulf War. Only 41% of Democrats and 43% of Independents think so.

And 85% of Republicans say Saddam must go within six months vs. 66% of Democrats and 67% of independents.

The IBD/TIPP poll was conducted Sept. 3-8. A total of 914 randomly selected Americans were interviewed by telephone. The margin of error for the poll is 3.3 percentage points.

-----

---

Date: Tue, 10 Sep 2002 09:31:44 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Pew Poll: Americans Still Feel Vulnerable (W Lester, AP)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209100929440.15743-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

---

story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story2&cid=1200&u=/ap/20020905/ap\_on\_re\_us/

Thu Sep 5, 6:13 PM ET

Poll: Americans Still Feel Vulnerable

By WILL LESTER, Associated Press Writer

WASHINGTON (AP) - Americans still have a sense of vulnerability about terrorist attacks even though many of their attitudes about life in this country have returned to levels not seen since before Sept. 11, says a poll released Thursday.

Faith in public institutions, positive feelings about the media and even support for President Bush have faded considerably -- but not worries about another attack.

"Over the course of the year, the number feeling another attack is likely to happen has never fallen below 50 percent," said Andrew Kohut, director of the Pew Research Center for the People & the Press.

Separate polls taken by Pew in the Washington and New York areas indicated that residents there feel more vulnerable than most in the country. Residents of the New York area were more likely to say they faced continued emotional stress. Residents of the Washington area said they were more concerned they live in an area where a future terrorist attack is likely.

The continuing sense of national vulnerability has affected public attitudes on a variety of issues -- from the need for more focus on homeland security to support for using force to keep the country safe to the need for the United States to remain involved internationally.

The attacks gave most people in the country a common experience seared into their memories -- 97 percent said they can remember exactly where they were and what they were doing the moment they heard about the attacks. "One of the big findings was that just about everyone was bonded by this," Kohut said.

Nationally, two-thirds said the attacks had a great emotional impact on them. That was slightly higher in the two targeted cities.

But the emotions have lasted longer in New York and Washington. Six in 10 residents of both cities said they have taken preventive measures against terrorism. Nationally, the number was just over four in 10.

Three in 10 in those two cities say they have traveled less by air, handled mail differently and avoided public events as a result of the attacks.

The Pew Research Center's Sept. 11 project consisted of a national poll of 1,001 adults as well as a New York-area sample of 401 adults and a Washington-area sample of 400 adults interviewed between Aug. 14-25. The

error margin was plus or minus 3.5 percentage points nationally and 5.5 percentage points for each of the cities and their suburbs.

The public's confidence in the war on terrorism is slipping, the poll suggested.

Among the poll's national findings on the war on terrorism:

- \* Only a third thinks terrorists are less able to launch a new attack than they were a year ago, and slightly more think their capacity to attack is about the same.
- \* Only 15 percent think the war in Afghanistan has been a success, while 70 percent say it's too early to tell.
- \* People were more inclined to want the government to focus on homeland security than on rooting out terrorist networks overseas.

"What really surprised me was the extent the public is not as satisfied as it was on the war on terrorism," Kohut said.

People were inclined to want the United States engaged in world affairs, by a 53-34 margin. That's a slight drop from October, but higher than the isolationist tendencies that prevailed after the Cold War.

The attacks are still fresh in memory for a quarter of the American public, and four in 10 in the two cities.

One of the biggest effects on people's behavior after Sept. 11 has been on their family lives. Four in 10 say they spend more time at home and with family, a figure that increases to almost six in 10 in New York.

Both mothers and fathers shared responsibilities for talking with children, but mothers were significantly more likely to hear their children express worries about terrorism. Half of the mothers of children age 5 to 17 said their children expressed fears, while a third of fathers had heard such comments.

While many of the personal experiences were shared nationally, the residents of New York and Washington were far more likely to talk about lasting effects.

Kohut described the feelings of the city residents this way:

"A relatively large number say they've considered moving, considered changing jobs, avoided crowded public events, handled mail differently, traveled by air less."

-----

Pew Research Center: <http://www.people-press.org>

(C) Copyright 2002 The Associated Press

[story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story2&cid=1200&u=/ap/20020905/ap\\_on\\_re\\_us/](http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story2&cid=1200&u=/ap/20020905/ap_on_re_us/)

---

Copyright (C) 2001 Yahoo! Inc., and Powerful Media Inc.



\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Tue, 10 Sep 2002 16:38:33 -0400  
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>  
Subject: Less Telemarketing Tomorrow  
To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <009701c2590a\$083dad40\$0d0a010a@leo>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-priority: Normal

Telemarketing Silent on Sept. 11  
Tue Sep 10, 12:36 AM ET  
By JOE RUFF, Associated Press Writer

[http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story2&cid=509&e=2&u=/ap/20020910/ap\\_on\\_bi\\_ge/sept\\_11\\_telemarketers\\_7](http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story2&cid=509&e=2&u=/ap/20020910/ap_on_bi_ge/sept_11_telemarketers_7)

OMAHA, Neb. (AP) - Recognizing that many Americans won't be in the mood for getting sales calls, many of the nation's telemarketers plan to take the day off Wednesday.

SNIP

Telemarketers make outbound calls to conduct surveys and bring business to client companies in industries including banking, magazine and book publishing, telecommunications and insurance. They also receive calls to help the customers of those companies.

--

Leo G. Simonetta  
Art & Science Group, LLC  
simonetta@artsci.com

=====  
Date: Tue, 10 Sep 2002 14:30:25 -0700  
To: "'AAPORNET'" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
From: Rufus Browning <browning@sfsu.edu>  
Subject: Re: Reporting "unacceptable" behavior  
In-Reply-To: <NGBBJPLPNIOPHCGJNAEOEIIACJAA.hstuart@elwayresearch.com>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
          boundary="====\_13409371==\_ .ALT"

-----\_13409371==\_ .ALT  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

The Public Research Institute at San Francisco State University conducted a survey for the Calif. Integrated Waste Management Board in 2001 of oil-changing "do-it-yourselfers", focusing on disposal of used motor oil and oil filters. Improper disposal is a significant environmental problem and is widely understood to be illegal (which it is) and unacceptable. PRI first conducted a pilot survey that assessed several ways of estimating improper disposal, including asking about neighbors before and after asking about R's own oil-disposal practices.

PRI's web site is <http://pri.sfsu.edu>

You can click on Used Oil to get to a downloadable report, survey instrument, and other materials.

Rufus Browning  
Senior Faculty Researcher  
Public Research Institute  
San Francisco State University  
[browning@sfsu.edu](mailto:browning@sfsu.edu)

At 08:13 AM 9/4/2002 -0700, you wrote:

>Colleagues,  
>  
> Is there evidence, experience or literature to indicate whether  
>people will more or less forthcoming about their own socially unacceptable  
>behavior if the question asks them to report what they think "other people"  
>or their neighbors do? The behavior in question is disposal of household  
>hazardous waste.  
>  
>H.Stuart Elway, Ph.D.  
>Elway Research, Inc.  
>206/264-1500  
>[www.elwayresearch.com](http://www.elwayresearch.com)

-----\_13409371==\_.ALT  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*  
\* This post contains a forbidden message format \*  
\* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*  
\* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \*  
\* If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
\* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

-----\_13409371==\_.ALT--

=====  
Date: Wed, 11 Sep 2002 09:59:35 -0500  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@marketsharescorp.com](mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com)>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)  
X-Accept-Language: en,pdf  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: [aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)

Subject: Auto Ownership  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Can anyone direct me to a Census site where I can find percentage of African Americans or African American households in Chicago who own vehicles or have vehicles available for use?

Thanks

Nick

---

Date: Wed, 11 Sep 2002 11:12:26 -0400  
Subject: University student voting trends?  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Message-ID:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F96039421@CMPA01.smallbusiness.local>  
content-class: urn:content-classes:message  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Howard Fienberg" <HFienberg@stats.org>  
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g8BFDjI29207

Anyone have any data on changes in college student voting registration (and actual voting) since 9/11?

Was there any noticeable increase? I have a reporter looking for information.

Cheers,  
Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) hfienberg@stats.org  
<http://www.stats.org>

---

Date: Wed, 11 Sep 2002 10:21:58 -0500  
From: MFlanagan@goamp.com  
Received: by AMP1 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
id <SRAYD16G>; Wed, 11 Sep 2002 10:21:59 -0500  
Message-ID: <669C9575C5E1D511B7B5001083FCEE8DE97486@AMP1>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Job Posting  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

I'm posting the following job announcement on behalf of AAPOR member Samuel J. Best:

Academic Assistant II/III  
Project Manager  
Center for Survey Research and Analysis

The Center for Survey Research and Analysis at the University of Connecticut is a fast-growing leader in the survey research field. This position provides skilled support in the management of the social science survey projects. Duties include coordinating all phases of assigned projects including: development of research proposals, project design, questionnaire writing, management of data collection process, data analysis, report writing and presentation of findings. The position also includes some sales and grant writing responsibility.

Minimum qualifications: MA required and three years of experience in a survey research environment. Demonstrated ability to utilize a CATI system/software; excellent writing and communication skills preferred.

Screening will continue until position is filled. Salary will range from \$40K to \$50K. Submit resume to: Mary Lukas, University of Connecticut, Center for Survey Research and Analysis, 341 Mansfield Road, U-1032, Storrs, CT 06269-1032.

=====  
Date: Wed, 11 Sep 2002 17:00:55 -0400  
From: "Michael Cohen" <michael.cohen@bts.gov>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: survey statistician positions at BTS  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id g8BL0uI03776

The Office of Survey Programs of the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, U.S. Department of Transportation, seeks to hire three survey statisticians and a survey-oriented mathematical statistician. If interested, please consult the Web page

<http://www.usajobs.opm.gov/a9bts.htm>

Applications close September 25 or 30 depending on the position.

Michael P. Cohen  
Assistant Director for Survey Programs  
Bureau of Transportation Statistics  
400 Seventh Street SW #4432  
Washington DC 20590 USA  
phone 202-366-9949 fax 202-366-3385

---

Date: Wed, 11 Sep 2002 19:55:30 -0400  
From: "Jim Ellis" <jellis@saturn.vcu.edu>  
To: "Aapornet@Usc. Edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: call center manager recruitment  
Message-ID: <NCBBLAEIMLLHHMHMJOJAEELGFCAA.jellis@saturn.vcu.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000  
In-Reply-To:  
<Pine.A41.4.44+UNC.0209061400210.34342-100000@login8.isis.unc.edu>

I hope you don't mind receiving this posting describing a position for which we are recruiting at VCU:

Call Center Manager  
Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory  
Center for Public Policy  
Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond VA

Full-time grant-funded state classified position with benefits. Manages operation of 48 station university-based call center: Supervises one full-time assistant manager and several part-time supervisors. Direct or indirect responsibilities include training, supervision, data base programming and management, inventory control, production process quality control and assurance, follow-up on human resources actions, timekeeping, preparing project budgets, scheduling staff for optimal efficiency and timely completion of projects, consulting on the scheduling of projects, participating in evening training sessions, devising and applying optimal sample management strategies, and working on special projects.

Experience with Microsoft Office applications, primarily Word, Excel and Access required. SPSS or SAS a plus but not required. Must be organized and systematic, but flexible and creative. Able to work in fast paced atmosphere and meet direct time constraints. Familiar with survey research methods and practices.

At least 2 years experience required in survey research, market research, telemarketing, customer service call center, or related field. BA or BS in social science or related field required, MA or MS preferred. Extensive management experience may substitute for college degree. At least 1 year supervisory experience in a telecommunications production environment is preferred.

For application assistance, please see  
<http://www.hr.vcu.edu//jobs/index.html>. Look under "Accounting, Management,  
Professional and Computer/Programming." VCU is an urban university  
enrolling more than 20,000 students in more than 160 degree programs.

NOTE: Because this position is grant-funded, it is exempt from the state of  
Virginia's current hiring freeze.

SERL human resources contact:  
Michelle Whittingham  
804-828-8813

Posted by:  
Jim Ellis  
Director, Technical Division, SERL-VCU

---

Date: Wed, 11 Sep 2002 22:45:37 -0400  
From: "Ashley Bowers" <afbowers@email.unc.edu>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: SAPOR 2002 Annual Conference: Advance Registration  
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 5.00.2314.1300  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

The annual conference of the Southern Association for Public Opinion  
Research will be held on October 3 and 4, 2002 in Raleigh, North Carolina.  
The deadline for advance registration is this Friday, September 13.  
However, payment for early registration (provided that a registration form  
has been faxed/mailed by September 13) will be accepted until September  
20. If you are interested in attending, please contact Ashley Bowers at  
[ashley\\_bowers@unc.edu](mailto:ashley_bowers@unc.edu) for a registration form and conference agenda.

We have an exciting program planned for this year and look forward to  
seeing you in October!

Ashley Bowers  
Operations Director  
University of North Carolina Survey Research Unit  
730 Airport Road, Suite 103  
CB 2400, UNC-CH  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27599-2400  
Phone: (919) 966-0476  
Fax: (919) 966-2221  
E-mail: [ashley\\_bowers@unc.edu](mailto:ashley_bowers@unc.edu)









Subject: Global Mood Reflects a Growing Gap, as in Moscow Poll (LATimes)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209121036130.24180-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

---

Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times

---

[www.latimes.com/news/specials/911/la-fg-world12sep12.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/specials/911/la-fg-world12sep12.story)

September 12 2002

Global Mood Reflects a Growing Gap

REACTION: WHILE MANY JOIN THE U.S. IN GRIEVING OVER ITS LOSS, OTHERS OFFER A STARK REMINDER OF HOW DEEP ANTI-AMERICANISM RUNS. IN A MOSCOW POLL, 53% SAY ATTACKS WERE 'DESERVED.'

By SEBASTIAN ROTELLA and MICHAEL SLACKMAN  
TIMES STAFF WRITERS

RIYADH, Saudi Arabia -- The world joined the United States on Wednesday in remembering the horror and recognizing the repercussions of Sept. 11.

People in many nations mourned the loss of lives and of an image of the United States that had perhaps been an illusion.

"America for many was the place where dreams get fulfilled, a place where people thought nothing bad can happen," said Katarzyna Lasocik, 39, a Polish marketing manager who paid her respects at the U.S. Embassy in Warsaw. "This feeling was crushed."

But the grief was not unanimous. The anniversary juxtaposed sorrow about the past with fear of the future, admiration for American values with distrust of American power.

The day was a reminder of how much America's enemies hate the U.S. : Extremists at a London mosque connected with Al Qaeda held a baleful celebration they billed as "A Towering Day in History."

The global mood Wednesday was edgy and ambivalent. It reflected a growing distance between the United States and the rest of the world. Even among some U.S. allies, solidarity and sympathy mixed with alarm about what is seen as a disastrous rush toward war with Iraq.

There were, of course, heartfelt gestures. Thousands of Australian drivers turned on their headlights in tribute to the dead at 8:46 a.m., the moment when the first plane struck the first tower in New York. Milan fashion designers and race car drivers played a benefit soccer game to

raise money for the victims and survivors.

The emotions in Britain, which lost 67 citizens in the World Trade Center, came closest to the outpouring in the United States. Memorials filled churches, offices, fire stations and town squares. Television and radio stations provided nonstop coverage of events in New York and London. Prime Minister Tony Blair, Cabinet ministers, Prince Charles and Prince Harry joined about 2,000 people at a service in London's St. Paul's Cathedral.

U.S. Ambassador William S. Farish thanked the British government and people, calling them "America's truest friends."

Lt. Frank Dwyer of the New York Police Department presented British Home Secretary David Blunkett with a bedraggled British flag found by New York police officers as they scabbled through the rubble of the World Trade Center looking for survivors.

"This flag, torn and tattered, still may be flown and is a rich symbol of the endurance and strength of the British people and the pain and agony that they went through that day," Dwyer said. "This flag belongs to this land."

The tone was different in lands such as Saudi Arabia, a nominal U.S. ally that has come under suspicion since Sept. 11. Fifteen of the hijackers were Saudi nationals, and Saudis are accused of funneling millions of dollars to Al Qaeda and other terrorist networks in the guise of charitable contributions.

Saudi Arabia found itself in the awkward position Wednesday of feeling both like a victim and a suspect, of wanting sympathy and offering condolences. Young men in cafes in downtown Riyadh, the capital, said they understood American anger toward their country -- up to a point.

"I don't blame America for the way it reacted, because I understand the way America perceived what happened," said Mishari Saud, 21. But he complained that Americans have "lumped us all into one boat."

"People trusted America so much, they would fight for America," said Abdullah, 40, a businessman who said he lived five years in the United States. "Now we all feel cheated."

Tension hung over Riyadh and the region. U.S. embassies in neighboring Bahrain, Qatar, Oman and the United Arab Emirates were closed for security reasons. U.S. military bases were on their highest state of alert.

Chagrined Saudis have shown signs of confronting their problems. The kingdom announced this week that it will set up an agency dedicated to monitoring the work and cash flow of charitable organizations -- though officials persist in denying that the donations end up in the hands of terrorists.

In a letter to President Bush, Crown Prince Abdullah, the de facto ruler of the country, said: "We in Saudi Arabia felt an especially great pain at the realization that a number of young Saudi citizens had been enticed and deluded.... They allowed themselves to be used as a tool to do great

damage to Islam, a religion they espoused, and to all Muslims."

Other Muslims in the region disagreed. Asked about Osama bin Laden, Naima Mohammed, a Palestinian shopper in East Jerusalem wearing a head covering and traditional embroidered dress, showed off two prominent gold teeth as she smiled.

"He's a good Muslim and a hero," said Mohammed, 60.

A senior political leader of Hamas, the radical Islamic organization in the Gaza Strip, said he was happy about the long-term effect of the Sept. 11 attacks.

"Weak nations and oppressed people got the proof that they too can stand up against military might," said Abdulaziz Rantisi. "This will increase Arab revolutionary thinking."

However, Palestinian Authority President Yasser Arafat, along with Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, sent messages of condolence and support to the American people.

Elsewhere, there was a disconnect between the official line and public opinion. On a day when Russian President Vladimir V. Putin told Bush in a phone call that "there are things we cannot forget, we must not forget," 53% of 2,803 respondents to an instant poll by the Echo of Moscow radio station said the United States "deserved" last year's attacks.

Hostility came in deeds as well as words. Police in Bilbao, Spain, defused a car bomb Wednesday after a warning given in the name of the Basque terrorist group ETA; the caller described the 55 pounds of dynamite as a "special homage" for the anniversary, according to authorities.

In Afghanistan, U.S. troops avoided injury in two shooting incidents that marred their own observances. At the Bagram air base outside Kabul, a lone gunman appeared to challenge coalition forces, firing an antiquated muzzle-loading weapon at a guard tower about 6 a.m.

U.S. troops returned fire, wounding the shooter, and Afghan troops captured him. About the same time, two men were spotted trying to breach the base's perimeter, prompting an order to close all access to the base. In eastern Afghanistan near Khowst, two rockets fell in the vicinity of U.S. forces.

The war on terror was largely upstaged, though, by worries about the expected U.S. campaign against Iraq.

At a memorial service in a Catholic Church in Nairobi, where the U.S. ambassador recalled the Kenyans and Americans killed by an Al Qaeda bomb attack in 1998, a Roman Catholic nun implored God "to free [the U.S.] from the enslaving desire of revenge."

African newspapers similarly used the occasion to warn against attacking Iraq. "This is a war that must not be waged," said Kenya's Daily Nation. "Terrorism will not be defeated through terrorism."

Nigeria's Daily Trust said any attack on Iraq would rank as "one of the

greatest crimes of the century."

There were protests about a possible U.S. strike against Iraq in Paris, Manila and Singapore, where a man wearing a Saddam Hussein mask and army fatigues was arrested at the heavily guarded U.S. Embassy when he tried to enter a memorial service uninvited.

Some participants in ceremonies said their criticism of policy on Iraq grew out of affection, not antipathy, for the United States.

Heidi Watzold attended a memorial in the Berlin Dome, a blackened 19th century cathedral that was damaged during World War II. The stout, redheaded Berlin resident wore a sign around her neck that read: "God Bless America. The souls of terrorists are cursed and will receive no Paradise."

"I understand that if you can do nothing against this terrorism, you feel sorrow. You feel you have no weapons," she said.

"But I'm against going into Iraq. I pray the Americans and the Germans don't go in. Think Vietnam. Think Somalia. You don't know the end. What is the endgame?"

-----

Times staff writers John Daniszewski and David Zucchini in Kabul, Jeffrey Fleishman in Berlin, David Holley in Rome, Davan Maharaj in Nairobi, Richard C. Paddock in Jakarta, Janet Stobart in London, Tracy Wilkinson and Mitchell Landsberg in Jerusalem, Carol J. Williams in Moscow, and correspondents William Wallace in London, Fayed abu Shammalah in Gaza City and Ela Kasprzycka in Warsaw contributed to this report.

[www.latimes.com/news/specials/911/la-fg-world12sep12.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/specials/911/la-fg-world12sep12.story)

-----  
Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times  
-----

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Thu, 12 Sep 2002 16:42:18 -0400  
From: jennifer.m.rothgeb@census.gov  
Subject: NEW Funding Opportunity for QDET Conference Fellows - Applications DUE Sept 30.  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
X-Mailer: Lotus Notes Release 5.0.7 March 21, 2001  
Message-ID: <OF00E1F10B.7CA14816-ON85256C32.00717BAE@tco.census.gov>  
X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on LNHQ08MTA/HQ/BOC (Release 5.0.8 | June 18, 2001) at 09/12/2002  
04:56:57 PM  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-type: multipart/mixed;  
Boundary="0\_\_=85256C3200717BAE8f9e8a93df938690918c85256C3200717BAE"  
Content-Disposition: inline

--0\_\_=85256C3200717BAE8f9e8a93df938690918c85256C3200717BAE  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

(Embedded image moved to file: pic18696.pcx)

[www.jpsm.umd.edu/qdet](http://www.jpsm.umd.edu/qdet)

JUST ANNOUNCED:  
Additional FELLOWSHIPS available for U.S. Citizens

The National Science Foundation is providing QDET conference funding to support attendance by U. S. citizens, particularly students, minorities, and women. As part of the effort, a limited number of fellowships are available for U. S. attendees at the International Conference on Questionnaire Development Evaluation and Testing Methods (QDET) to be held November 14-17, 2002 at the Embassy Suites Charleston Convention Center Hotel in Charleston, South Carolina, USA. Accepted fellows will receive:

- round-trip economy airfare to Charleston, limited to \$600;
- waiver of the conference registration fees (\$475);
- conference-related meals;

Recipients will probably be responsible for their hotel expenses which are estimated at \$114 per night plus taxes, though depending on the number of recipients selected, it is possible that benefits will be extended to include hotel expenses. Accepted Fellows might be requested to assist with some duties during the conference.

Fellowship Applicants should complete:

- A 500-word essay describing the applicant's research area and reasons for wanting to attend the QDET conference, focusing on how their participation will enhance their chosen career path.
- A letter of recommendation written by a faculty member, work supervisor, or other person knowledgeable about the applicant's accomplishments and interest in survey methodology.
- Brief resume including a list of publications/research papers
- The conference registration form (contained on the website as a .pdf file)

Send applications (by mail or E-mail) by September 30 to:  
Jennifer Rothgeb  
Chair, QDET Conference  
U. S. Census Bureau  
FB 4, Rm 3125  
Washington, D.C. 20233-9100 USA  
E-mail: [jennifer.m.rothgeb@census.gov](mailto:jennifer.m.rothgeb@census.gov)

Evaluation Procedures:

The QDET Organizing Committee will evaluate the applications and announce the successful applicants. Applicants will be notified through E-mail by October 16, 2002.

--0\_\_=85256C3200717BAE8f9e8a93df938690918c85256C3200717BAE  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*

\* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*

\* This post contains a forbidden message format \*

\* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*

\* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \*

\* If your postings display this message your mail program \*

\* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*

\* \* \* \* \*

--0\_\_=85256C3200717BAE8f9e8a93df938690918c85256C3200717BAE--

=====  
Date: Fri, 13 Sep 2002 15:21:52 -0400  
Subject: ARRIVEDERCI SADDAM! [Jim Robbins]  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Message-ID:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F96039474@CMPA01.smallbusiness.local>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Howard Fienberg" <HFienberg@stats.org>  
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g8DJN6I18906

ARRIVEDERCI SADDAM! [Jim Robbins]  
La Repubblica, a left of center daily in Rome, published a nationwide poll today that shows a majority of Italians favoring military action against Iraq. In response to the question, "In your view, do the terrorist threat and suspicion of Saddam Husayn's aggressive intentions justify preventive intervention in Iraq on the part of the United States and of the individual allies?" the results were Yes: 53.0, No: 43.0, No opinion: 4.0. To the question, "In your view, if military intervention in Iraq were to take place under the aegis of the United Nations, should Italy take part with its own troops?" Yes: 59.0, No: 35.0, No opinion: 6.0. Viva Italia!

Posted 2:03 PM | [Link]  
<[http://www.nationalreview.com/thecorner/2002\\_09\\_08\\_corner-archive.asp](http://www.nationalreview.com/thecorner/2002_09_08_corner-archive.asp)>

-----  
Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) hfienberg@stats.org  
<http://www.stats.org>

=====  
Date: Fri, 13 Sep 2002 14:33:40 -0500

From: David\_Moore@gallup.com  
Received: from 198.175.140.71 by exchnng7.gallup.com (InterScan E-Mail  
VirusWall NT); Fri, 13 Sep 2002 14:33:44 -0500  
Received: by Exchnng7.gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
id <RX7RAZVY>; Fri, 13 Sep 2002 14:33:44 -0500  
Message-ID: <BFC17A2EB27CD411A9E30000D1ECEFE40C3F06FD@Exchnng7.gallup.com>  
To: HFienberg@stats.org, aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: ARRIVEDERCI SADDAM! [Jim Robbins]  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

A poll in Italy conducted by DOXA S.p.A for the Gallup Organization  
produced different results -

"Would you favor or oppose sending American ground troops (the  
United States sending ground troops) to the Persian Gulf in an attempt to  
remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq?" Favor - 36%; Oppose - 49%; No  
opinion 15%. See British, Italians, Spanish Oppose U.S. Attack to Oust  
Saddam Hussein

David

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

From: Howard Fienberg [mailto:HFienberg@stats.org]  
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2002 3:22 PM  
To: AAPORNET (E-mail)  
Subject: ARRIVEDERCI SADDAM! [Jim Robbins]

ARRIVEDERCI SADDAM! [Jim Robbins]

La Repubblica, a left of center daily in Rome, published a nationwide poll  
today that shows a majority of Italians favoring military action against  
Iraq. In response to the question, "In your view, do the terrorist threat  
and suspicion of Saddam Husayn's aggressive intentions justify preventive  
intervention in Iraq on the part of the United States and of the individual  
allies?" the results were Yes: 53.0, No: 43.0, No opinion: 4.0. To the  
question, "In your view, if military intervention in Iraq were to take place  
under the aegis of the United Nations, should Italy take part with its own  
troops?" Yes: 59.0, No: 35.0, No opinion: 6.0. Viva Italia!

Posted 2:03 PM | [Link]

<[http://www.nationalreview.com/thecorner/2002\\_09\\_08\\_corner-archive.asp](http://www.nationalreview.com/thecorner/2002_09_08_corner-archive.asp)>

-----  
Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) hfienberg@stats.org  
<http://www.stats.org>



---

Date: Fri, 13 Sep 2002 14:39:01 -0500  
From: David\_Moore@gallup.com  
Received: from 198.175.140.71 by exchn7.gallup.com (InterScan E-Mail  
VirusWall NT); Fri, 13 Sep 2002 14:39:04 -0500  
Received: by Exchn7.gallup.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
id <RX7RAZWJ>; Fri, 13 Sep 2002 14:39:04 -0500  
Message-ID: <BFC17A2EB27CD411A9E30000D1ECEFE40C3F0700@Exchn7.gallup.com>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: ARRIVEDERCI SADDAM! [Jim Robbins]  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

The hyperlink did not work, but you can find the article at  
<http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr020909.asp>.  
David

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

From: Moore, David  
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2002 3:34 PM  
To: HFienberg@stats.org; aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: ARRIVEDERCI SADDAM! [Jim Robbins]

A poll in Italy conducted by DOXA S.p.A for the Gallup Organization  
produced different results -

"Would you favor or oppose sending American ground troops (the  
United States sending ground troops) to the Persian Gulf in an attempt to  
remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq?" Favor - 36%; Oppose - 49%; No  
opinion 15%. See British, Italians, Spanish Oppose U.S. Attack to Oust  
Saddam Hussein

David

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

From: Howard Fienberg [mailto:HFienberg@stats.org]  
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2002 3:22 PM  
To: AAPORNET (E-mail)  
Subject: ARRIVEDERCI SADDAM! [Jim Robbins]

ARRIVEDERCI SADDAM! [Jim Robbins]

La Repubblica, a left of center daily in Rome, published a nationwide poll  
today that shows a majority of Italians favoring military action against  
Iraq. In response to the question, "In your view, do the terrorist threat  
and suspicion of Saddam Husayn's aggressive intentions justify preventive  
intervention in Iraq on the part of the United States and of the individual  
allies?" the results were Yes: 53.0, No: 43.0, No opinion: 4.0. To the  
question, "In your view, if military intervention in Iraq were to take place  
under the aegis of the United Nations, should Italy take part with its own  
troops?" Yes: 59.0, No: 35.0, No opinion: 6.0. Viva Italia!

Posted 2:03 PM | [Link]

<[http://www.nationalreview.com/thecorner/2002\\_09\\_08\\_corner-archive.asp](http://www.nationalreview.com/thecorner/2002_09_08_corner-archive.asp)>

---

Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) hfienberg@stats.org  
<http://www.stats.org>

---

Date: Fri, 13 Sep 2002 16:42:51 -0400  
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>  
To: <HFienberg@stats.org>, "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: ARRIVEDERCI SADDAM! [Jim Robbins]  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Gee, "preventive intervention" sounds friendly.

Will they be distributing box lunches?

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
Voice (610) 408-8800  
Fax (610) 408-8802  
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

From: Howard Fienberg <HFienberg@stats.org>  
To: AAPORNET (E-mail) <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Date: Friday, September 13, 2002 3:23 PM  
Subject: ARRIVEDERCI SADDAM! [Jim Robbins]

>ARRIVEDERCI SADDAM! [Jim Robbins]

>La Repubblica, a left of center daily in Rome, published a nationwide poll today that shows a majority of Italians favoring military action against Iraq. In response to the question, "In your view, do the terrorist threat and suspicion of Saddam Husayn's aggressive intentions justify preventive intervention in Iraq on the part of the United States and of the individual allies?" the results were Yes: 53.0, No: 43.0, No opinion: 4.0. To the question, "In your view, if military intervention in Iraq were to take place under the aegis of the United Nations, should Italy take part with its own troops?" Yes: 59.0, No: 35.0, No opinion: 6.0. Viva Italia!

>Posted 2:03 PM | [Link]

<[http://www.nationalreview.com/thecorner/2002\\_09\\_08\\_corner-archive.asp](http://www.nationalreview.com/thecorner/2002_09_08_corner-archive.asp)>

>

>-----

>Howard Fienberg

>Senior Analyst

>The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)

>2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
>Washington, DC 20037  
>(ph) 202-223-3193  
>(fax) 202-872-4014  
>(e) hfienberg@stats.org  
>http://www.stats.org  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

---

Date: Fri, 13 Sep 2002 17:40:59 -0700  
From: Kristi Hagen <kristi.hagen@NAU.EDU>  
Subject: citations for effects of survey length  
X-Sender: kkh3@jan.ucc.nau.edu  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Message-id: <4.3.2.7.2.20020913173934.00b3afd0@jan.ucc.nau.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.2  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

I am interested in any information and citations for studies that have reviewed the impact of survey length on response rates and refusal rates. You can email me directly. Thanks

~~~~~  
Kristi Kay Hagen, MA, MA  
Research Operations Manager  
Social Research Laboratory,  
Northern Arizona University  
PO Box 15301, Flagstaff AZ 86011-5301  
PH: 928-523-1515  
Fax:928-523-6654

---

Date: Fri, 13 Sep 2002 22:00:37 -0700  
From: Kristi Hagen <kristi.hagen@NAU.EDU>  
Subject: citations for effects of telephone survey interviewing time  
X-Sender: kkh3@jan.ucc.nau.edu  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Message-id: <4.3.2.7.2.20020913215841.00b04ce0@jan.ucc.nau.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.2  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

I was not completely clear with my last email (only in my head). I am interested in any information and citations for studies that have reviewed the impact of how long a telephone survey (in terms of time that respondent is on the telephone with an interviewer) is on response rates and refusal rates. You can email me directly. Thanks

~~~~~  
Kristi Kay Hagen, MA, MA  
Research Operations Manager  
Social Research Laboratory,

Northern Arizona University  
PO Box 15301, Flagstaff AZ 86011-5301  
PH: 928-523-1515  
Fax:928-523-6654

=====  
Date: Sat, 14 Sep 2002 09:20:38 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Colleges Lobby to Move Up in the Polls (WashPost)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209140919110.12676-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

-----  
(C) 2002 The Washington Post Company  
-----

[www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A15284-2002Sep13](http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A15284-2002Sep13)

Saturday, September 14, 2002; Page A01

Colleges Lobby to Move Up in the Polls

Schools Politicking Each Other to Advance in Annual Rankings

By Amy Argetsinger  
Washington Post Staff Writer

All year, Elisabeth Muhlenfeld's mailbox has brimmed with glossy brochures and letters from the schools vying for her regard. Hobart and William Smith Colleges touted an illustrious lineup of guest speakers. Cedar Crest boasted about its most-accomplished graduates. Middlebury sent a view book full of striking campus photos. And so on, from Wofford, Elon, Franklin & Marshall, Moravian and others.

It was much like the academic marketing blitz aimed at teenagers deciding where to apply for college. Except that Muhlenfeld had settled on her campus years ago -- as the president of Virginia's Sweet Briar College.

In the perpetual race to raise their national profiles, college leaders are starting to advertise themselves to an unlikely audience: each other. At stake are the "academic reputation" ratings that help mold the popular but controversial "America's Best Colleges" rankings by U.S. News & World Report. The magazine's latest edition was released yesterday.

In the 15 years since it began ranking institutions annually, U.S. News has been lauded and lambasted for highlighting the hard numbers of higher education quality, from admissions standards and graduation

rates to faculty resources. Yet the most important factor in the rankings system remains the ever-so-subjective reputation score, derived from surveying presidents, deans and admissions officers on their perceptions of other schools.

The reputation survey has drawn an increasing torrent of criticism from college leaders, who find it unscientific and unfair.

"It's a beauty contest," scoffed Patricia A. McGuire, president of Trinity College in the District, who said she ripped up the survey U.S. News sent her this year. A recent poll of presidents by the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, a national organization for trustees, found 70 percent who believed reputation was emphasized too heavily in the rankings, and 38 percent who demanded an end to reputational ratings altogether.

Seven percent admitted that they had intentionally downgraded the score of a rival school to make their own look better.

Yet in these same circles, the survey seems more crucial than ever. Campus leaders report that they are receiving more and more promotional material from their peers, with the apparent goal of swaying votes. A few cop to doing it themselves.

"It's part of a marketing mania that's taken hold in higher education," said Howard University President H. Patrick Swygert, who acknowledged sending an annual letter to "400 or 500 of my closest friends" to note the school's latest achievements.

"We all object to treating higher education as a commodity," he said. "And most of us do it."

The phenomenon of inter-campus marketing may be most intense among graduate and professional programs, whose rise or fall in similar rankings by U.S. News and other periodicals can have a precipitous effect on the number of students who apply or recruiters who visit.

Myron Roomkin, dean of American University's Kogod School of Business, received three packages in three weeks -- from a rival business school he won't identify -- on the eve of a recent reputation survey. Included were a box of golf balls, a five-pound Hershey chocolate bar and a jar of chili peppers with a reminder that "when you think of something hot, think of us."

Another school sent an elaborate brochure that Roomkin said his own marketers estimated had cost \$20 apiece to print -- presumably sent to all the deans and MBA program directors at more than 300 business schools, not to mention the scores of corporate recruiters who are also surveyed for such rankings. The brochure arrived by costly overnight mail.

"People are genuinely concerned about the rising cost of education, so you have to ask yourself, are we spending the money on the right thing?" Roomkin said.

An annual circulation-booster for U.S. News, the "America's Best Colleges" issue and its lucrative spinoff book have withstood a barrage

of criticism over the years for promoting a shallow brand-name ethic among college-choosing students and parents and for feeding an arms-race mentality among schools.

Many schools have tinkered with their admissions practices -- shrinking their freshman classes, dropping SAT requirements, increasing the proportion of students admitted through binding early-decision programs -- to make their student bodies appear more elite under the measures that U.S. News uses to assess a school's selectivity.

But experts note that some of the most-debated aspects of the rankings, such as the percentage of admitted students who choose to enroll, account for barely 2 to 3 percent of the overall ranking. More important by far is reputation, weighted at 25 percent.

U.S. News officials say they conduct the reputation survey to help gauge intangible virtues, including the quality of teaching and learning, that are not captured by more objective measures. This year, they changed the category's name to "peer assessment," acknowledging presidents' discomfort with the ambiguities of the word "reputation."

Of all the things U.S. News considers, reputation is "the easiest to change -- theoretically," said George Dehne, a higher education marketing consultant based in South Carolina. "To build a bigger library, to pay your faculty more, all those things are expensive. It's alluring to think: Gee, we'll just go out and schmooze the president and admissions director."

No doubt, reputation matters. Though University of Maryland officials say they did not lobby survey-takers, their reputation score bumped up from 3.7 on a 5-point scale to 3.8 this year. A modest move, but it was enough to let the state's flagship campus improve from 21st place to 18th on U.S. News's ranking of best public universities.

It's not just for bragging rights. Many governing boards and state education leaders have borrowed the framework of the U.S. News rankings to make their own judgments of how well colleges are performing, with consequences ranging from school funding to whether the president stays onboard.

Two years ago, Virginia ordered public colleges to establish specific performance benchmarks and goals. Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond declared that one of its goals would be to ascend from U.S. News's third tier of national universities (those ranked from 130 to 195) to its second (those just below the top 50).

As part of that goal, VCU pledged to move its reputation score from 2.8 to 3.2 in five years. This year, it holds at 2.9.

Though VCU hired a new vice president of institutional research to develop a national marketing plan, President Eugene P. Trani said such efforts are aimed more at attracting high-caliber students from across the country than lobbying his fellow presidents.

"I'm one who believes the U.S. News and World Report ranking is a fact of life," he said. "It has a lot of credibility, and we have to recognize it."

Lisa Akchin, an associate vice president at the University of Maryland-Baltimore County, said she sees nothing crass in most of the mailings between campuses. Presidents have always reached out this way to their peers, she said, and most simply send the annual reports and magazine reprints they have prepared for alumni and supporters anyway.

Still, UMBC -- a small school that has made marked gains in national visibility -- sent presidents a miniature magnetic chessboard this year to herald its chess team's national championship.

"There is a lot of clutter out there, and when we're thinking about what to send, we do look at ways to stand out," Akchin said.

Yet it remains unclear whether a college can successfully change its reputation through better marketing.

"Academic reputations are very slow to build, and they're very slow to be lost," said Sweet Briar's Muhlenfeld, explaining why she objects to the survey itself. "A certain department might be known as top-notch, when in fact it was top-notch in the 1950s when your dissertation professor told you it was top-notch."

Most schools, in fact, have maintained largely the same rating over the past several years, according to Robert Morse, U.S. News director of data research. "We haven't seen any evidence that these profile-building efforts or informational mailings have any real success," he said. The Association of Governing Boards report released this month warned board members about the wasteful expense of such campaigns.

Muhlenfeld herself used to send her fellow presidents copies of her school's alumnae magazine -- but stopped after realizing she barely read any of the material she receives from most other colleges. "I'm aware that most of it goes in the trash," she said.

Yet others acknowledge the subtle power of advertising in helping to form their impressions. Roomkin, though critical of mailing expensive tchotchkes, said he finds himself drawn to the news of another campus when delivered in a simpler letter or brochure.

"They do convey information, especially when they talk about which faculty members are moving where," he said. "There really is value in learning what's going on at other institutions. You just have to get beyond the brag."

###

[www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A15284-2002Sep13](http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A15284-2002Sep13)

---

(C) 2002 The Washington Post Company

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

---

Date: Sun, 15 Sep 2002 09:10:41 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Building National Resolve by Talking About It (BJ Schulman, NYTimes)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209150909100.20798-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

---

Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company

---

[www.nytimes.com/2002/09/15/weekinreview/15SCHU.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/15/weekinreview/15SCHU.html)

September 15, 2002

Building National Resolve by Talking About It

By BRUCE J. SCHULMAN

NATIONAL debate about war in Iraq is finally underway. On Thursday, President Bush publicly laid out his arguments against Iraq for the first time and he had earlier decided to seek Congressional authorization. The secretary of defense and national security adviser journeyed to Capitol Hill to discuss the administration's aims, and cautionary voices have appeared in Congress, the chattering classes and the international community.

America has gone into battle many times, sometimes after a sustained national discussion, other times without one. In wars initiated after wide-ranging public debate, this helped to strengthen the nation's resolve and fuel a spirit of sacrifice and collective endeavor. But going to war without this process has historically fostered division, doubt and discontent.

Debate has proved vital, and the president plays a unique role because the public usually pays attention only after the president has spoken. Mr. Bush has now recognized that more than legal authority is required.

Consider Woodrow Wilson, a former professor who believed deeply in the president's responsibility to lead public opinion. He engaged the nation in a lengthy, vigorous debate about involvement in World War I.

After Germany announced unrestricted submarine warfare against Britain, Berlin declared every British merchant ship a legitimate target and warned neutral parties like the United States not to entrust passengers or cargo to such vessels. But Wilson insisted on the right to trade with warring states; if American lives were lost, he would hold Germany accountable. Three months later, a U-boat torpedoed the British liner Lusitania, killing 1,198 people, including 128 Americans. Amid the calls for war, Wilson tried to soothe the nation: "There is such a



thing as a nation being so right that it does not need to convince others by force."

In Congress and within the cabinet, isolationists critiqued Wilson's version of neutrality, sponsoring resolutions on Capitol Hill forbidding Americans to enter the war zone on ships flying any colors but the Stars and Stripes.

Meanwhile, opposition voices in Congress, the diplomatic service and the press pushed war. Theodore Roosevelt denounced Wilson as a "time server," without courage.

By the time Wilson sought a declaration of war, in April 1917, the nation had considered the stakes and costs of intervention. Opposition remained but Congress and the public rallied behind the president.

Franklin D. Roosevelt understood even better than Wilson the need to take his case for overseas intervention directly to the nation. Facing a far more perilous world situation and a nation so hostile to foreign entanglements that Congress had adopted neutrality laws forbidding the traffic with belligerents that had led America into World War I, Roosevelt knew what problems "a large misinformed public opinion" could produce. So he began a sustained effort to educate the American people and build support for the battle against fascism.

In 1937, Roosevelt traveled to Chicago, a hotbed of isolationism, to deliver his famous "Quarantine the Aggressor" speech. "War is a contagion," he warned. Isolation or neutrality could not protect the United States: "There must be positive endeavors to preserve peace."

In 1939, as Europe plunged into war, Roosevelt convened a special session of Congress, urging revision of the Neutrality Act to permit arms sales to Britain and France. Opponents of aid to the Allies, like the aviator Charles A. Lindbergh and the radio commentator Father Charles E. Coughlin, denounced Roosevelt and warned against involvement. After six weeks of heated debate, Congress sent the president a revised bill that allowed the Allies to buy munitions on a cash-and-carry basis. A year later, a similarly contentious debate preceded approval of Roosevelt's plan to supply the cash-starved Allies aid through a Lend-Lease program.

OVER three years of sustained argument, Roosevelt occasionally back-tracked, but at every step a long national conversation preceded fateful moves toward total war.

World War II and the cold war recalibrated the balance of power in foreign affairs, making the president truly the commander in chief. In the atomic age, the speed of world affairs, the global reach of American power, the secrecy and complexity of weapons and negotiations concentrated power in the White House. Modern presidents could go to war without broad support or Congressional approval.

With no debate or even warning, chief executives repeatedly ordered military action. Many small-scale conflicts -- for example, Lyndon B. Johnson's intervention in the Dominican Republic and Ronald Reagan's invasion of Grenada -- proved military and political successes. Others quickly soured, like the C.I.A.-backed Bay of Pigs operation ordered by

John F. Kennedy.

But the Korean and Vietnam Wars illustrated the dangers of taking the nation into war without building a consensus. When North Korean troops crossed the 38th parallel in June 1950, American intervention was hardly inevitable. In his determination to send American ground troops, President Harry S. Truman ventured far ahead of Congressional opinion. Meanwhile, many public opinion leaders remained circumspect about America's role in defending South Korea. Even the secretary of defense, Louis A. Johnson, said the United States should provide only air and naval support. Yet five days after the attack, Truman opted for land war.

In retrospect, his decision may have been correct, but at the time, his failure to secure an informed consensus backfired. The Chinese entered the war; stalemate ensued. Truman's standing fell to record lows and he lost the ability to govern effectively. Ultimately, he decided not to seek re-election. The Republicans took the White House largely because of Dwight D. Eisenhower's claim that he would go to Korea and extricate America from the mess Truman had made.

Vietnam provides an even more troubling precedent. In August 1964, after an incident in the Gulf of Tonkin, President Johnson secured from Congress a carte blanche resolution to "take all necessary measures to protect American troops and prevent further aggression in Vietnam." A year later, he secretly escalated the conflict. He sent 50,000 new troops and privately committed to deploy another 50,000 before the end of year. He also instructed Gen. William C. Westmoreland to Americanize the war.

BUT though Johnson assumed responsibility for the defense of South Vietnam, he never explained his actions to the nation or sought its approval. He refused to declare a national emergency, to call up the reserves or to ask for a tax increase to pay for the war. He took the crucial decisions for war, but misled both Congress and the public about the gravity of his actions. In fact, he instructed his aides to expand the war in "a low-keyed manner" to "avoid undue concern and excitement in the Congress and in domestic public opinion."

Johnson's conduct of the war damaged his own and the government's credibility, miring the nation in a quagmire that would bitterly divide the American people.

In the war on terrorism, President Bush leads a nation supportive of his general aims. Few doubt the malevolence of Saddam Hussein or the dangers posed by weapons of mass destruction. By engaging in public debate, by educating the American people and receiving the approval of their representatives, the president would only strengthen his hand. Cloaking himself in resolutions from his father's presidency, Mr. Bush could have ordered an invasion. But to do so without the considered judgment of his nation would only have fostered division at home and discomfort abroad. On the other hand, the mightiness of a great democracy, moved by deliberation to unified action, can comfort its allies and caution its enemies.

-----

Simon Schama is University Professor at Columbia University and the

author, most recently, of ``A History of Britain.''

[www.nytimes.com/2002/09/15/weekinreview/15SCHU.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/15/weekinreview/15SCHU.html)

-----  
Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company  
-----

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Sun, 15 Sep 2002 15:08:10 -0400  
Subject: Re: Picking up the thread: Matching anonymous surveys from students  
in schools  
Message-ID: <20020915.150818.-209507.3.jelinson@juno.com>  
X-Mailer: Juno 5.0.15  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary=--\_JNP\_000\_25cd.5f34.6429  
X-Juno-Line-Breaks: 9-6,10,14-16,18-20,23,25-26,28-29,32-33,35-65,66-32767  
From: Jack Elinson <jelinson@juno.com>

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.

----\_JNP\_000\_25cd.5f34.6429  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The way to do it is to have the students create an identifying number  
known only to themselves - and that can be created only by them  
Furthermore, they do not have to remember this number, because it can be  
recreated the next time they are called to answer questionnaires.  
We used this method in the '70s(?) in the first national studies of drug  
use conducted by Columbia's Department of Sociomedical Sciences.sponsored  
by NIDA. I believe the method had also been used by Peter Rossi among  
college students.

Although I do not remember the details, it goes something like this:  
Ask the students to create a five digit ID, more or less as  
follows:

First digit: From your mother's maiden last name, use the third letter  
For example: If her name was Rebecca Block the third letter of  
her maiden last name is O. Translate the letter O telephone dial style  
to 6 (MNO = 6)

|       |       |       |       |       |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| ABC=2 | DEF=3 | GHI=4 | JKL=5 | MNO=6 |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|

PRS=7            TUV=8            WXY=9  
Other digits can be made up from the person's first name, month of birth,  
date of birth, etc.

The same procedure is used at each administration of the questionnaire.  
Well over 95% match was achieved this way. Non-match results from failure  
of all the same persons to be called up the second time, for reasons of  
absences, etc. And errors. And rare non-unique numbers.            JE

=====  
On Thu, 12 Sep 2002 11:11:36 -0400 (Eastern Daylight Time)

<tmglp@t.mail.virginia.edu> writes:

> Hi folks:

> I recall a relatively recent thread of discussion on AAPORnet  
> about  
> methods to use in an anonymous, multi-wave, self-administered survey  
> of  
> students, to allow matching of Wave I and Wave II questionnaires  
> without  
> having any link to a student's name or identity. We're being asked  
> to do  
> exactly that (by our IRB) in a survey of high school students that  
> we are  
> readying for the field now.

> Can anybody point me to the earlier postings? I could pull them  
> from

> AAPORnet archives if I knew when they occurred.

> Or, just get in touch directly please if you have advice to share  
> on how  
> to do this.

> Thanks!

>

Tom

>

>

>

> Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434) 243-5223

> NOTE: NEW TELEPHONE AREA CODE CSR Main Number: (434) 243-5222

> Center for Survey Research FAX: (434) 243-5233

> University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2205 Fontaine Ave

> P. O. Box 400767 Suite 303

> Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

-----\_\_JNP\_000\_25cd.5f34.6429  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*  
\* This post contains a forbidden message format \*  
\* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*  
\* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \*  
\* If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
\* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

-----\_\_JNP\_000\_25cd.5f34.6429--

=====  
Date: Sun, 15 Sep 2002 18:40:16 -0400  
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>  
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.79 [en] (Windows NT 5.0; U)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Yes, we have no bananas!  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The invoice for dues send out by the New York Chapter of AAPOR contains the following splendid example of permission-based marketing weasel wording:

Occasionally we share our mailing list with select outside organizations that offer programs or services that may be of interest to our members.

Would you prefer your name not be included? [ ] Yes

This raises some serious questions, such as:

Would you actually trust this organization to respect your privacy?

Would you pay to attend a seminar on questionnaire design sponsored by this organization?

Jan Werner  
jwerner@jwdp.com

=====  
Date: Mon, 16 Sep 2002 10:46:39 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: PEW STUDY: Internet cements itself in ivory tower (LM Bowman, CNET)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209161043320.23442-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

-----  
© 1995 - 2002 CNET Networks, Inc.  
-----

[news.com.com/2100-1023-957874.html](http://news.com.com/2100-1023-957874.html)

September 15, 2002, 5:00 PM PT

Internet cements itself in ivory tower

College students consider the Internet as integral to their lives as the television and the telephone, according to a new study on their Web habits.

By Lisa M. Bowman  
Staff Writer, CNET News.com

The Pew Internet and American Life Project found that 79 percent of students surveyed think the Web has had a positive influence on their lives overall, with 60 percent saying it's improved relationships with classmates and nearly half saying e-mail allows them to tell professors an idea they would not have expressed in class. Nearly three out of

four college students check their e-mail every day and use the Web for library research.

Not surprisingly, college students--long known as the most prolific downloaders of music--are much more Web-savvy than the average American. While 59 percent of Americans are online, the percentage of college students connected to the Web is much higher at 86 percent.

"Today's 18-year-old college freshmen were born the same year the PC was introduced, and they have grown up with these technologies," said Steve Jones, lead author of the study and head of the communications department at the University of Illinois at Chicago. "To them, the Internet and e-mail are as commonplace as telephones and television--and equally as indispensable."

Because many colleges provide free, high-speed connections, college students are also more active in downloading media, a detail that's turned some college campuses into targets of the entertainment industry, which has been busy scouring the Web landscape for copyright infringers.

According to the Pew study, about 60 percent of college students have downloaded music files, compared with just 28 percent of the general population.

Instant messaging, a phenomenon catching on like wildfire among teens, also is gaining traction with college students. According to the study, 26 percent of students use IM daily, compared with just 12 percent of the general Internet population.

While many news reports have documented the millions of students using the Internet to download files and IM friends, Jones said he was most surprised by the study's finding that students also use the Internet as frequently for academic purposes. Jones said the Internet has radically changed the way college students interact with their professors and each other, thanks to features such as mail lists, e-mail and Web sites.

"We've heard a lot about college students downloading music, but when you look at what we've found, they use the Internet as much or more for academic purposes," he said.

Jones also said the business world could take a lesson from the study. He said upon graduation, college students probably will seek the same high-quality Internet speeds they had on campus.

"This generation is going to end up making the Internet a major part of their lives as they go into the work force," Jones said. "The folks who are trying to market broadband are missing out if they're not targeting this wired market."

#### Related News

- \* Teen market clicks past e-tailers July 3, 2002  
<http://news.com.com/2100-1017-941731.html>
- \* Schools declare file-swapping truce March 14, 2002

<http://news.com.com/2100-1023-859705.html>

- \* Study: College students would pay for Napster April 10, 2001  
<http://news.com.com/2100-1023-255610.html>
- \* Student's PC seized after record industry complaint Sept. 15, 2000  
<http://news.com.com/2100-1023-245770.html>
- \* Get this story's "Big Picture"  
<http://news.com.com/2104-1023-957874.html>

[news.com.com/2100-1023-957874.html](http://news.com.com/2100-1023-957874.html)

-----  
© 1995-2002 CNET Networks, Inc.  
-----

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Tue, 17 Sep 2002 09:59:09 -0400  
Subject: Constitution Study: Americans Say Teach the Bad with the Good  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
        charset="iso-8859-1"  
Message-ID:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F9603947C@CMPA01.smallbusiness.local>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3  
From: "Howard Fienberg" <HFienberg@stats.org>  
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g8HE00I18044

Constitution Study: Americans Say Teach the Bad with the Good  
<<http://www.newswise.com/articles/2002/9/CON.PAG.html?sc=wire>>

The United States will be remembered as one of the most democratic and free nations the world has produced, say most Americans, but nine out of ten also believe America should be a land where children are taught both the good and the bad about their history. --Public Agenda

-----  
Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) [hfienberg@stats.org](mailto:hfienberg@stats.org)

<http://www.stats.org>

=====  
Date: Tue, 17 Sep 2002 13:04:12 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@bellsouth.net>  
Subject: COMMUNICATING WITH AMERICA: KEY WORDS, THEMES AND LANGUAGE  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g8HHFaI10599

For general interest as to how research based on the results from polling and focused groups can lead to more effective communication with the media. The study, results and recommendations, was commissioned by the American Jewish Committee who had The Luntz (Frank Luntz ) Communication, a national research polling firm, put together a communications manual titled The Ten Commandments of Effective Communication.

Dick Halpern

THE LUNTZ RESEARCH COMPANIES

COMMUNICATING WITH AMERICA:  
KEY WORDS, THEMES AND LANGUAGE

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS OF EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION

This document does not seek to judge or recommend policy for the Israeli government. This is strictly a study of communication effectiveness. We have taken the actual words of the leading spokespeople from both sides of the conflict (as spoken on American television) and tested them word-for-word with Americans who live and work in Washington, D.C. The session participants placed themselves neither in the Israeli or Palestinian camps the "non-aligned" swing vote of American public opinion toward the Middle East. What follows is an explanation and analysis of their reaction to current Israeli language and a step-by-step approach for a more effective communication effort.

1) Above all, draw direct parallels between Israel and America. From history to culture to values, the closer you define the similarities between Israel and America, the more likely you are to win the support of those who are neutral. The American-Israeli parallel should be a part of every American interview starting with the response to the very first question. Conclude with: "And what would America do under similar circumstances?"

2) The language of Israel is the language of America: "democracy," "freedom," "security," and "peace." These four words are at the core of the American political, economic social and cultural system. They should be repeated as often as possible because they will resonate with virtually every American.



3) Explain why a threat to Israel is a threat to America. The reason why Americans are paying attention to the Middle East is not because of the rising level of violence or a personal concern for Israelis or Palestinians. The reason why Americans are paying attention is a fear that somehow the U.S. will get dragged into the conflict and AMERICAN lives will be lost and gas price will be higher. Therefore, you need to explain why a threat to Israel's security is a threat to America's security and economy.

4) Promote Anwar Sadat and King Hussein BEFORE you de-legitimize Arafat. Nobody likes Arafat in America, but Israelis are undermining their own message and strategy every time they state assertively and categorically that Arafat is not legitimate. You need to SHOW it, not say it. A better answer is to compare Arafat with Anwar Sadat, an American icon, as well as King Hussein. "Sadat...King Hussein ... people of courage in the Arab world that have stood up to terrorists, told their people to put down their guns, and made peace with Israel." But Yasser Arafat?

5) Oslo matters a lot. Oslo was a Treaty, not a technicality, and Americans believe that signing your name to a treaty, accord or agreement denotes a total commitment to whatever is written in the document. Emphasize Arafat's signature. Emphasize what he agreed to. Then demonstrate exactly how he failed and the consequences of that failure. "The same man who signed the Oslo Accord is the same man who signed the checks that paid the terrorists. That man is Yasser Arafat. And when he signed those checks, he signed away his credibility, his integrity, and his honor "

6) The American people differentiate between Arafat and the Palestinian people. So should you. There was an immediate and clear distinction between the empathy people felt for the Palestinians and the scorn they directed at Arafat. If it looks like you are attacking the Palestinian people as well as Arafat, your message will be ignored or even backfire. Right now, Americans sympathize with the plight of the Palestinians, and that sympathy will increase if you fail to differentiate.

7) Never forget 9/11. It has been forever implanted into the minds and psyches of the American people. Here's where you make the direct contrast between Israelis and Palestinians. On that fateful day, Israelis shed tears of pain for the Americans who were killed. But on that day, the Palestinians danced in the streets in celebration. Conclude with: "Yes, there is a difference between the two peoples." One caveat do not compare the situation in Israel to America on 9/11. Americans see their situation differently, and comparing the two undermines your credibility.

8) Explain your principles. Both Arab and Israeli spokespeople go right into an attack against the other, and virtually no one on either side explains the principles behind their actions. Americans respond much better to facts, actions and results when they know why not just how. And use rhetorical questions. "Can there be true peace without security?" "Who can Americans really trust as their faithful ally?"

9) The nation that is perceived as being most for peace will win this debate. It didn't matter how it was said or who said it. Every time someone made the plea for peace, the reaction was positive. If you were to do a media content analysis, you'd find that the Palestinian spokespeople are using the peace word much more than the Israelis and it is working. If you want to regain the public relations advantage, peace

should be at the core of whatever message you wish to convey.

10) You can't please everyone. Some people cannot be moved to support Israel no matter what words, themes or language you use. Your goal is to inform and empower your supporters and educate the neutrals. Leave the hostiles alone.

#### TALKING ABOUT ISRAEL

Nothing will build support for Israel more than linking it to the culture and values of the United States. Israel represents the only democratic country in a region dominated by extremist nations that are entrenched in non-Western religious doctrine. Americans are fervent in their desire to protect and foster the democratic principles that define the United States, and are emotionally vested in the sisterhood between Israel and the United States that result from shared values of freedom, equality and security.

The American public appreciates the blunt, plainspoken manner of President Bush and Defense Secretary Rumsfeld. The very black-and-white, morally unambiguous language that makes the pointy-headed academics squirm comes across to the average American as refreshingly candid.

However, what works for Americans talking to their countrymen will not work when the spokesperson is Israeli. Blunt, unequivocal language (particularly when spoken with an Israeli accent) was poorly received because, to the American ear, it sounds too confrontational when spoken by a foreigner even an ally. Americans are inherently peace advocates and they want the rest of the world to get along. This may sound simplistic or idealistic, but it is a fact. The blunt, in-your-face tone of some leading Israelis is simply too provocative. With that in mind, we recommend the following approach:

1) "Never again." September 11, 2001 was the darkest day in modern American history. So empathize. Explain what it was like the day in 1973 when Israel had to face enemies of its own on most of its borders. Then add: As difficult as it may be for us to accept, our future will hold darker days if we do not remain vigilant in the fight against terrorism. We must not sink back into the illusion of safety. Don't make a direct comparison to 9/11, but invoke the emotions surrounding that event.

2) Appeal to America as "the only nation on the globe capable of defending democracy and ridding the world of terrorism." This is not some abstract, theoretical observation. The language is very powerful: "If we do not face the world's dangers head-on if we do not proactively use American power to promote democratic values and make the world a more just place the enemies of freedom will prevail. The best defense against terrorism is a good offense. The best medicine is preventative medicine. Israel and America must stand together as one against terrorism of any kind."

3) "We cannot afford to make up our defense and foreign policy as we go along." Foreign policy is a serious, life and death business, so say it. Right now, it appears as though Israeli retribution is random. Americans need to know that your policy has been studied and analyzed "Israel, just like America, treats the defense of our nation as a sacred obligation, not as an excuse or arbitrary action."

For a while after September 11th, Americans saw Israel and America as one in the fight against terrorism. That support has begun to wane for three reasons:

(1) There is a limit to how much pain, suffering and bloodshed Americans will watch or listen to. The first, second, even tenth suicide bomber attracted significant attention. But because there have been so many horrific incidents in recent months, the shock value has lessened. Remarkably, lengthy discussions by either side about the horrors do not result in positive audience reactions. This is clearly a change from previous years.

(2) The pain, suffering and bloodshed is not exclusively caused by Arabs or Palestinians. You already know this to be the case but it deserves repeating. Every time an Israeli tank is seen leveling a Palestinian home, and every time an Israeli soldier is shown firing at youths with stones, your support and credibility drops in the eyes of the non-aligned Americans. The reason(s) don't matter. The justification is irrelevant. A picture really is worth more than 10,000 words. You have to get control of the visual (particularly your military response) if you want to take control of the message.

(3) The loss of hope and lack of a potential solution. Said one participant, "Israel and the Palestinians have long been mortal enemies. The violence in the Middle East has been going on for centuries, and it will never end." Unless there is at least a glimmer of hope, Americans will increasingly tune out. That is why every interview should end with the expressed desire for a "permanent lasting peace" and a commitment to work to achieve it

#### WORDS THAT WORK

"As the lone superpower, the United States has a unique responsibility. You are truly democracy's last resource, freedom's final defense against tyranny and aggression. But you are not the world's policeman, and you cannot right all of the world's wrongs.

"Like America, Israel is a democratic country. We share the same values, and we cherish peace above all else. Like America, we were founded on the principles of freedom, democracy and peace. And as America fights a war on terrorism to forever prevent another September 11th, so too does Israel defend itself against the extreme violence taken by Arafat against innocent Israeli civilians. Israel does not want violence; it wants peace. And like America, we will continue to work until that day when peace can be shared by all peoples of the region. A permanent lasting peace is our ultimate goal.

#### TALKING ABOUT PEACE

Peace is the word.

Americans want and need to hear that the terror can be stopped. They have

to believe that at some point, the sides can come together and find common ground. You may not want to hear this but the side that seems to want peace more will win the support of the non-aligned American public. This is exactly why the Palestinian spokespeople are repeating the word "peace" again and again. Unless this explicit desire for peace is conveyed in Israeli communication efforts, Israeli support will continue to erode.

But it is perfectly acceptable and even desirable to use peace and security in the same sentence. Americans fundamentally believe that any democracy has a right to defend itself, and they do believe that Israel is exercising that right when it responds to these homicide bombers. The Arabs are getting away with the homicidal bombings because they "condemn" them and then call for "peace." Why? Americans are responding to the intension rather than the action. Israel must use the same strategy. Every Israeli message should be about peace and security.

ISRAELI WORDS THAT WORK

Some say violence in the Middle East can never end. But it can, with courageous leaders like Egypt's Anwar Sadat and Jordan's King Hussein. Sadat and King Hussein recognized Israel's right to exist, and in return, we made significant land concessions and a lasting peace was achieved.

Contrary to what the current Palestinian spokespeople have said, it is absolutely possible to stop terror. Yasser Arafat says he is for peace, but he can't or won't stop the suicide bombers from killing innocents and has refused Israel's offers of peace even land for peace. For peace to occur, this violence must end.

There is a fundamental principle that Israel has learned from America: you cannot have peace without security. Americans have known pain and suffering only since 9/11. We have lived this for 54 years. We have been and will continue to be at the forefront of the war against terrorism and the efforts to secure a fair and lasting peace for everyone. But peace can only come when Arafat stops the terrorism and says yes to peace. Until then, Israel will use it's deterrent power to protect our people and maintain our security.

TALKING ABOUT YASSER ARAFAT & THE PALESTINIANS

"I understand and sympathize with the Palestinians, but not with Arafat"

The words and phrases used by Americans to describe Yasser Arafat are universally harsh and hostile. Even those who sympathize with the Palestinian cause hold Arafat in contempt. Several called him a "terrorist" and many were critical of him for doing so little for his people.

Yet as much as "non-aligned" Americans dislike and distrust him, they consider him to be a legitimate leader. The reason is simple. Americans have a fundamental belief in and a commitment to democracy and the electoral process, and they believe Arafat was fairly elected. So while they will acknowledge that Arafat is an obstacle to peace, they still expect Israel to recognize and negotiate with him. In fact, every time an Israeli spokesperson or representative made the statement that Arafat was in some way "irrelevant," the American reaction was immediate and harshly negative. Said one: "It is unbridled arrogance to call the elected leader of your sworn enemy irrelevant, and what's happened over the past few weeks

has made him even more relevant."

A DEBATE ISRAEL LOST

ISRAELI: "Frankly, we think Yasser Arafat is irrelevant, and we've said so. He's had eight years to implement his obligations under the Oslo agreement and dismantle these terrorist organizations. He hasn't, and Israelis have died."

ARAB: "If the Israelis insist on talking about the democratically elected leader of the Palestinian people as irrelevant, that says a lot about their occupation. And that says a lot as to why the Palestinian people are fighting that occupation."

With this in mind, we recommend the following approach:

(1) Challenge Arafat's policies, methods, and actions, but do not question his authority at least not initially. One of the single most positive reactions to any Israeli came when Shimon Peres said that Arafat "is legitimate in the sense that he was elected by the Palestinian people. And we cannot replace the Palestinian people. We cannot elect their leaders or fire them." Peres then went on to criticize Arafat strenuously, and that criticism was accepted and even endorsed because of this initial statement.

Israel should not make Arafat's irrelevancy or departure a core message. While it may be Israeli policy (and again, we do not comment on policy) this language erodes the credibility of the spokesman and Israel's credibility. It also raises suspicion as to whether Israel is pursuing a policy of deterrence or dominance.

Instead, erode Arafat's credibility by citing specific examples of his intemperance, anti-American behavior and acceptance/endorsement of terrorism. Quoting him verbatim will be far more effective than a linguistic frontal assault. In particular, emphasize that it was his signature that authorized the funding of terrorism against the Israeli people.

(2) Contrast Arafat's aggression and dishonesty with the constructive cooperation of other well-known and respected Arab leaders. Israel's relationship with Anwar Sadat and King Hussein are shining examples of how Israel and her neighbors "can work towards common goals in a respectful and peaceful manner." Your various anti-Arafat messages should draw attention to these two specific relationships, reminding the American audience that the U.S. itself held Sadat and Hussein in high esteem as well. Such positive positioning will reinforce Israel's historic efforts at cooperation with her Arab neighbors as well as drawing a clear contrast between the courage and leadership of these two great leaders and the failed, violent record of Arafat's government.

(3) Remind listeners that Arafat himself signed the Oslo Accord. Just as Americans will respect the democratic electoral process even if they dislike the outcome, they have respect for international agreements and

expect leaders to uphold them. To commit in writing to peace and then go out and break it again and again is unacceptable. "We offered him a state, and what we got was terror. He could have been known as the father of his country, but instead he will only be known as a terrorist. His signature meant nothing. His word means nothing."

Please understand that Americans have never heard or seen a fellow democracy expel one of its citizens or, in this case, someone they believe was duly elected. Add to that the visual of laying siege to his compound and the attempt to destroy the Palestinian infrastructure and you should begin to understand why an impression of Israeli arrogance and aggression now exists in America. Humility, not righteous indignation, is the better emotion to express on American television right now.

Finally, there is a line of communication that will be effective but only if used rhetorically and only at the end of a lengthy discussion of the causes and prevention of terrorism. Should the United States negotiate with terrorists? Should the United States negotiate with Osama Bin Laden? If articulated carefully, this is an effective closer.

#### WORDS THAT WORK

Under the Oslo agreements, Yasser Arafat was supposed to become the Nelson Mandela of the Palestinians, a man who would set aside violence as a political tool and renounce terrorism. Unfortunately, his jurisdiction itself has harbored a vast network of international terrorism.

This is a tragedy not just for us Israelis but for the Palestinians as well. Consider what Yasser Arafat has done not just to the people of Israeli, but to his own people. An entire generation of young, talented people are told by their leaders to strap bombs to themselves and kill as many Israelis as possible -- that the more people they kill, the more likely they are to go to heaven.

This is not just a terrible crime against Israel. It's a terrible crime against Palestinians, against all humanity. Just as we live in peace with our Egyptian and Jordanian neighbors, our future Palestinian partners, I am sure, will not educate their children to do this. We will have peace, but only once security is achieved.

Remember, we offered Arafat a country. We offered Arafat virtually every acre of land he asked for. We agreed to almost every term. Arafat had the chance to stand for peace and father a Palestinian nation. Instead, he chose the path of violence.

And for that reason Israel must now seek other avenues to pursue peace.

#### TALKING ABOUT THE ISRAELI MILITARY ACTION & "OCCUPATION"

"The Palestinians make the point that there's been a 35-year Israeli military occupation of the Palestinian territories. And they feel frustrated. They're angry. They don't have F-16s. They don't have Apache helicopters. They have to do something to try to liberate their land."

Wolf Biltzer, CNN

During periods of military action against Palestinians, the central communication principle of Israeli foreign policy must be the fight against terrorism and the preservation of freedom. As President Bush told a joint-session of Congress nine days after the World Trade Center fell, there is no middle ground. Just as every American foreign policy issue during the Cold War was examined in the context of the Soviet threat, every Israeli foreign affairs question must now be viewed through the prism of the war on terrorism.

Israel must define its military actions as those of self-defense and deterrence. These words resound with Americans' fundamental desire to protect a fellow democracy's values and sovereignty, as well as an individual's right to protect themselves from attack. In light of September 11th, Americans now accept the notion of using an aggressive offense as a deterrence tactic. So focus on the protecting democracy and explain how your actions in the West Bank and Gaza are done only as a method of deterrence. Frame every military event in these terms.

Link the military action to Arafat himself and not the Palestinian people. It will be helpful to address Arafat's refusal to negotiate and his inability to control his own people. Americans note that "he promises things he can't deliver" ... "he will not negotiate" ... "he pays lip service

to whatever audience is listening at that time." Americans do understand what Israel is facing, but you still need to use concrete examples to remind the world of his obstinacy and aggression.

AN ARAB CRITICISM THAT DOES NOT WORK

"President Arafat did not teach anybody to be a suicidal bombing. It is the Israeli occupation who taught people that they have -- that seeking death is far more relevant than hoping for life, a life that they don't see any light at the end of the occupation tunnel."

WORDS THAT WORK We have to distinguish between those engaging in terrorism and those engaging in self-defense. Today, the Israeli army is defending the people of Israel from what is unquestionably a war of terrorism against

us. And any democracy attacked by terrorism has a moral right to defend itself, and Israel is exercising that right. Yasser Arafat has adopted the most extreme means of terror to attain his desired goals. Under his authority, murderers have been sent to kill our people in restaurants, shopping centers and hotel lobbies even at religious events. What option do we have? What option would the United States choose if they had to live in these conditions? When a young man walks into a cafe full of teenagers and blows himself up, that's called terrorism. You don't have to be an international lawyer to figure it out. Nothing, no cause can possibly justify the murder of innocent civilians and particularly the targeting of children. That's what the war on terrorism is about here.  
EFFECTIVE SOUND-BITES

These statements would be particularly effective if spoken by younger Israelis and/or women. Too many Israeli spokespeople are older men. Americans react more favorably and are more likely to agree with women and younger people.

-- "Israel is willing to restart peace talks with the Palestinians, but only if the terrorist attacks halt for a few days first. Is a few days of peace so much to ask?"

-- "To prevail in the war on terror, we must face certain challenges and realities head-on. We must see the world as it is, while at the same time working to improve relations with our neighbors as they can and one day should be."

-- "It's difficult to sustain any sort of a 'peace process' when one of the parties denies the other's very right to exist."

-- "We are seeking a real and lasting peace. But peace will be ratified not by signatures on a piece of paper, but by the reality of no more Israeli children being blown up in pizza parlors or outside places of worship."

-- "When Menachim Begin signed the peace treaty with Egypt, it was Ariel Sharon who personally evacuated and returned the Sinai. It was Ariel Sharon who addressed the mothers and fathers of Palestinians directly, asking for no more bloodshed. And it is Ariel Sharon that is prepared to make peace if the Palestinian homicide bombers will stop making war.  
CONCLUSION: DON'Ts AND Do's

There are four specific comments by Israeli spokespeople that if repeated, could truly lead to a disintegration of American support. These are exact quotes, and all have one thing in common: an extreme, overly aggressive attack. You absolutely can achieve your goals building support for Israel and isolating Arafat but not with the language that you are using. If you would just change a sentence or two, you can also say exactly what you want. So here's what we recommend.

WRONG: "We must go on fighting against these terrorists. But even more, we must target their leaders, the people who purchase the arms, the bullets, the weapons of pain, destruction and death. We have to stop their leaders, because that is how we stop their army, and in the end, that is how you stop terrorism. We've tried everything else. This is the only answer left. And after having a cease-fire, we shall start immediately talking about peace."

RIGHT: No mother should live in fear. No mother should have to worry that



when their daughter goes off to the store, she might be killed by a homicide bomber. No parent should worry that when their children go for a hike, they might be tortured and brutally murdered. The terrorism must stop. We have to stop the purchase of guns by terrorists. We have to stop the purchase of bullets by terrorists. And we have to hold the terrorist leadership ultimately accountable for the pain and suffering they have caused. Fighting terrorism isn't easy, and it isn't pretty, but it must be done. And when it is done, we can again return to our ultimate goal a true, fair, lasting peace between Israelis and Palestinians.

WRONG: "Arafat is the head of a morally bankrupt leadership. While Israel stands for peace, Arafat proudly stands for war. Arafat's policies have been of aggression, with the intent of wiping out the people, government, and culture of Israel. He has deliberately sent suicide bombers to ravage innocent civilians. His map of the area has no Israel. He has consistently provoked and perpetuated destruction. He has intentionally blocked any hopes for peace."

RIGHT: We have choices in life. Yasser Arafat had a choice. He was offered 95 percent of the West Bank, 100 percent of Gaza, and an independent state with Jerusalem as its Capitol. But he still said no. He chose terror instead. He could have stood up and said NO to aggression. He didn't. He could have directed his operation to root out and stop these bombings. He didn't. He could have taught his people that peace is better than war, that living together side by side with Israelis is preferable to a constant state of war. He didn't. He could have stood up and said YES to peace, but he didn't.

WRONG: "The 60 bodies will be buried in the presence of Red Cross. This should put an end to this Big Lie which has been repeated time and time again about a massacre which didn't happen. People forget that we lost 23 soldiers in this battle."

RIGHT: What happened in Jenin is a tragedy for everyone. Everyone. It is particularly tragic when Palestinian terrorists choose to hide in homes, schools and places of worship. They turn innocent civilians into combatants and, too often, casualties. If Yasser Arafat was truly serious about ending terrorism, there would have been no Jenin. We will talk, negotiate and work toward peace. We have offered the Palestinians a state and they have chosen terrorism. What are we to do? We cannot allow those who have killed our people to escape and kill again. These people must be brought to justice.

WRONG: "Occupation? We never occupied any Palestinian land. They never had independent, never had any government there. They never got the independence when this area was under a Jordanian occupation for 19 years."

RIGHT: I have several questions I would ask my Palestinian neighbors. What have you achieved with your war of terror? Are you better off today than you were before the campaign? Is your economy stronger? Are your schools better? Are your people safer and more secure?

If Yasser Arafat had kept his word, if he had followed the Oslo Accord that he himself signed, there would be peace between Israel and the Palestinians and he would have been the father of a nation. So again I say to him what Israelis have said every day since Oslo, stop the violence. Honor the agreement that you yourself signed at the White House in front of the American people and the world. Stop the attacks. Stop the pain.

And so I have one last question for my Palestinian neighbors. Where would you like to be, and what would you like to see in your future? A state of your own? A government of your own? A police force of your own? Stop the attacks, stop the terror and you can have that future.

---

Date: Tue, 17 Sep 2002 12:54:21 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: AP Poll on politics and the congressional elections (AP)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209171253160.14311-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

---

Copyright (C) 2001 Yahoo! Inc.

---

[story.news.yahoo.com/news?templ=story2&old=664&u=/ap/20020917/ap\\_to=po/politics\\_poll\\_method\\_2](http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?templ=story2&old=664&u=/ap/20020917/ap_to=po/politics_poll_method_2)

Tue Sep 17, 1:46 AM ET

The AP's Poll on politics and the congressional elections

By The Associated Press

The Associated Press poll on politics is based on telephone interviews with 758 randomly selected registered voters from all states except Alaska and Hawaii. The interviews were conducted Sept. 6-10 by ICR/International Communications Research of Media, Pa.

The results were weighted to represent the population by key demographic factors such as age, sex, region and education.

In the poll, no more than one time in 20 should chance variations in the sample cause the results to vary by more than 3.5 percentage points from the answers that would be obtained if all Americans were polled.

This margin of error is larger for responses of subgroups, such as income categories. There are other sources of potential error in polls, including the wording and order of questions.

—

1. If the elections for Congress were held today, which party's candidate would you vote for in your district? Would you vote for ...

\_The Democratic Party candidate, 40 percent.

\_The Republican Party candidate, 40 percent.

\_Neither, 5 percent.

\_Don't know, 14 percent.

\_Refused, 1 percent.

2. Which one of the following issues do you think is the most important in the elections for Congress?

\_The economy, 23 percent.

\_Education, 19 percent.

\_Health care, 18 percent.

\_Fighting terrorism, 17 percent.

\_Social Security, 9 percent.

\_Taxes, 8 percent.

\_Decline of the stock market, 1 percent.

\_Don't know-refused, 5 percent.

3. When it comes to dealing with the economy and jobs, which party do you think would do a better job?

\_Democratic Party, 23 percent.

\_Republican Party, 21 percent.

\_Both about the same, 38 percent.

\_Neither, 13 percent.

\_Don't know-refused, 5 percent.

4. When it comes to dealing with national security and the war on terrorism, which party do you think would do a better job?

\_Democratic Party, 15 percent.

\_Republican Party, 37 percent.

\_Both about the same, 36 percent.

\_Neither, 8 percent.

\_Don't know-refused, 4 percent.

5. In general, do you think it is better for the same political party to control both the Congress and the presidency so they can work together more closely or do you think it is better to have different political parties controlling the Congress and the presidency to prevent either one from going too far?

\_Better if same party controls Congress and the presidency, 32 percent.

\_Better if different parties control Congress and the presidency, 61 percent.

\_Don't know-refused, 7 percent.

###

Copyright © 2002 The Associated Press

-----  
Copyright (C) 2001 Yahoo! Inc.  
-----

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 09:07:47 -0400  
Subject: "Public strong on opinions - weaker on knowledge"  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
        charset="iso-8859-1"  
Message-ID:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F9603948C@CMPA01.smallbusiness.local>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
content-class: urn:content-classes:message  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Howard Fienberg" <HFienberg@stats.org>  
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g8ID90I00578

"Public strong on opinions - weaker on knowledge"  
<[http://www.eurekalert.org/pub\\_releases/2002-09/cu-pso091702.php](http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2002-09/cu-pso091702.php)> -

"The public's knowledge of topical science issues appears to be only slightly improved by either their education or their consumption of news media, according to interim findings from a research project at Cardiff University, UK." (Cardiff University)

-----  
Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) hfienberg@stats.org  
<http://www.stats.org>

=====  
Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 09:17:53 -0400  
Subject: Poll of Egyptian opinion  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
        charset="iso-8859-1"  
Message-ID:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F9603948F@CMPA01.smallbusiness.local>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
content-class: urn:content-classes:message  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Howard Fienberg" <HFienberg@stats.org>  
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g8IDJ5I01598

This poll of Egyptians <<http://www.ahram.org.eg/weekly/2002/603/sc41.htm>> taken by Al-Ahram Weekly, shows that a majority of 52% think the US "deserved" the attacks of September 11, and 39% believe they were perpetrated by Israel.

QUESTION 1: How would you describe your feelings when you saw the destruction of New York's twin towers?

They deserved it: 52%  
Sympathy for the victims: 35%  
Afraid of the future: 24%  
Admiration for the culprits: 28%  
Anger at the culprits: 10%

QUESTION 2: Who do you think is responsible for the attacks?

Israeli intelligence/Mossad: 39%  
We'll never know: 25%  
Al-Qa'eda or other Islamic militants: 19%

Others: 19%

QUESTION 3: How do you view the American war on terror?

A means of asserting the US's global dominance: 68%

A war against Arabs and Muslims: 51%

A justified response to the attacks: 15%

QUESTION 4: How do you view the results of the American war on terror?

Descent into chaos and increasing violence: 93%

The end of democracy and human rights: 48%

Success in eradicating terrorism and a more peaceful world: 1%

QUESTION 5: How do you view the future of radical Islamists?

Their popularity will increase: 51%

They are becoming weak and isolated: 31%

11 September was their death blow: 11%

QUESTION 6: What do you feel should have been Arab and Islamic governments' position on the US war on terror?

Oppose: 63%

Support: 10%

Remain neutral: 22%

-----  
Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) hfienberg@stats.org  
<http://www.stats.org>

=====  
Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 08:45:34 -0500  
From: David\_Moore@gallup.com  
To: HFienberg@stats.org, aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: Poll of Egyptian opinion  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

It might be useful to note the following from the web site itself:

"Al-Ahram Weekly has conducted a straw poll about 11 September, one year

later. Our team sampled the opinions of 150 people selected randomly, but not according to exact statistical procedures, from a variety of locations and social classes, including North Coast resorts and Cairo's back streets."

David

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

From: Howard Fienberg [mailto:HFienberg@stats.org]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2002 9:18 AM  
To: AAPORNET (E-mail)  
Subject: Poll of Egyptian opinion

This poll of Egyptians <<http://www.ahram.org.eg/weekly/2002/603/sc41.htm>> taken by Al-Ahram Weekly, shows that a majority of 52% think the US "deserved" the attacks of September 11, and 39% believe they were perpetrated by Israel.

QUESTION 1: How would you describe your feelings when you saw the destruction of New York's twin towers?

They deserved it: 52%  
Sympathy for the victims: 35%  
Afraid of the future: 24%  
Admiration for the culprits: 28%  
Anger at the culprits: 10%

QUESTION 2: Who do you think is responsible for the attacks?

Israeli intelligence/Mossad: 39%  
We'll never know: 25%  
Al-Qa'eda or other Islamic militants: 19%  
Others: 19%

QUESTION 3: How do you view the American war on terror?

A means of asserting the US's global dominance: 68%  
A war against Arabs and Muslims: 51%  
A justified response to the attacks: 15%

QUESTION 4: How do you view the results of the American war on terror?

Descent into chaos and increasing violence: 93%  
The end of democracy and human rights: 48%  
Success in eradicating terrorism and a more peaceful world: 1%

QUESTION 5: How do you view the future of radical Islamists?

Their popularity will increase: 51%  
They are becoming weak and isolated: 31%  
11 September was their death blow: 11%

QUESTION 6: What do you feel should have been Arab and Islamic governments' position on the US war on terror?

Oppose: 63%

Support: 10%  
Remain neutral: 22%

-----  
Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) hfienberg@stats.org  
<http://www.stats.org>

=====  
Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 10:01:30 -0400  
Subject: Thomas Friedman cries, "Don't Believe the Polls"  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
        charset="iso-8859-1"  
Message-ID:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F96039497@CMPA01.smallbusiness.local>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Howard Fienberg" <HFienberg@stats.org>  
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>,  
    "Eugene Volokh (E-mail)" <VOLOKH@mail.law.ucla.edu>,  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g8IE2fI04735

Thomas Friedman believes his unscientific sample of callers trumps those  
silly public opinion polls:

<http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/18/opinion/18FRIE.html>

-----  
Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) hfienberg@stats.org  
<http://www.stats.org>

=====



Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 08:00:52 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: NCES: Internet Access in US Public Schools & Classrooms, 1994-2001  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209180758080.27576-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

DOE has just today released this, after some 15 years of research...

-- Jim

=====  
-----  
National Center for Education Statistics  
Office of Educational Research & Improvement, U.S. Dept. of Education  
1990 K Street, NW, Washington, DC 20006, USA, Phone: (202) 502-7300  
-----  
=====

[nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2002018](http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2002018)

Internet Access in U.S. Public Schools and Classrooms: 1994-2001

This report presents data on Internet access in U.S. public schools from 1994 to 2001 by school characteristics. It provides trend analysis on the progress of public schools and classrooms in connecting to the Internet and on the ratio of students to instructional computers with Internet access. For the year 2001, this report also presents data on the types of Internet connections used; student access to the Internet outside of regular school hours; laptop computer loans; and operating systems, memory capacity and disk space found most frequently on instructional computers. It also contains information on special hardware and software for students with disabilities, school-sponsored e-mail addresses, school Web sites, and technologies and procedures to prevent student access to inappropriate material on the Internet.

On-line Availability: Download, view and print the report as a pdf file.

-----

Cover Date: September 2002

Web Release: September 17, 2002

Print Release: Currently only available online, print version forthcoming.

Publication #: (NCES 2002018)

Authors: Anne Kleiner and Elizabeth Farris

Product Type: E.D. TAB

Survey Areas: Fast Response Survey System (FRSS)

Subject Descriptors:

- \* Computers
- \* Internet access in schools
- \* Technology use in education

Questions: For questions about the content of this product, please contact Bernard R. Greene.

[nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2002018](http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2002018)

---

---

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 11:37:52 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>  
X-X-Sender: pmeyer@login8.isis.unc.edu  
To: Howard Fienberg <HFienberg@stats.org>  
cc: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>,  
"Eugene Volokh (E-mail)" <VOLOKH@mail.law.ucla.edu>  
Subject: Re: Thomas Friedman cries, "Don't Believe the Polls"  
In-Reply-To:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F96039497@CMPA01.smallbusiness.local>  
Message-ID:  
<Pine.A41.4.44+UNC.0209181132050.44682-100000@login8.isis.unc.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

His main point, "that most Americans are perplexed," could well be true. Our scientific polls don't capture perplexity very well. It comes through masked as real, substantive attitudes, as Phil Converse told an earlier incarnation of ourselves.

I thought it was a well-balanced column and not demeaning to pollsters at all.

=====  
Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549  
Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: [www.unc.edu/~pmeyer](http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer)  
=====

On Wed, 18 Sep 2002, Howard Fienberg wrote:

> Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 10:01:30 -0400

> From: Howard Fienberg <HFienberg@stats.org>  
> To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>,  
> "Eugene Volokh (E-mail)" <VOLOKH@mail.law.ucla.edu>  
> Subject: Thomas Friedman cries, "Don't Believe the Polls"  
>  
> Thomas Friedman believes his unscientific sample of callers trumps those  
> silly public opinion polls:  
> <http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/18/opinion/18FRIE.html>  
>  
>  
> -----  
> Howard Fienberg  
> Senior Analyst  
> The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
> 2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
> Washington, DC 20037  
> (ph) 202-223-3193  
> (fax) 202-872-4014  
> (e) hfienberg@stats.org  
> <http://www.stats.org>  
>  
>  
>  
>

---

Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 09:24:02 -0700  
From: "Uyeda, Mary" <Muyel107@HCA.WA.GOV>  
To: "'HFienberg@stats.org'" <HFienberg@stats.org>,  
"AAPORNET (E-mail)"  
Subject: RE: Thomas Friedman cries, "Don't Believe the Polls"  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

So now Howard,  
I'm not sure what you are saying here. I found Friedman's article to be quite thoughtful. "What I hear" isn't the same as drawing a sample and conducting a survey...is it?

But then, I also happen to agree with him. Ah, perhaps he heard me! There it is!

Mary K. Uyeda, Ph.D.  
Purchasing & Policy  
360-923-2738  
muyel107@hca.wa.gov

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

From: Howard Fienberg [mailto:HFienberg@stats.org]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2002 7:02 AM  
To: AAPORNET (E-mail); Eugene Volokh (E-mail)  
Subject: Thomas Friedman cries, "Don't Believe the Polls"

Thomas Friedman believes his unscientific sample of callers trumps those silly public opinion polls:  
<http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/18/opinion/18FRIE.html>

-----  
Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) [hfienberg@stats.org](mailto:hfienberg@stats.org)  
<http://www.stats.org>

=====  
Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 12:41:14 -0500  
From: "Rob Daves" <[daves@startribune.com](mailto:daves@startribune.com)>  
To: <[aeikensdp@aol.com](mailto:aeikensdp@aol.com)>, <[rmayland@aol.com](mailto:rmayland@aol.com)>, <[tsilver@capaccess.org](mailto:tsilver@capaccess.org)>, <[sschier@carleton.edu](mailto:sschier@carleton.edu)>, <[75227.173@compuserve.com](mailto:75227.173@compuserve.com)>, <[reide@email.usps.gov](mailto:reide@email.usps.gov)>,  
Subject: Minnesota Poll news  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Disposition: inline

Friends...

Those with an interest in Minnesota politics will be interested in the most recent poll on voter support in the U.S. Senate race in Minnesota. You can find that story at [www.startribune.com](http://www.startribune.com)

However, if this e-mail is an intrusion, please accept my apologies, and hit your delete button.

All best wishes,

Rob Daves, director  
The Minnesota Poll

=====  
Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 12:43:10 -0500  
From: "Rob Daves" <[daves@startribune.com](mailto:daves@startribune.com)>  
To: <[HFienberg@stats.org](mailto:HFienberg@stats.org)>, <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>  
Subject: Re: Thomas Friedman cries, "Don't Believe the Polls"  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Disposition: inline

Mr. Friedman may or may not believe in sample surveys for public opinion research. But what he is doing is a tried-and-true journalism trick for

a lead of a thoughtful opinion piece. Phil Meyer's point is well taken, and Phil's right, of course. But we also have to understand that anytime someone, especially someone who's as thoughtful and respected as Mr. Friedman, denigrates polling, it further chips away at the credibility of polls and those who take them.

Obviously he's not in the same camp as Ross Perot (lie to pollsters) or Arianna Huffington (hang up on pollsters). But the long-term effect is the same. All of us who do market research know that anytime one's brand is attacked, the marketer must protect it to maintain a good image with customers and potential customers. There's no difference here. Our customers and potential customers, those who pay us for our professional services and who read or hear the results of our polling, have been concerned about the veracity of our sample surveys for a long time. And I think the concern is rising.

Mr. Friedman is just using a journalistic technique to rope readers in. Editorial writers at my newspaper have used the same type of technique, but with a different anecdotal setting (state fair instead of call-in programs). I've corrected them, and they've agreed not to do it again. (At least until the next time that they're hard up for a lead, and this technique comes to mind.)

If memory serves me correctly, the academic work done on call-in show participants is clear: They are very different politically and demographically from the general adult population. So he's wrong, and we should take Mr. Friedman's lead with a grain of salt and recognize it for what it is, just one more journalistic technique to rope readers in.

But as I did with our editorial writer, I think someone in AAPOR (standards folks, are you listening), ought to shoot the Times and Mr. Friedman a brief note that swiftly corrects him without being too harsh.

Now, back to rewarding task of public opinion research based on probability sampling.

Cheers...

Rob Daves, director  
Star Tribune Strategic & News Research

---

Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 15:00:03 -0400  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@panix.com>  
Subject: Re: Thomas Friedman cries, "Don't Believe the Polls"  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"

Rob Daves wrote:

>Mr. Friedman may or may not believe in sample surveys for public opinion  
>research. But what he is doing is a tried-and-true journalism trick for  
>a lead of a thoughtful opinion piece. Phil Meyer's point is well taken,

>and Phil's right, of course. But we also have to understand that  
>anytime someone, especially someone who's as thoughtful and respected as  
>Mr. Friedman, denigrates polling, it further chips away at the  
>credibility of polls and those who take them.

>

>Obviously he's not in the same camp as Ross Perot (lie to pollsters) or  
>Arianna Huffington (hang up on pollsters). But the long-term effect is  
>the same. All of us who do market research know that anytime one's  
>brand is attacked, the marketer must protect it to maintain a good image  
>with customers and potential customers. There's no difference here.  
>Our customers and potential customers, those who pay us for our  
>professional services and who read or hear the results of our polling,  
>have been concerned about the veracity of our sample surveys for a long  
>time. And I think the concern is rising.

>

>Mr. Friedman is just using a journalistic technique to rope readers in.  
> Editorial writers at my newspaper have used the same type of technique,  
>but with a different anecdotal setting (state fair instead of call-in  
>programs). I've corrected them, and they've agreed not to do it again.  
>(At least until the next time that they're hard up for a lead, and this  
>technique comes to mind.)

>

>If memory serves me correctly, the academic work done on call-in show  
>participants is clear: They are very different politically and  
>demographically from the general adult population. So he's wrong, and  
>we should take Mr. Friedman's lead with a grain of salt and recognize it  
>for what it is, just one more journalistic technique to rope readers in.

The NYT did a vox pop piece on Sunday showing very thin support for a war on Iraq. The reporter talked to people in several small upstate NY towns, including West Point, and found lots of ambivalence and even revulsion.

I think the polling industry has two problems here - one is that complex thoughts can't easily be fit into mutually exclusive checkboxes, and the other is that people may give what they feel is the "right" and "patriotic" answer when their feelings are really a lot more nuanced.

--

Doug Henwood  
Left Business Observer  
Village Station - PO Box 953  
New York NY 10014-0704 USA  
voice +1-212-741-9852  
fax +1-212-807-9152  
cell +1-917-865-2813  
email <<mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>>  
web <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>

=====  
Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 19:04:13 -0400  
From: Jeanne Anderson Research [<mailto:ande271@attglobal.net>]  
To: [daves@startribune.com](mailto:daves@startribune.com)  
Cc: [HFienberg@stats.org](mailto:HFienberg@stats.org); [aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)  
Subject: Re: Thomas Friedman cries, "Don't Believe the Polls"

The trouble with Friedman's article is that it isn't a balanced review or summary of \*all\* polls. For sure there are poll results based on simple "do you agree or disagree..." questions, some of which are biased in such a way to produce support for the Bush approach and some that are biased against. It seems to me there was at least one where something like the option "...without a resolution from the Security Council" was presented in a \*second\* question, the first presenting the simple support/not support for the Bush approach.

Should Friedman be advised not to refer to polls at all unless he does a sort of meta-analysis of all of them? Should an AAPOR member write a letter-to-the-editor describing the variations in poll results and the different "results" they yield?

The deciding factor would be whether statesmen/politicians have referred to one poll or another to support whatever their views are. \*That\* could do damage if different public opinion polls appear to yield different results. Friedman's emphasis was on what he has heard and on his own appraisal of the international situation, and we don't have an important argument with him.

Jeanne Anderson  
(formerly) Jeanne Anderson Research

=====  
=====  
Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 22:46:46 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@bellsouth.net>  
Subject: Re: Thomas Friedman cries, "Don't Believe the Polls"  
In-Reply-To: <sd8874f4.003@ngwgatel.startribune.com>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Friedman's almost cavalier dismissal of polling was painful and perhaps he could have chosen his words more carefully. But he obviously wanted to make a point about Iraq which is in clear opposition to the current views of the Bush administration. Bush, understandably, wants to believe that the majority of the American people are behind him with respect to his Iraq stance, and of course he has some polling evidence to back him up. So Friedman chose - at our expense -- a dramatic way to make his point, saying in so many words, that because the public do not fully understand the real issues, their opinions should not be taken as seriously as some would like. As much as I respect Friedman, this was perhaps a bit arrogant on his part and perhaps he could have expressed himself a bit more diplomatically.

Although so many others in the past have dismissed polling results when the findings contradict their views, its still hard to accept. But perhaps we learn something after each instance.

Dick Halpern

=====  
Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 21:12:14 -0700  
From: Richard <rmaullin@fmma.org>  
To: "'dhalpern@bellsouth.net'" <dhalpern@bellsouth.net>, aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: RE: Thomas Friedman cries, "Don't Believe the Polls"  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="ISO-8859-1"

Maybe Friedman could have been kinder to pollsters in setting up his argument with President Bush, but I took his column to be more of a criticism of the Administration and much of the media that poorly interprets the polling regarding the President's proposals for what to do about and to Iraq. The polls generally say that the public wants evidence of a significant problem, Congressional concurrence and UN and/or Allied participation, even if at first glance a majority agrees with going after Saddam. Friedman's argument makes a different point, however, not directly related to the attack or not poll questions. His argument is that removing Saddam does not solve the West's dilemma in dealing with anti-Western fanaticism in the Muslim/Arab world. That is an issue that pollsters only touch on in the most indirect ways. This pollster doesn't take much offense at Friedman's swipe at the polls; his more fundamental point is the one we ought to be discussing.

Richard Maullin  
Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates  
-----Original Message-----  
From: dick halpern [mailto:dhalpern@bellsouth.net]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2002 7:47 PM  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Thomas Friedman cries, "Don't Believe the Polls"

Friedman's almost cavalier dismissal of polling was painful and perhaps he could have chosen his words more carefully. But he obviously wanted to make a point about Iraq which is in clear opposition to the current views of the Bush administration. Bush, understandably, wants to believe that the majority of the American people are behind him with respect to his Iraq stance, and of course he has some polling evidence to back him up. So Friedman chose - at our expense -- a dramatic way to make his point, saying in so many words, that because the public do not fully understand the real issues, their opinions should not be taken as seriously as some would like. As much as I respect Friedman, this was perhaps a bit arrogant on his part and perhaps he could have expressed himself a bit more diplomatically.

Although so many others in the past have dismissed polling results when the findings contradict their views, its still hard to accept. But perhaps we learn something after each instance.

Dick Halpern

=====  
Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 01:17:39 -0400  
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>  
To: <rmaullin@fmma.org>, <dhalpern@bellsouth.net>, <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: Thomas Friedman cries, "Don't Believe the Polls"  
MIME-Version: 1.0



Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

You are correct that the writer's few brief remarks about polling data have absolutely nothing to do with the main point of the article and it's astounding that that issue could have generated even the small number of posts that address it.

You miss the point completely, in my opinion, in believing that Friedman is cautioning that taking out SH won't solve our problems. Quite the contrary. He is merely giving us a less ludicrous rationale for going ahead and doing just that. How generous of us to "change the context in which young (Iraqi) men grow up" and help them "close the dignity gap" -- with bombs. Why don't we just send them to Esalen? The article is an arrogant (because he couldn't possibly be that stupid) and unsubtle piece of propaganda that either has the administration smiling, or maybe asking, "Why didn't we think of that?" That a piece like this could be written without ANY reference to the Israeli-Arab conflict or the geopolitics of oil, and appear in the Nation's "newspaper of record," shows how profoundly lunar we are over here.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
Voice (610) 408-8800  
Fax (610) 408-8802  
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

From: Richard <rmaullin@fmma.org>  
To: 'dhalpern@bellsouth.net' <dhalpern@bellsouth.net>; aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Date: Thursday, September 19, 2002 12:21 AM  
Subject: RE: Thomas Friedman cries, "Don't Believe the Polls"

>

>Maybe Friedman could have been kinder to pollsters in setting up his  
>argument with President Bush, but I took his column to be more of a  
>criticism of the Administration and much of the media that poorly  
interprets  
>the polling regarding the President's proposals for what to do about and to  
>Iraq. The polls generally say that the public wants evidence of a  
>significant problem, Congressional concurrence and UN and/or Allied  
>participation, even if at first glance a majority agrees with going after  
>Saddam. Friedman's argument makes a different point, however, not directly  
>related to the attack or not poll questions. His argument is that removing  
>Saddam does not solve the West's dilemma in dealing with anti-Western  
>fanaticism in the Muslim/Arab world. That is an issue that pollsters only  
>touch on in the most indirect ways. This pollster doesn't take much  
offense

>at Friedman's swipe at the polls; his more fundamental point is the one we  
>ought to be discussing.

>

>Richard Maullin

>Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates  
>-----Original Message-----  
>From: dick halpern [mailto:dhalpern@bellsouth.net]  
>Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2002 7:47 PM  
>To: aapornet@usc.edu  
>Subject: Re: Thomas Friedman cries, "Don't Believe the Polls"  
>  
>  
>  
>Friedman's almost cavalier dismissal of polling was painful and perhaps he  
>could have chosen his words more carefully. But he obviously wanted to make  
>a point about Iraq which is in clear opposition to the current views of the  
>Bush administration. Bush, understandably, wants to believe that the  
>majority of the American people are behind him with respect to his Iraq  
>stance, and of course he has some polling evidence to back him up. So  
>Friedman chose - at our expense -- a dramatic way to make his point, saying  
>in so many words, that because the public do not fully understand the real  
>issues, their opinions should not be taken as seriously as some would like.  
>As much as I respect Friedman, this was perhaps a bit arrogant on his part  
>and perhaps he could have expressed himself a bit more diplomatically.  
>  
>Although so many others in the past have dismissed polling results when the  
>findings contradict their views, its still hard to accept. But perhaps we  
>learn something after each instance.  
>  
>Dick Halpern  
>  
>

---

Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 09:09:24 -0500  
From: MFlanagan@goamp.com  
Received: by AMP1 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
id <SRAYD8LJ>; Thu, 19 Sep 2002 09:09:24 -0500  
Message-ID: <669C9575C5E1D511B7B5001083FCEE8DEE8BB8@AMP1>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Cc: kdebelle@bellatlantic.net  
Subject: Focus Groups  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

I'm posting the following message for a new AAPOR member who has not had time to subscribe to the list. Please respond directly to her. Thanks.

Request for information:

I'm trying to organize a couple focus groups - two in Milwaukee, WI and two in Albuquerque, NM. Does anyone have any suggestions as to good focus group facilities in those areas that will handle the recruiting as well?

Please send response to: kdebelle@bellatlantic.net  
<mailto:kdebelle@bellatlantic.net> - thank you in advance for any advice!

Regards,

Kim de Belle

---

Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 11:23:26 -0400  
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>  
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.79 [en] (Windows NT 5.0; U)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com  
CC: rmaullin@fmma.org, dhalpern@bellsouth.net, aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Thomas Friedman cries, "Don't Believe the Polls"  
References: <028601c25f9b5e2b9eb4055efac3d1@default>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Friedman is a good observer and a good journalist. But he is a terrible columnist because his analysis is typically. I often agree with him, but that does not excuse the sloppy thinking he so frequently exhibits.

For a more insightful, yet personal, approach to the same topic that uses polling results properly, see Richard Cohen's column in today's Washington Post at:  
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A36907-2002Sep18.html>

Jan Werner  
jwerner@jwdp.com

---

"James P. Murphy" wrote:

>  
> You are correct that the writer's few brief remarks about polling data have  
> absolutely nothing to do with the main point of the article and it's  
> astounding that that issue could have generated even the small number of  
> posts that address it.  
>  
> You miss the point completely, in my opinion, in believing that Friedman is  
> cautioning that taking out SH won't solve our problems. Quite the contrary.  
> He is merely giving us a less ludicrous rationale for going ahead and doing  
> just that. How generous of us to "change the context in which young  
> (Iraqi)  
> men grow up" and help them "close the dignity gap" -- with bombs. Why don't  
> we just send them to Esalen? The article is an arrogant (because he couldn't  
> possibly be that stupid) and unsubtle piece of propaganda that either has  
> the administration smiling, or maybe asking, "Why didn't we think of that?"  
> That a piece like this could be written without ANY reference to the

> Israeli-Arab conflict or the geopolitics of oil, and appear in the Nation's  
> "newspaper of record," shows how profoundly lunar we are over here.  
>  
> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
> Voice (610) 408-8800  
> Fax (610) 408-8802  
> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Richard <rmaullin@fmma.org>  
> To: 'dhalpern@bellsouth.net' <dhalpern@bellsouth.net>; aapornet@usc.edu  
> <aapornet@usc.edu>  
> Date: Thursday, September 19, 2002 12:21 AM  
> Subject: RE: Thomas Friedman cries, "Don't Believe the Polls"  
>  
>  
> >Maybe Friedman could have been kinder to pollsters in setting up his  
> >argument with President Bush, but I took his column to be more of a  
> >criticism of the Administration and much of the media that poorly  
> >interprets  
> >the polling regarding the President's proposals for what to do about and  
> to  
> >Iraq. The polls generally say that the public wants evidence of a  
> >significant problem, Congressional concurrence and UN and/or Allied  
> >participation, even if at first glance a majority agrees with going after  
> >Saddam. Friedman's argument makes a different point, however, not  
> directly  
> >related to the attack or not poll questions. His argument is that  
> removing  
> >Saddam does not solve the West's dilemma in dealing with anti-Western  
> >fanaticism in the Muslim/Arab world. That is an issue that pollsters  
> only  
> >touch on in the most indirect ways. This pollster doesn't take much  
> >offense  
> >at Friedman's swipe at the polls; his more fundamental point is the one  
> we  
> >ought to be discussing.  
> >  
> >Richard Maullin  
> >Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates  
> >-----Original Message-----  
> >From: dick halpern [mailto:dhalpern@bellsouth.net]  
> >Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2002 7:47 PM  
> >To: aapornet@usc.edu  
> >Subject: Re: Thomas Friedman cries, "Don't Believe the Polls"  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >Friedman's almost cavalier dismissal of polling was painful and perhaps he  
> >could have chosen his words more carefully. But he obviously wanted to  
> make  
> >a point about Iraq which is in clear opposition to the current views of  
> the  
> >Bush administration. Bush, understandably, wants to believe that the  
> >majority of the American people are behind him with respect to his Iraq  
> >stance, and of course he has some polling evidence to back him up. So  
> >Friedman chose - at our expense -- a dramatic way to make his point,

saying  
> >in so many words, that because the public do not fully understand the  
real  
> >issues, their opinions should not be taken as seriously as some would  
like.  
> >As much as I respect Friedman, this was perhaps a bit arrogant on his  
part  
> >and perhaps he could have expressed himself a bit more diplomatically.  
> >  
> >Although so many others in the past have dismissed polling results when  
the  
> >findings contradict their views, its still hard to accept. But perhaps we  
> >learn something after each instance.  
> >  
> >Dick Halpern  
> >  
> >

---

Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 11:36:29 -0400  
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>  
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.79 [en] (Windows NT 5.0; U)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com  
CC: rmaullin@fmma.org, dhalpern@bellsouth.net, aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Thomas Friedman cries, "Don't Believe the Polls"  
References: <028601c25f9b5e2b9eb4055efac3d1@default>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Sorry for the repost, but as I was quickly informed, my earlier post was  
missing a couple of words ("quite shallow") essential to the point I was  
trying to make.

---

Friedman is a good observer and a good journalist. But he is a terrible  
columnist because his analysis is typically quite shallow. I often  
agree with him, but that does not excuse the sloppy thinking he so  
frequently exhibits.

For a more insightful, yet personal, approach to the same topic that  
uses polling results properly, see Richard Cohen's column in today's  
Washington Post at:  
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A36907-2002Sep18.html>

Jan Werner  
jwerner@jwdp.com

---

"James P. Murphy" wrote:  
>  
> You are correct that the writer's few brief remarks about polling data  
have  
> absolutely nothing to do with the main point of the article and it's  
> astounding that that issue could have generated even the small number of

> posts that address it.  
>  
> You miss the point completely, in my opinion, in believing that Friedman is  
> cautioning that taking out SH won't solve our problems. Quite the  
> contrary.  
> He is merely giving us a less ludicrous rationale for going ahead and  
> doing  
> just that. How generous of us to "change the context in which young  
> (Iraqi)  
> men grow up" and help them "close the dignity gap" -- with bombs. Why  
> don't  
> we just send them to Esalen? The article is an arrogant (because he  
> couldn't  
> possibly be that stupid) and unsubtle piece of propaganda that either has  
> the administration smiling, or maybe asking, "Why didn't we think of  
> that?"  
> That a piece like this could be written without ANY reference to the  
> Israeli-Arab conflict or the geopolitics of oil, and appear in the  
> Nation's  
> "newspaper of record," shows how profoundly lunar we are over here.  
>  
> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
> Voice (610) 408-8800  
> Fax (610) 408-8802  
> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Richard <rmaullin@fmma.org>  
> To: 'dhalpern@bellsouth.net' <dhalpern@bellsouth.net>; aapornet@usc.edu  
> <aapornet@usc.edu>  
> Date: Thursday, September 19, 2002 12:21 AM  
> Subject: RE: Thomas Friedman cries, "Don't Believe the Polls"  
>  
>  
> >Maybe Friedman could have been kinder to pollsters in setting up his  
> >argument with President Bush, but I took his column to be more of a  
> >criticism of the Administration and much of the media that poorly  
> interprets  
> >the polling regarding the President's proposals for what to do about and  
> to  
> >Iraq. The polls generally say that the public wants evidence of a  
> >significant problem, Congressional concurrence and UN and/or Allied  
> >participation, even if at first glance a majority agrees with going after  
> >Saddam. Friedman's argument makes a different point, however, not  
> directly  
> >related to the attack or not poll questions. His argument is that  
> removing  
> >Saddam does not solve the West's dilemma in dealing with anti-Western  
> >fanaticism in the Muslim/Arab world. That is an issue that pollsters  
> only  
> >touch on in the most indirect ways. This pollster doesn't take much  
> offense  
> >at Friedman's swipe at the polls; his more fundamental point is the one  
> we  
> >ought to be discussing.  
> >  
> >Richard Maullin

> >Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates  
> >-----Original Message-----  
> >From: dick halpern [mailto:dhalpern@bellsouth.net]  
> >Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2002 7:47 PM  
> >To: aapornet@usc.edu  
> >Subject: Re: Thomas Friedman cries, "Don't Believe the Polls"  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >Friedman's almost cavalier dismissal of polling was painful and perhaps he  
> >could have chosen his words more carefully. But he obviously wanted to  
> >make  
> >a point about Iraq which is in clear opposition to the current views of  
> >the  
> >Bush administration. Bush, understandably, wants to believe that the  
> >majority of the American people are behind him with respect to his Iraq  
> >stance, and of course he has some polling evidence to back him up. So  
> >Friedman chose - at our expense -- a dramatic way to make his point,  
> >saying  
> >in so many words, that because the public do not fully understand the  
> >real  
> >issues, their opinions should not be taken as seriously as some would  
> >like.  
> >As much as I respect Friedman, this was perhaps a bit arrogant on his  
> >part  
> >and perhaps he could have expressed himself a bit more diplomatically.  
> >  
> >Although so many others in the past have dismissed polling results when  
> >the  
> >findings contradict their views, its still hard to accept. But perhaps we  
> >learn something after each instance.  
> >  
> >  
> >Dick Halpern  
> >  
> >

---

Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 11:31:10 -0500  
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)  
X-Accept-Language: en,pdf  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Received from Stateline.org

Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend

By Greg McDonald, Senior Writer  
September 17, 2002

This election year may go down in the record books alongside 1998 when  
states posted an average turnout in the primaries of only 17 percent,

the worst in U.S. history for a non-presidential election year.

Blame it on erosion of trust in political leaders, a decline in civic education and political discourse, busy lives, or whatever you want. Pick almost any reason, and chances are it bears some of the blame for declining interest in the nation's political process, says Curtis Gans of the Committee for the Study of the American Electorate.

The committee plans to release a report on voter turnout for the 2002 primaries in the next two weeks. It's expected to show slight gains in voter numbers in many states, especially those where tight races and economic issues were prevalent. But overall, the numbers nationwide are expected to be on par with the 1998 elections. In a few states, such as Minnesota and Rhode Island, they will be lower.

"Turnout at this time is running at about the same level as 1998," said Gans, adding that the final tallies will be "a fraction of a percentage higher.or lower" than that year.

Gans said state primaries closer to the Nov. 5 general election tended to have higher turnouts than primaries in the spring or mid-summer. For example, in most of the 11 states holding primaries on Sept. 10, the turnouts on average were better. Some of the more closely contested races - like the Florida battle between Bill McBride and Janet Reno for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination - probably played a role in getting voters to the polls.

"That drove turnout up, but it drove turnout up in such small numbers that we are still facing a long-term crisis of the decline in the civic religion," Gans said, pointing out that voter participation has steadily declined since the 1960s when nearly 60 percent of registered voters went to the polls.

Florida hasn't had a 60 percent turnout since the 1960 presidential election. In 1998 when Jeb Bush was elected governor, the state's primary turnout mirrored the national average precisely at 17 percent. But this year's Sept. 10 primary produced a turnout of 28.7 percent, which made state election officials downright giddy.

"This is great," said one records-keeper for the Florida elections division. "I don't know what it means for the general election (on Nov. 5), but it shows that people are interested in the governor's race this year."

But in Minnesota's Sept. 10 primary, there seemed to be a lack of interest in the campaign to replace Independent Gov. Jesse Ventura, who opted not to run for re-election. This year's turnout was only 18.5 percent, compared to the 1998 primary turnout of 19.6 percent.

Contact Greg McDonald

---

Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 12:44:42 -0400  
To: mail@marketsharescorp.com, aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>  
Subject: Re: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend



Please note, Gans reports (below) turnout as a percentage of the registration numbers available, and not as a percentage of the voting age population. Furthermore, registration numbers are often seriously overstated if the lists are not purged on a timely basis. They frequently are not purged.

One more note. In presidential years the numerator for the turnout calculation is valid votes for president. That understates turnout. However, in off year elections such as 1998 and 2002 the numerator commonly used is valid votes for the House of Representatives, which is a serious understatement of the number of people going to the polls. Some congressional districts have uncontested races and a very low vote in only that race, and in other districts the vote recorded. One cannot compare the off year turnout with the presidential year. It doesn't even make much sense to compare one off year election with another.

warren mitofsky

At 11:31 AM 9/19/2002 -0500, Nick Panagakis wrote:

>Received from Stateline.org  
>  
>Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
>  
>By Greg McDonald, Senior Writer  
>September 17, 2002  
>  
>This election year may go down in the record books alongside 1998 when  
>states posted an average turnout in the primaries of only 17 percent,  
>the worst in U.S. history for a non-presidential election year.  
>  
>Blame it on erosion of trust in political leaders, a decline in civic  
>education and political discourse, busy lives, or whatever you want.  
>Pick almost any reason, and chances are it bears some of the blame for  
>declining interest in the nation's political process, says Curtis Gans  
>of the Committee for the Study of the American Electorate.  
>  
>The committee plans to release a report on voter turnout for the 2002  
>primaries in the next two weeks. It's expected to show slight gains in  
>voter numbers in many states, especially those where tight races and  
>economic issues were prevalent. But overall, the numbers nationwide are  
>expected to be on par with the 1998 elections. In a few states, such as  
>Minnesota and Rhode Island, they will be lower.  
>  
>"Turnout at this time is running at about the same level as 1998," said  
>Gans, adding that the final tallies will be "a fraction of a percentage  
>higher.or lower" than that year.  
>  
>Gans said state primaries closer to the Nov. 5 general election tended  
>to have higher turnouts than primaries in the spring or mid-summer. For  
>example, in most of the 11 states holding primaries on Sept. 10, the  
>turnouts on average were better. Some of the more closely contested  
>races - like the Florida battle between Bill McBride and Janet Reno for  
>the Democratic gubernatorial nomination - probably played a role in  
>getting voters to the polls.  
>  
>"That drove turnout up, but it drove turnout up in such small numbers

>that we are still facing a long-term crisis of the decline in the civic  
>religion," Gans said, pointing out that voter participation has steadily  
>declined since the 1960s when nearly 60 percent of registered voters  
>went to the polls.

>

>Florida hasn't had a 60 percent turnout since the 1960 presidential  
>election. In 1998 when Jeb Bush was elected governor, the state's  
>primary turnout mirrored the national average precisely at 17 percent.  
>But this year's Sept. 10 primary produced a turnout of 28.7 percent,  
>which made state election officials downright giddy.

>

>"This is great," said one records-keeper for the Florida elections  
>division. "I don't know what it means for the general election (on Nov.  
>5), but it shows that people are interested in the governor's race this  
>year."

>

>But in Minnesota's Sept. 10 primary, there seemed to be a lack of  
>interest in the campaign to replace Independent Gov. Jesse Ventura, who  
>opted not to run for re-election. This year's turnout was only 18.5  
>percent, compared to the 1998 primary turnout of 19.6 percent.

>

>Contact Greg McDonald

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

212 980-3031  
212 980-3107 FAX

mitofsky@mindspring.com  
www.mitofskyinternational.com

---

Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 12:23:58 -0500  
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)  
X-Accept-Language: en,pdf  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: mitofsky@mindspring.com, aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
References: <5.1.1.6.2.20020919123539.01d168f8@mail.mindspring.com>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Warren, as usual, adds his insightful comments below.

On list purging, I remember in 1992 when the registered voter counts exceeded Census voting age counts in some Chicago wards - which could not be explained by the Census undercount in 1990. It seems some ward committeemen, who oversee the process, just wanted bragging rights.

Based on Illinois experience, motor-voter drives could also be adding people to the registration rolls, people with marginal interest in voting.

I am surprised by the use of congressional vote in off-years - races higher on the ballot could be more useful or the congressional vote in all years for off-year turnout projections.

Thanks Warren.

Warren Mitofsky wrote:

>  
> Please note, Gans reports (below) turnout as a percentage of the  
> registration numbers available, and not as a percentage of the voting age  
> population. Furthermore, registration numbers are often seriously over  
> stated if the lists are not purged on a timely basis. They frequently are  
> not purged.

>  
> One more note. In presidential years the numerator for the turnout  
> calculation is valid votes for president. That understates turnout.  
> However, in off year elections such as 1998 and 2002 the numerator  
commonly  
> used is valid votes for the House of Representatives, which is a serious  
> understatement of the number of people going to the polls. Some  
> congressional districts have uncontested races and a very low vote in only  
> that race, and in other districts the vote recorded. One cannot compare  
the  
> off year turnout with the presidential year. It doesn't even make much  
> sense to compare one off year election with another.  
> warren mitofsky

>  
> At 11:31 AM 9/19/2002 -0500, Nick Panagakis wrote:

>  
> >Received from Stateline.org  
> >  
> >Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
> >  
> >By Greg McDonald, Senior Writer  
> >September 17, 2002  
> >  
> >This election year may go down in the record books alongside 1998 when  
> >states posted an average turnout in the primaries of only 17 percent,  
> >the worst in U.S. history for a non-presidential election year.  
> >  
> >Blame it on erosion of trust in political leaders, a decline in civic  
> >education and political discourse, busy lives, or whatever you want.  
> >Pick almost any reason, and chances are it bears some of the blame for  
> >declining interest in the nation's political process, says Curtis Gans  
> >of the Committee for the Study of the American Electorate.  
> >  
> >The committee plans to release a report on voter turnout for the 2002  
> >primaries in the next two weeks. It's expected to show slight gains in  
> >voter numbers in many states, especially those where tight races and  
> >economic issues were prevalent. But overall, the numbers nationwide are  
> >expected to be on par with the 1998 elections. In a few states, such as  
> >Minnesota and Rhode Island, they will be lower.  
> >  
> >"Turnout at this time is running at about the same level as 1998," said  
> >Gans, adding that the final tallies will be "a fraction of a percentage  
> >higher.or lower" than that year.

> >

> >Gans said state primaries closer to the Nov. 5 general election tended  
> >to have higher turnouts than primaries in the spring or mid-summer. For  
> >example, in most of the 11 states holding primaries on Sept. 10, the  
> >turnouts on average were better. Some of the more closely contested  
> >races - like the Florida battle between Bill McBride and Janet Reno for  
> >the Democratic gubernatorial nomination - probably played a role in  
> >getting voters to the polls.  
> >  
> >"That drove turnout up, but it drove turnout up in such small numbers  
> >that we are still facing a long-term crisis of the decline in the civic  
> >religion," Gans said, pointing out that voter participation has steadily  
> >declined since the 1960s when nearly 60 percent of registered voters  
> >went to the polls.  
> >  
> >Florida hasn't had a 60 percent turnout since the 1960 presidential  
> >election. In 1998 when Jeb Bush was elected governor, the state's  
> >primary turnout mirrored the national average precisely at 17 percent.  
> >But this year's Sept. 10 primary produced a turnout of 28.7 percent,  
> >which made state election officials downright giddy.  
> >  
> >"This is great," said one records-keeper for the Florida elections  
> >division. "I don't know what it means for the general election (on Nov.  
> >5), but it shows that people are interested in the governor's race this  
> >year."  
> >  
> >But in Minnesota's Sept. 10 primary, there seemed to be a lack of  
> >interest in the campaign to replace Independent Gov. Jesse Ventura, who  
> >opted not to run for re-election. This year's turnout was only 18.5  
> >percent, compared to the 1998 primary turnout of 19.6 percent.  
> >  
> >Contact Greg McDonald  
> >  
> >Mitofsky International  
> >1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor  
> >New York, NY 10022  
> >  
> >212 980-3031  
> >212 980-3107 FAX  
> >  
> >mitofsky@mindspring.com  
> >www.mitofskyinternational.com

---

Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 13:41:02 -0400  
From: "DeBell, Matthew" <MDeBell@air.org>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

The House vote is the only thing that consistently appears on all ballots nationwide in off-year elections. If higher offices were used -- Senate, or governor -- then comparisons would be pretty dodgy since there is not always a senatorial or gubernatorial race.

--

Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.  
Research Analyst  
Education Statistics Services Institute  
American Institutes for Research

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]  
> Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2002 1:24 PM  
> To: mitofsky@mindspring.com; aapornet@usc.edu  
> Subject: Re: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
>  
>  
> Warren, as usual, adds his insightful comments below.  
>  
> On list purging, I remember in 1992 when the registered voter counts  
> exceeded Census voting age counts in some Chicago wards - which could  
> not be explained by the Census undercount in 1990. It seems some ward  
> committeemen, who oversee the process, just wanted bragging rights.  
>  
> Based on Illinois experience, motor-voter drives could also be adding  
> people to the registration rolls, people with marginal  
> interest in voting.  
>  
> I am surprised by the use of congressional vote in off-years - races  
> higher on the ballot could be more useful or the congressional vote in  
> all years for off-year turnout projections.  
>  
> Thanks Warren.  
>

=====  
Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 13:50:54 -0400  
From: "Steve Raabe" <sraabe@potomacinc.com>  
To: <MDeBell@air.org>, <aapornet@usc.edu>  
References: <3B3E23FB7DBAD411AC1C00306E0004A2DE1579@DC3>  
Subject: Re: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
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 6.00.2600.0000  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000

Please forgive my ignorance, but why wouldn't one use the number of voters who presented themselves at the polls as the turnout figure, regardless of in which races they actually cast votes?

Steve Raabe  
OpinionWorks  
Cooperstown, NY

----- Original Message -----  
From: "DeBell, Matthew" <MDeBell@air.org>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2002 1:41 PM

Subject: RE: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend

> The House vote is the only thing that consistently appears on all ballots  
> nationwide in off-year elections. If higher offices were used -- Senate,  
or  
> governor -- then comparisons would be pretty dodgy since there is not  
always

> a senatorial or gubernatorial race.

>

> --

> Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.

> Research Analyst

> Education Statistics Services Institute

> American Institutes for Research

>

> > -----Original Message-----

> > From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]

> > Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2002 1:24 PM

> > To: mitofsky@mindspring.com; aapornet@usc.edu

> > Subject: Re: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend

> >

> >

> > Warren, as usual, adds his insightful comments below.

> >

> > On list purging, I remember in 1992 when the registered voter counts

> > exceeded Census voting age counts in some Chicago wards - which could

> > not be explained by the Census undercount in 1990. It seems some ward

> > committeemen, who oversee the process, just wanted bragging rights.

> >

> > Based on Illinois experience, motor-voter drives could also be adding

> > people to the registration rolls, people with marginal

> > interest in voting.

> >

> > I am surprised by the use of congressional vote in off-years - races

> > higher on the ballot could be more useful or the congressional vote in

> > all years for off-year turnout projections.

> >

> > Thanks Warren.

> >

---

Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 12:56:24 -0500

From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>

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

X-Accept-Language: en,pdf

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: sraabe@potomacinc.com, aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend

Not all states provide a "total ballots cast" number which is what you  
are suggesting.

Steve Raabe wrote:

>

> Please forgive my ignorance, but why wouldn't one use the number of voters

> who presented themselves at the polls as the turnout figure, regardless of  
> in which races they actually cast votes?

>

> Steve Raabe  
> OpinionWorks  
> Cooperstown, NY

> ----- Original Message -----

> From: "DeBell, Matthew" <MDeBell@air.org>

> To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

> Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2002 1:41 PM

> Subject: RE: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend

>

> > The House vote is the only thing that consistently appears on all  
ballots

> > nationwide in off-year elections. If higher offices were used --  
Senate,

> or

> > governor -- then comparisons would be pretty dodgy since there is not  
> always

> > a senatorial or gubernatorial race.

> >

> > --

> > Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.

> > Research Analyst

> > Education Statistics Services Institute

> > American Institutes for Research

> >

> > -----Original Message-----

> > > From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]

> > > Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2002 1:24 PM

> > > To: mitofsky@mindspring.com; aapornet@usc.edu

> > > Subject: Re: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend

> > >

> > >

> > > Warren, as usual, adds his insightful comments below.

> > >

> > > On list purging, I remember in 1992 when the registered voter counts  
> > > exceeded Census voting age counts in some Chicago wards - which could  
> > > not be explained by the Census undercount in 1990. It seems some ward  
> > > committeemen, who oversee the process, just wanted bragging rights.

> > >

> > > Based on Illinois experience, motor-voter drives could also be adding  
> > > people to the registration rolls, people with marginal  
> > > interest in voting.

> > >

> > > I am surprised by the use of congressional vote in off-years - races  
> > > higher on the ballot could be more useful or the congressional vote in  
> > > all years for off-year turnout projections.

> > >

> > > Thanks Warren.

> > >

---

Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 14:00:02 -0400 (EDT)

From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>

X-X-Sender: pmeyer@login8.isis.unc.edu

To: Steve Raabe <sraabe@potomacinc.com>

cc: MDeBell@air.org, <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
In-Reply-To: <00a601c26005\$1aa02100\$6401a8c0@stny.rr.com>  
Message-ID:  
<Pine.A41.4.44+UNC.0209191358100.15488-100000@login8.isis.unc.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I think it's cultural lag. When ballots were hand counted, it was extra work to keep track of the number of ballots, so nobody did it. With ballots counted by machines, it should be no problem. But election officials are stuck in the "this is the way we've always done it" syndrome.

=====  
Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549  
Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer  
=====

On Thu, 19 Sep 2002, Steve Raabe wrote:

> Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 13:50:54 -0400  
> From: Steve Raabe <sraabe@potomacinc.com>  
> To: MDeBell@air.org, aapornet@usc.edu  
> Subject: Re: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
>  
> Please forgive my ignorance, but why wouldn't one use the number of voters  
> who presented themselves at the polls as the turnout figure, regardless of  
> in which races they actually cast votes?  
>  
> Steve Raabe  
> OpinionWorks  
> Cooperstown, NY  
> ----- Original Message -----  
> From: "DeBell, Matthew" <MDeBell@air.org>  
> To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
> Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2002 1:41 PM  
> Subject: RE: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
>  
>  
>> The House vote is the only thing that consistently appears on all  
ballots  
>> nationwide in off-year elections. If higher offices were used --  
Senate,  
> or  
>> governor -- then comparisons would be pretty dodgy since there is not  
> always  
>> a senatorial or gubernatorial race.  
>>  
>> --  
>> Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.  
>> Research Analyst  
>> Education Statistics Services Institute  
>> American Institutes for Research



> >  
> > > -----Original Message-----  
> > > From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]  
> > > Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2002 1:24 PM  
> > > To: mitofsky@mindspring.com; aapornet@usc.edu  
> > > Subject: Re: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
> > >  
> > >  
> > > Warren, as usual, adds his insightful comments below.  
> > >  
> > > On list purging, I remember in 1992 when the registered voter counts  
> > > exceeded Census voting age counts in some Chicago wards - which could  
> > > not be explained by the Census undercount in 1990. It seems some ward  
> > > committeemen, who oversee the process, just wanted bragging rights.  
> > >  
> > > Based on Illinois experience, motor-voter drives could also be adding  
> > > people to the registration rolls, people with marginal  
> > > interest in voting.  
> > >  
> > > I am surprised by the use of congressional vote in off-years - races  
> > > higher on the ballot could be more useful or the congressional vote in  
> > > all years for off-year turnout projections.  
> > >  
> > > Thanks Warren.  
> > >  
>  
>

=====  
Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 14:10:02 -0400  
From: "DeBell, Matthew" <MDeBell@air.org>  
To: "'Steve Raabe'" <sraabe@potomacinc.com>, aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
        charset="iso-8859-1"

One would prefer to use the total number of ballots cast (pretty close to the total number of voters who show up at the polls or vote absentee). Apparently some jurisdictions fail to report this figure, which is a shame since it's so basic.

Despite the problems, the total number of votes cast for the highest office is sometimes used instead of the House total.

--  
Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.  
Research Analyst  
Education Statistics Services Institute  
American Institutes for Research

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Steve Raabe [mailto:sraabe@potomacinc.com]  
> Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2002 1:51 PM

> To: MDeBell@air.org; aapornet@usc.edu  
> Subject: Re: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
>  
>  
> Please forgive my ignorance, but why wouldn't one use the  
> number of voters  
> who presented themselves at the polls as the turnout figure,  
> regardless of  
> in which races they actually cast votes?  
>  
> Steve Raabe  
> OpinionWorks  
> Cooperstown, NY

=====  
Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 14:18:21 -0400  
From: "Steve Raabe" <sraabe@potomacinc.com>  
To: "DeBell, Matthew" <MDeBell@air.org>, <aapornet@usc.edu>  
References: <3B3E23FB7DBAD411AC1C00306E0004A2DE157A@DC3>  
Subject: Re: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
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 6.00.2600.0000  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000

Perhaps a future AAPOR initiative, to encourage elections officials to include this helpful number in their future reports?

Steve Raabe  
OpinionWorks  
Cooperstown, NY

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

From: "DeBell, Matthew" <MDeBell@air.org>  
To: "'Steve Raabe'" <sraabe@potomacinc.com>; <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2002 2:10 PM  
Subject: RE: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend

> One would prefer to use the total number of ballots cast (pretty close to  
> the total number of voters who show up at the polls or vote absentee).  
> Apparently some jurisdictions fail to report this figure, which is a shame  
> since it's so basic.

>  
> Despite the problems, the total number of votes cast for the highest  
office  
> is sometimes used instead of the House total.

>  
> --  
> Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.  
> Research Analyst  
> Education Statistics Services Institute  
> American Institutes for Research

>

> > -----Original Message-----  
> > From: Steve Raabe [mailto:sraabe@potomacinc.com]  
> > Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2002 1:51 PM  
> > To: MDeBell@air.org; aapornet@usc.edu  
> > Subject: Re: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
> >  
> >  
> > Please forgive my ignorance, but why wouldn't one use the  
> > number of voters  
> > who presented themselves at the polls as the turnout figure,  
> > regardless of  
> > in which races they actually cast votes?  
> >  
> > Steve Raabe  
> > OpinionWorks  
> > Cooperstown, NY

---

Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 16:47:09 -0400  
To: MDeBell@air.org, aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>  
Subject: RE: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
In-Reply-To: <3B3E23FB7DBAD411AC1C00306E0004A2DE1579@DC3>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

The problem with DeBell's suggestion is the House vote does not consistently appear on all ballots.

As an estimate of turnout comparable to the presidential year, It would be no more trouble using the largest vote for elected office in a state. If a state did not have a statewide office, (4 states do not have one this year), then one could sum the vote for House seats.

My point is that calling the House vote the turnout in an off year is deliberately misleading. Taking it as a percentage of registration makes no sense.

If AAPOR wants to be proactive all it need do is lobby the Census Bureau, which publishes the turnout report that everyone uses. If Gans is your source, I have no further comment.  
warren mitofsky

At 01:41 PM 9/19/2002 -0400, DeBell, Matthew wrote:  
>The House vote is the only thing that consistently appears on all ballots  
>nationwide in off-year elections. If higher offices were used -- Senate,  
>or  
>governor -- then comparisons would be pretty dodgy since there is not  
>always  
>a senatorial or gubernatorial race.  
>  
>--  
>Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.

>Research Analyst  
>Education Statistics Services Institute  
>American Institutes for Research

>

> > -----Original Message-----

> > From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]

> > Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2002 1:24 PM

> > To: mitofsky@mindspring.com; aapornet@usc.edu

> > Subject: Re: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend

> >

> >

> > Warren, as usual, adds his insightful comments below.

> >

> > On list purging, I remember in 1992 when the registered voter counts  
> > exceeded Census voting age counts in some Chicago wards - which could  
> > not be explained by the Census undercount in 1990. It seems some ward  
> > committeemen, who oversee the process, just wanted bragging rights.

> >

> > Based on Illinois experience, motor-voter drives could also be adding  
> > people to the registration rolls, people with marginal  
> > interest in voting.

> >

> > I am surprised by the use of congressional vote in off-years - races  
> > higher on the ballot could be more useful or the congressional vote in  
> > all years for off-year turnout projections.

> >

> > Thanks Warren.

> >

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

212 980-3031  
212 980-3107 FAX

mitofsky@mindspring.com  
www.mitofskyinternational.com

=====  
Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 17:00:35 -0400  
From: "DeBell, Matthew" <MDeBell@air.org>  
To: "'mitofsky@mindspring.com'" <mitofsky@mindspring.com>, aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Perhaps I chose a word poorly. What consistently appears on all ballots nationwide is the House race. I am not claiming everybody votes in that race, merely that an election for the House is the only kind of election that can be counted upon to take place everywhere.

I agree that treating the number of votes for the House race(s) as a

measure of turnout is flawed.

--

Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.  
Research Analyst  
Education Statistics Services Institute  
American Institutes for Research

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Warren Mitofsky [mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com]

> Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2002 4:47 PM

> To: MDeBell@air.org; aapornet@usc.edu

> Subject: RE: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend

>

>

> The problem with DeBell's suggestion is the House vote does not  
> consistently appear on all ballots.

>

> As an estimate of turnout comparable to the presidential  
> year, it would be

> no more trouble using the largest vote for elected office in  
> a state. If a

> state did not have a statewide office, (4 states do not have one this  
> year), then one could sum the vote for House seats.

>

> My point is that calling the House vote the turnout in an off year is  
> deliberately misleading. Taking it as a percentage of  
> registration makes no  
> sense.

>

> If AAPOR wants to be proactive all it need do is lobby the  
> Census Bureau,

> which publishes the turnout report that everyone uses. If  
> Gans is your

> source, I have no further comment.

> warren mitofsky

>

>

>

>

> At 01:41 PM 9/19/2002 -0400, DeBell, Matthew wrote:

> >The House vote is the only thing that consistently appears  
> on all ballots

> >nationwide in off-year elections. If higher offices were  
> used -- Senate, or

> >governor -- then comparisons would be pretty dodgy since  
> there is not always

> >a senatorial or gubernatorial race.

> >

> >--

> >Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.

> >Research Analyst

> >Education Statistics Services Institute

> >American Institutes for Research

> >

> > > -----Original Message-----

> > > From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]

> > > Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2002 1:24 PM  
> > > To: mitofsky@mindspring.com; aapornet@usc.edu  
> > > Subject: Re: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
> > >  
> > >  
> > > Warren, as usual, adds his insightful comments below.  
> > >  
> > > On list purging, I remember in 1992 when the registered  
> voter counts  
> > > exceeded Census voting age counts in some Chicago wards -  
> which could  
> > > not be explained by the Census undercount in 1990. It  
> seems some ward  
> > > committeemen, who oversee the process, just wanted  
> bragging rights.  
> > >  
> > > Based on Illinois experience, motor-voter drives could  
> also be adding  
> > > people to the registration rolls, people with marginal  
> > > interest in voting.  
> > >  
> > > I am surprised by the use of congressional vote in  
> off-years - races  
> > > higher on the ballot could be more useful or the  
> congressional vote in  
> > > all years for off-year turnout projections.  
> > >  
> > > Thanks Warren.  
> > >  
>  
> Mitofsky International  
> 1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor  
> New York, NY 10022  
>  
> 212 980-3031  
> 212 980-3107 FAX  
>  
> mitofsky@mindspring.com  
> www.mitofskyinternational.com  
>  
>

---

Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 16:25:59 -0500  
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)  
X-Accept-Language: en,pdf  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
References: <3B3E23FB7DBAD411AC1C00306E0004A2DE157C@DC3>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The extent of the flaw due to unopposed house races is evident at the site below showing Clerk of the House official results by state for

house, senate ,and presidential races.

<http://clerkweb.house.gov/elections/elections.htm>

"DeBell, Matthew" wrote:

>  
> Perhaps I chose a word poorly. What consistently appears on all ballots  
> nationwide is the House race. I am not claiming everybody votes in that  
> race, merely that an election for the House is the only kind of election  
> that can be counted upon to take place everywhere.

>  
> I agree that treating the number of votes for the House race(s) as a  
measure  
> of turnout is flawed.

>  
> --  
> Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.  
> Research Analyst  
> Education Statistics Services Institute  
> American Institutes for Research

>  
> > -----Original Message-----  
> > From: Warren Mitofsky [mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com]  
> > Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2002 4:47 PM  
> > To: MDeBell@air.org; aapornet@usc.edu  
> > Subject: RE: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend

> >  
> > The problem with DeBell's suggestion is the House vote does not  
> > consistently appear on all ballots.

> >  
> > As an estimate of turnout comparable to the presidential  
> > year, It would be  
> > no more trouble using the largest vote for elected office in  
> > a state. If a  
> > state did not have a statewide office, (4 states do not have one this  
> > year), then one could sum the vote for House seats.

> >  
> > My point is that calling the House vote the turnout in an off year is  
> > deliberately misleading. Taking it as a percentage of  
> > registration makes no  
> > sense.

> >  
> > If AAPOR wants to be proactive all it need do is lobby the  
> > Census Bureau,  
> > which publishes the turnout report that everyone uses. If  
> > Gans is your  
> > source, I have no further comment.  
> > warren mitofsky

> >  
> >  
> >  
> > At 01:41 PM 9/19/2002 -0400, DeBell, Matthew wrote:  
> > >The House vote is the only thing that consistently appears  
> > on all ballots  
> > >nationwide in off-year elections. If higher offices were

> > used -- Senate, or  
> > >governor -- then comparisons would be pretty dodgy since  
> > there is not always  
> > >a senatorial or gubernatorial race.  
> > >  
> > >--  
> > >Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.  
> > >Research Analyst  
> > >Education Statistics Services Institute  
> > >American Institutes for Research  
> > >  
> > > -----Original Message-----  
> > > > From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]  
> > > > Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2002 1:24 PM  
> > > > To: mitofsky@mindspring.com; aapornet@usc.edu  
> > > > Subject: Re: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
> > > >  
> > > >  
> > > > Warren, as usual, adds his insightful comments below.  
> > > >  
> > > > On list purging, I remember in 1992 when the registered  
> > voter counts  
> > > > exceeded Census voting age counts in some Chicago wards -  
> > which could  
> > > > not be explained by the Census undercount in 1990. It  
> > seems some ward  
> > > > committeemen, who oversee the process, just wanted  
> > bragging rights.  
> > > >  
> > > > Based on Illinois experience, motor-voter drives could  
> > also be adding  
> > > > people to the registration rolls, people with marginal  
> > > > interest in voting.  
> > > >  
> > > > I am surprised by the use of congressional vote in  
> > off-years - races  
> > > > higher on the ballot could be more useful or the  
> > congressional vote in  
> > > > all years for off-year turnout projections.  
> > > >  
> > > > Thanks Warren.  
> > > >  
> >  
> > Mitofsky International  
> > 1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor  
> > New York, NY 10022  
> >  
> > 212 980-3031  
> > 212 980-3107 FAX  
> >  
> > mitofsky@mindspring.com  
> > www.mitofskyinternational.com  
> >  
> >

---

Date: Fri, 20 Sep 2002 12:34:37 -0500



From: MFlanagan@goamp.com  
Received: by AMP1 with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
id <SRAY1BRJ>; Fri, 20 Sep 2002 12:34:38 -0500  
Message-ID: <669C9575C5E1D511B7B5001083FCEE8DF13B07@AMP1>  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Cc: mdilauri@nonprofitstaffing.com  
Subject: Job Posting  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Please see the job posting next below. Please respond directly to the e-mail address listed in the posting.

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

From: MDiLauri [mailto:mdilauri@nonprofitstaffing.com]  
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2002 3:24 PM  
To: AAPOR-info@goAMP.com  
Subject: Please post the following position

Professionals for NonProfits (PNP) is pleased to notify you of a new search we are conducting in your area of expertise. If you or someone you know is interested in pursuing this career opportunity, please send a cover letter and resume to mdilauri@nonprofitstaffing.com or fax to (212) 546-9094. If you think there is a particular source I should use to locate interested candidates please let me know. Thank you.

TITLE: VP for Research

ORG. TYPE: A UNIQUE, RESEARCH, EDUCATION AND ADVOCACY INSTITUTION FOR WOMEN.

LOCATION: New York, NY

SALARY: \$150K and benefits

RESPONSIBILITIES:

This position will report directly to the President and work in a collaborative professional environment to conduct and commission public opinion and major research projects across the diverse spectrum of women's lives. It is anticipated that the research will be translated in ways that make it accessible to a variety of audiences and that motivates individuals and institutions to work toward eradicating the barriers that prevent women from becoming full partners in society. The research will provide the underpinnings for the organization to become a national advocate for change. The new Vice President for Research will be responsible for building the repository of information to broaden public understanding of the core issues affecting women's lives. The ability to evaluate the research of others, and to translate research into a tool of advocacy will have just as significant potential impact as the original research.

QUALIFICATIONS:

The Vice President for Research must have well established social science research credentials. It is expected that this person will be familiar with broad-based gender issues and have a compelling desire to work on them, interpreting nuance and jargon into comprehensible and persuasive arguments. The organization is looking for an innovative thinker - someone with the ability to conceive and implement creative research and communications to influence public opinion - and an appreciation of the impact of fast paced public debate on the shape of public policies. The Vice President must already be established with outstanding credibility in the academic research community while at the same time provide evidence of the ability to apply research to compelling real world situations. The Center is looking for an intelligent, articulate, hardworking and energetic professional who is a creative self-starter and is able to independently design, develop and implement strategies for the use of social and behavioral research on behalf of the organization.

---

Date: Fri, 20 Sep 2002 11:37:49 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: help asked  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209201136200.5766-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

APOLOGIES FOR CROSSPOSTING

Dear fellow researchers,

I am writing an introduction about CASI for NON-SURVEY persons. My editor asked me to include a short section on available software. As my personal hands-on experience is limited, I ask your advice.

Which software have you personally used and liked?

Please reply directly to me EDITHL@XS4ALL.NL

Of course I will summarize the replies and feed it back to the list.  
Thanking you all in advance & warm greetings from a still sunny Amsterdam  
Edith

Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, Methodika  
Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam  
tel + 31 20 622 34 38 fax + 31 20 330 25 97  
e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl

---

Hope is like a small light in the dark  
It keeps the nightmares away till the dawn of a new world

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Fri, 20 Sep 2002 16:04:20 -0700  
From: "Lance Hoffman" <lhoffman@opinionaccess.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Ad Council  
Message-ID: <003501c260fa\$0e1e1c20\$7301a8c0@LHOFFMAN>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
    boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_0036\_01C260BF.61BF4420"  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook, Build 10.0.2627  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6700

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----\_NextPart\_000\_0036\_01C260BF.61BF4420  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Does anyone know if Ad Council is a member of AAPOR?

Lance Hoffman  
Account Executive  
Opinion Access Corp. <<http://www.opinionaccess.com/>>  
P: 718.729.2622 x.157  
F: 718.729.2444  
C: 646.522.2012

-----\_NextPart\_000\_0036\_01C260BF.61BF4420  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\*           ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED---           \*  
\*       This post contains a forbidden message format       \*  
\*   (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting)   \*  
\*       This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT   \*  
\*   If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
\*   is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

-----\_NextPart\_000\_0036\_01C260BF.61BF4420--

=====  
Date: Sat, 21 Sep 2002 07:36:51 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Japanese Leader Faces Questions Over North Korea Meeting  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209210730210.11881-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN

Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

PUBLIC OPINION ABSTRACT

The recent summit meeting in North Korea has been vigorously attacked by Japanese news organizations, as has been the government's slowness in releasing details about deceased abductees. Some editorials have said that Japanese Prime Minister Koizumi should have walked out of the talks when he learned that most of the missing were dead. Still, the first polls since Mr. Koizumi signed the agreement with North Korea showed strong support for the prime minister. Some indicated that nearly 90 percent of respondents believe that the summit diplomacy was a good idea. Mr. Koizumi said as much today: "I still believe my judgment was not wrong. It was appropriate. It is natural that there are positive, negative and various other opinions in this free, democratic country."

---

Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company

---

[www.nytimes.com/2002/09/21/international/asia/21JAPA.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/21/international/asia/21JAPA.html)

September 21, 2002

Japanese Leader Faces Questions Over North Korea Meeting

By HOWARD W. FRENCH

TOKYO, Sept. 20 -- Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi of Japan, facing criticism from news organizations at home instead of the praise he expected after his recent summit meeting in North Korea, has made two statements about high-profile issues involving North Korea almost as afterthoughts.

On Thursday, Mr. Koizumi said that North Korea had pledged to allow international nuclear inspectors into the country to ensure that plutonium from atomic reactors was not being diverted to make weapons.

Such a commitment would satisfy one of the most important demands the United States has made of North Korea, and be a major step forward in nuclear efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons in East Asia.

Doubts were immediately raised about the reported promise, however, because the joint communiqué signed by Japan and North Korea on Tuesday makes no mention of nuclear inspectors, and neither Mr. Koizumi nor numerous other Japanese officials who briefed reporters during the one-day summit meeting mentioned such a pledge by North Korea.

The furthest the final communiqué goes on the subject is to say that "both sides confirm that, for an overall resolution of the nuclear issues on the Korean peninsula, they would comply with all related international agreements."

Then, in a television interview that will be broadcast on Sunday, Mr. Koizumi said that President Bush told him when the two men spoke by telephone after the summit meeting that he would reconsider dialogue with North Korea.

"I said on the phone to President Bush, that, I had taken up the subject of 'axis of evil' remarks" with Kim Jong Il, the North Korean leader, "but at the same time, President Bush should open a road to dialogue," Mr. Koizumi was quoted as saying. "Then President Bush said he would consider this seriously."

Mr. Koizumi's comments, from excerpts from a television interview that will be broadcast in Japan on Sunday, related the prime minister's telephone conversation with Mr. Bush after his return from his landmark meeting in North Korea. They were released by the prime minister's office.

But the White House had a different version of events, saying that Mr. Koizumi had informed the president about his trip to North Korea, but that Mr. Bush did not indicate any imminent changes of policy.

For weeks now White House officials have said they are looking for an opportunity to send a senior official to North Korea, and it seems likely that James A. Kelly, the assistant secretary of state who handles East Asia, may be headed there in coming months.

But a senior administration official said that Mr. Koizumi's trip "has not altered our strategy," and that there was no discussion of dropping North Korea from the list of countries making up the "axis of evil" that Mr. Bush described in his State of the Union speech in January: Iraq, Iran and North Korea.

For two weeks before the summit meeting, Mr. Koizumi's government had repeatedly stated that getting a complete accounting of the fates of 11 Japanese believed kidnapped by North Korea since the 1970's would determine whether relations could be normalized between the two countries after 54 years.

Upon arrival in Pyongyang, the North Korean capital, Mr. Koizumi learned that 6 of the 11 were long dead, and another was missing. North Korean authorities revealed that two Japanese whose disappearance was unknown to their government had also died in North Korea, where abducted Japanese were reportedly employed to train North Korean spies in their language and culture. Japan said today that one more person, believed kidnapped in 1978, had been identified and was still alive.

Though still visibly shocked by the news of the deaths, Mr. Koizumi addressed reporters during a news conference in Pyongyang and said that Japan would go ahead with normalization talks with North Korea. In the meantime, North Korea has committed itself to extending a moratorium on missile testing, while Japan has officially apologized for 35 years of brutal colonial rule of Korea and pledged to provide a large, but unspecified, financial aid package to a neighbor, whose economy is near collapse.

The agreement has been vigorously attacked by Japanese news

organizations, as has been the government's slowness in releasing details about deceased abductees. Some editorials have said that Mr. Koizumi should have walked out of the talks when he learned that most of the missing were dead.

Still, the first polls since Mr. Koizumi signed the agreement with North Korea showed strong support for the prime minister. Some indicated that nearly 90 percent of respondents believe that the summit diplomacy was a good idea.

Mr. Koizumi said as much today: "I still believe my judgment was not wrong. It was appropriate. It is natural that there are positive, negative and various other opinions in this free, democratic country."

[www.nytimes.com/2002/09/21/international/asia/21JAPA.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/21/international/asia/21JAPA.html)

---

Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Tue, 24 Sep 2002 08:57:31 -0400  
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <pjlavrakas@tvratings.com>  
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Do Not Call lists  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

I would appreciate feedback about how long a duration survey organizations use for keeping telephone numbers of their "Do Not Call" lists. That is, once a person asks to never be called again, do you ever "release" that number from your Do Not Call list and thus make it available once again for sampling contact? If so, after how long?

I will summarize what I learn and respond back to AAPORnet. Thanks, PJL

---

Date: Tue, 24 Sep 2002 09:31:39 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMontreal.CA>  
Subject: suicide - perceptions of the population

We plan to carry out a survey on suicide i.e. to what extent it is considered "normal", inevitable, etc...

If anybody has data or references to data, articles, etc. on perceptions of suicide among the general population or specific populations like young people, students, etc., we would greatly appreciate. Please, send directly to me...

Thanks a lot

Claire Durand

Claire.Durand@umontreal.ca

<http://www.fas.umontreal.ca/socio/durandc/>

Université de Montréal, dept. de sociologie,  
C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,  
Montréal, Québec, Canada, H3C 3J7  
(514) 343-7447

=====  
Date: Tue, 24 Sep 2002 11:08:59 -0400  
Subject: Harper sorry for calling Ipsos-Reid 'liberal'  
From: "Howard Fienberg" <HFienberg@stats.org>  
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>

Harper sorry for calling Ipsos-Reid 'liberal'  
Sheldon Alberts, Deputy Ottawa Bureau Chief  
National Post  
Tuesday, September 24, 2002  
<<http://www.nationalpost.com/national/story.html?id={D2AFB605-A24B-4756-9A06-31797EC7EE7E}>>

OTTAWA - Stephen Harper, the Canadian Alliance leader, yesterday apologized to a major Canadian polling firm for telling an American television audience the company has a liberal bias. Mr. Harper issued a retraction to Toronto-based Ipsos-Reid Corporation after the firm threatened to sue the Alliance leader over remarks he made during an interview on Fox News, a 24-hour cable news network, on Sept. 13. "Ten days ago, on the American television network Fox News, I made a comment involving liberal pollsters and liberal poll results," Mr. Harper said in a letter to Ipsos-Reid's lawyers. "The statement is incorrect. We retract and withdraw same, and apologize to Ipsos-Reid for our error. We are pleased to make this clarification and apology, and regret any inconvenience and embarrassment that may have been caused." Mr. Harper had appeared on Fox News Live to comment on remarks Jean Chrétien, the Prime Minister, made linking the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks to rising world poverty. Fox's Shepard Smith cited a poll by Ipsos-Reid that suggested up to 85% of Canadians believed the United States was partially responsible for the attacks. Mr. Harper suggested the pollster had liberal leanings. John Wright, senior vice-president at Ipsos-Reid, said the company will not pursue legal action. "We are pleased and satisfied with his [Harper's] prompt response to what was a very concerning matter for us. We feel this matter is now concluded," he said.

-----  
Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037

(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) hfienberg@stats.org  
<http://www.stats.org>

---

Date: Tue, 24 Sep 2002 12:18:54 -0400  
From: Jeanne Anderson Research <ande271@attglobal.net>  
Reply-To: ande271@attglobal.net  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en]C-CK-MCD {TLC;RETAIL} (Win95; U)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
CC: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
References: <5.1.1.6.2.20020919163915.00b6f638@mail.mindspring.com>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Might there not be a few voters who \*didn't\* vote for the office where the most votes were recorded, but nevertheless cast a vote for another office?

Warren Mitofsky wrote:

> The problem with DeBell's suggestion is the House vote does not  
> consistently appear on all ballots.  
>  
> As an estimate of turnout comparable to the presidential year, It would be  
> no more trouble using the largest vote for elected office in a state. If a  
> state did not have a statewide office, (4 states do not have one this  
> year), then one could sum the vote for House seats.  
>  
> My point is that calling the House vote the turnout in an off year is  
> deliberately misleading. Taking it as a percentage of registration makes  
> no  
> sense.  
>  
> If AAPOR wants to be proactive all it need do is lobby the Census Bureau,  
> which publishes the turnout report that everyone uses. If Gans is your  
> source, I have no further comment.  
> warren mitofsky  
>  
> At 01:41 PM 9/19/2002 -0400, DeBell, Matthew wrote:  
> >The House vote is the only thing that consistently appears on all ballots  
> >nationwide in off-year elections. If higher offices were used -- Senate,  
> or  
> >governor -- then comparisons would be pretty dodgy since there is not  
> always  
> >a senatorial or gubernatorial race.  
> >  
> >--  
> >Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.  
> >Research Analyst  
> >Education Statistics Services Institute



> > American Institutes for Research  
> >  
> > > -----Original Message-----  
> > > From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]  
> > > Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2002 1:24 PM  
> > > To: mitofsky@mindspring.com; aapornet@usc.edu  
> > > Subject: Re: Primary Turnout May Prolong Downtrend  
> > >  
> > >  
> > > Warren, as usual, adds his insightful comments below.  
> > >  
> > > On list purging, I remember in 1992 when the registered voter counts  
> > > exceeded Census voting age counts in some Chicago wards - which could  
> > > not be explained by the Census undercount in 1990. It seems some ward  
> > > committeemen, who oversee the process, just wanted bragging rights.  
> > >  
> > > Based on Illinois experience, motor-voter drives could also be adding  
> > > people to the registration rolls, people with marginal  
> > > interest in voting.  
> > >  
> > > I am surprised by the use of congressional vote in off-years - races  
> > > higher on the ballot could be more useful or the congressional vote in  
> > > all years for off-year turnout projections.  
> > >  
> > > Thanks Warren.  
> > >  
>  
> Mitofsky International  
> 1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor  
> New York, NY 10022  
>  
> 212 980-3031  
> 212 980-3107 FAX  
>  
> mitofsky@mindspring.com  
> www.mitofskyinternational.com

=====  
Date: Tue, 24 Sep 2002 15:27:23 -0500  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Francis Fullam <quire1@earthlink.net>  
Subject: Can you help the DNC?  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

I just received a request by mail today to help the DNC by "updating your voter information" Perhaps there is enough expertise within AAPOR to advise them on how to reduce their survey processing costs.

The request consisted of an "election survey and voter records confirmation" (the letter did clarify that, "This is not a voter registration form.") The final question in the "survey" a request to send a donation. There were 4 dollar amounts suggested (\$15, \$25, \$30, and \$50). What was interesting was that there was an additional choice category: "I cannot support the DNC with a contribution right now, but will include \$7.50 to help defray the cost of processing this survey."

Francis Fullam  
QSystems Consulting

---

Date: Tue, 24 Sep 2002 16:50:17 -0400  
From: "Mike Donatello" <Mike.Donatello@MarketDataAnalysis.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: RE: Can you help the DNC?

Nice "survey"!

--  
Mike Donatello  
Senior Partner, Vice President of Research  
Borrell Associates Inc.  
Digital Direction for Media Companies  
2902 Mother Well Ct., Oak Hill, VA 20171-4065  
V 703.582.5680 F 703.832.8630  
MDonatello@borrellassociates.com

-----Original Message-----  
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of Francis Fullam  
Sent: 24 September, 2002 16:27  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Can you help the DNC?

I just received a request by mail today to help the DNC by "updating your voter information" Perhaps there is enough expertise within AAPOR to advise them on how to reduce their survey processing costs.

The request consisted of an "election survey and voter records confirmation" (the letter did clarify that, "This is not a voter registration form.") The final question in the "survey" a request to send a donation. There were 4 dollar amounts suggested (\$15, \$25, \$30, and \$50). What was interesting was that there was an additional choice category: "I cannot support the DNC with a contribution right now, but will include \$7.50 to help defray the cost of processing this survey."

Francis Fullam  
QSystems Consulting

---

Date: Tue, 24 Sep 2002 16:50:21 -0700  
From: "Lance Hoffman" <lhoffman@opinionaccess.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: RE: Can you help the DNC?

What will they think of next?

Lance Hoffman  
Account Executive  
Opinion Access Corp.

P: 718.729.2622 x.157  
F: 718.729.2444  
C: 646.522.2012

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

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of Mike Donatello  
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2002 1:50 PM  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: Can you help the DNC?

Nice "survey"!

--

Mike Donatello  
Senior Partner, Vice President of Research  
Borrell Associates Inc.  
Digital Direction for Media Companies  
2902 Mother Well Ct., Oak Hill, VA 20171-4065  
V 703.582.5680 F 703.832.8630  
MDonatello@borrellassociates.com

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

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of Francis Fullam  
Sent: 24 September, 2002 16:27  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Can you help the DNC?

I just received a request by mail today to help the DNC by "updating your voter information" Perhaps there is enough expertise within AAPOR to advise them on how to reduce their survey processing costs.

The request consisted of an "election survey and voter records confirmation" (the letter did clarify that, "This is not a voter registration form.") The final question in the "survey" a request to send a donation. There were 4 dollar amounts suggested (\$15, \$25, \$30, and \$50). What was interesting was that there was an additional choice category: "I cannot support the DNC with a contribution right now, but will include \$7.50 to help defray the cost of processing this survey."

Francis Fullam  
QSystems Consulting

=====  
Date: Tue, 24 Sep 2002 17:08:33 -0400  
From: jennifer.m.rothgeb@census.gov  
Subject: QDET Conference Early Registration Closes October 1  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
X-Mailer: Lotus Notes Release 5.0.7 March 21, 2001

Message-ID: <OFD7645E7A.AFBF25E6-ON85256C3E.0073C097@tco.census.gov>  
X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on LNHQ08MTA/HQ/BOC (Release 5.0.8 | June 18,  
2001) at 09/24/2002  
05:23:40 PM  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

[www.jpsm.umd.edu/qdet](http://www.jpsm.umd.edu/qdet)

QDET Conference early registration closes next Tuesday, October 1.

After October 1, the registration fee will increase to \$525.

Register now to avoid additional costs.  
Registration form is available on the conference website.

---

Date: Tue, 24 Sep 2002 17:24:53 -0400  
From: jennifer.m.rothgeb@census.gov  
Subject: QDET Conference Early Registration ends Oct 1 - - Program now on  
website  
To: aapornet@usc.edu

(Apologies for cross-posting)

International Conference on Questionnaire Development, Evaluation, and  
Testing Methods  
Charleston, South Carolina, USA  
November 14-17, 2002

The QDET final conference program is available on the conference website:  
[www.jpsm.umd.edu/qdet](http://www.jpsm.umd.edu/qdet)

Early registration closes October 1.  
Register now to avoid extra registration costs.  
The registration form is available on the conference website.

---

Date: Tue, 24 Sep 2002 17:32:30 -0700  
From: "Mike O'Neil" <mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu>  
To: <lhoffman@opinionaccess.com>, <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: RE: Can you help the DNC?

We also got the DNC survey. Within a day or so of this, we got a similar  
opportunity from the RNC. Frugging is nonpartisan, and apparently works.

Mike O'Neil  
[www.oneilresearch.com](http://www.oneilresearch.com)

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

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of  
Lance Hoffman

Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2002 4:50 PM  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: Can you help the DNC?

What will they think of next?

Lance Hoffman  
Account Executive  
Opinion Access Corp.  
P: 718.729.2622 x.157  
F: 718.729.2444  
C: 646.522.2012

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

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of Mike Donatello  
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2002 1:50 PM  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: Can you help the DNC?

Nice "survey"!

--

Mike Donatello  
Senior Partner, Vice President of Research  
Borrell Associates Inc.  
Digital Direction for Media Companies  
2902 Mother Well Ct., Oak Hill, VA 20171-4065  
V 703.582.5680 F 703.832.8630  
MDonatello@borrellassociates.com

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

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of Francis Fullam  
Sent: 24 September, 2002 16:27  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Can you help the DNC?

I just received a request by mail today to help the DNC by "updating your voter information" Perhaps there is enough expertise within AAPOR to advise them on how to reduce their survey processing costs.

The request consisted of an "election survey and voter records confirmation" (the letter did clarify that, "This is not a voter registration form.") The final question in the "survey" a request to send a donation. There were 4 dollar amounts suggested (\$15, \$25, \$30, and \$50). What was interesting was that there was an additional choice category: "I cannot support the DNC with a contribution right now, but will include \$7.50 to help defray the cost of processing this survey."

Francis Fullam  
QSystems Consulting

=====  
Date: Wed, 25 Sep 2002 09:06:54 -0400  
From: Goldenberg\_K <Goldenberg\_K@bls.gov>  
To: "'aapornet'" <AAPORNET@USC.EDU>, "'EDITHL@XS4ALL.NL'" <EDITHL@XS4ALL.NL>  
Subject: Pretesting with children  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
        charset="iso-8859-1"

I am posting this message for Edith de Leeuw. Please respond directly to her.  
Karen Goldenberg

\*\*\*\*\*  
Dear friends and colleagues,

We are working on a paper for an international conference on questionnaire development, evaluation, and testing (QDET).  
In this paper we discuss how cognitive laboratory procedures for questionnaire testing (e.g., focus group, in depth interviews) can be adapted for children.  
What makes children special and how should we adapt the procedures. In this paper we want to give examples from questionnaire pretests that have been conducted with children. However published reports on this are VERY uncommon. This is why we ask for your help.

Please share your experiences with us. If you have ever pretested questionnaires or survey interviews for and with children, please send me an e-mail to me at EDITHL@XS4ALL.NL and not to the list  
If you have a report or just a one page conclusions or anecdotal evidence or any experinece or thoughts, please share it with us !

We will be very grateful and of course will send you a copy of our draft.

Warm regards, Edith de Leeuw, Natacha Borgers, & Astrid Smits

Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, Methodika  
Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam  
tel + 31 20 622 34 38 fax + 31 20 330 25 97  
e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl

-----  
Hope is like a small light in the dark  
        It keeps the nightmares away till the dawn of a new world

---

Date: Wed, 25 Sep 2002 08:10:04 -0500  
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)  
X-Accept-Language: en,pdf  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Opt Out Lists  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Dick Morris got so many things wrong in his opening paragraph that I hesitate to ask this question.

Specifically, some national polls were closer to Gore's winning margin than +2 points. In New York, all polls (except Zogby) showed Clinton ahead and some were close to her winning +12 point margin; e.g., Quinnipiac +12 points, CBS/NY Times, +8 points.

My question: Which states allow public opinion surveys to be included along with telemarketing in opt out lists?

<http://www.hillnews.com/issues/092502/morris.shtm>  
Dick Morris, The Hill, Sept. 25

The perils of polling

Polling is in trouble. Big trouble. The data is no longer reliable and won't be for several more years. Why were all the national polls (except Zogby) wrong in predicting that George Bush would get more votes than Al Gore in 2000? Why were all the polls wrong again in predicting a close Senate race between Rep. Rick Lazio (R) and Hillary Clinton in New York that same year? The telephone poll is no longer a credible method of measuring public opinion. In 28 states, the state legislatures have passed laws giving telephone users the right to opt out of receiving telemarketing phone calls, including public opinion surveys. More and more voters are availing themselves of this right and the pickings for telephone polling firms are getting more and more scarce.

---

Date: Wed, 25 Sep 2002 09:31:13 -0400  
From: "Raghavan Mayur" <mayur@technometrica.com>  
To: <mail@marketsharescorp.com>, <aapornet@usc.edu>  
References: <3D91B5A9.50A1AEBD@marketsharescorp.com>  
Subject: Re: Opt Out Lists  
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 5.00.2919.6600  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

One should take Mr. Morris's expert opinion with a pinch of salt. He runs a website called

vote.com -- may be he subscribes to the idea that his website could call races better than polling organizations & wishes others fail. Also may be Mr. Morris should read the post-election analysis by veterans such as Warren Mitofsky and the folks at NPAA instead of taking pot shots at pollsters. Ironic, I have never seen a formal release of a poll conducted by him, but he is vested by the media with the title of "pollster" -- what a pity!

Raghavan Mayur  
President, TIPP

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

From: "Nick Panagakis" <mail@marketsharescorp.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2002 9:10 AM  
Subject: Opt Out Lists

>  
> Dick Morris got so many things wrong in his opening paragraph that I  
> hesitate to ask this question.  
>  
> Specifically, some national polls were closer to Gore's winning margin  
> than +2 points. In New York, all polls (except Zogby) showed Clinton  
> ahead and some were close to her winning +12 point margin; e.g.,  
> Quinnipiac +12 points, CBS/NY Times, +8 points.  
>  
> My question: Which states allow public opinion surveys to be included  
> along with telemarketing in opt out lists?  
>  
>  
> <http://www.hillnews.com/issues/092502/morris.shtml>  
> Dick Morris, The Hill, Sept. 25  
>  
> The perils of polling  
>  
> Polling is in trouble. Big trouble. The data is no longer reliable and  
> won't be for several more years. Why were all the national polls (except  
> Zogby) wrong in predicting that George Bush would get more votes than  
> Al Gore in 2000? Why were all the polls wrong again in predicting a  
> close Senate race between Rep. Rick Lazio (R) and Hillary Clinton in New  
> York that same year? The telephone poll is no longer a credible method



> of measuring public opinion. In 28 states, the  
state legislatures have  
> passed laws giving telephone users the right to  
opt out of receiving  
> telemarketing phone calls, including public  
opinion surveys. More and  
> more voters are availing themselves of this  
right and the pickings for  
> telephone polling firms are getting more and  
more scarce.

---

Date: Wed, 25 Sep 2002 10:32:40 -0400  
Subject: AP: Berkeley study finds youths more conservative than parents  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3  
Message-ID:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F9603955B@CMPA01.smallbusiness.local>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Howard Fienberg" <HFienberg@stats.org>  
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g8PEXnI22456

Berkeley study finds youths more conservative than parents  
Published 3:00 p.m. PDT Tuesday, September 24, 2002  
<[http://www.sacbee.com/state\\_wire/story/4528885p-5548378c.html](http://www.sacbee.com/state_wire/story/4528885p-5548378c.html)>  
BERKELEY, Calif. (AP) - Teenagers are more conservative on issues such as  
school prayer and abortion than their parents, according to a study  
released Tuesday.

Political science professors Merrill Shanks and Henry Brady of the  
University of California, Berkeley, found the generation gap was most  
pronounced on issues such as school prayer - on which 69 percent of  
teenagers surveyed said it should be allowed, compared to 59 percent of  
adults 27 to 59.

When it came to federal funding of faith-based charities, 59 percent of  
college-aged adults supported it along with 67 percent of younger  
teenagers. That compares to 40 percent of adults in the older age bracket.

On the issue of abortion, 44 percent of those 15 to 22 supported  
restrictions while 34 percent of adults over 26 shared that feeling.

But when it came to issues of social security and education, the results  
differed. Only 52 percent of those over 60 supported increasing education  
funding.

As traditionally has been the case, youths continue to want more federal  
protection of women and minorities and also are more likely to be troubled  
by job discrimination against gays and lesbians as compared to their older  
counterparts. Younger Americans also want more federal dollars spent on the  
poor and protecting the environment.

There were no major differences between young and old when it came to

military defense, gun control, tax policy, criminal punishment and government spending on health care.

The survey consisted of 1,258 telephone interviews between April 23 and Nov. 20, 2001, with 84 percent of the polling conducted before Sept. 11. The poll has a margin of error of 3.5 percentage points.

-----  
Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) hfienberg@stats.org  
<http://www.stats.org>

=====  
Date: Wed, 25 Sep 2002 08:27:13 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Berkeley study finds youths more conservative than parents (AP)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209250826260.13580-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

-----  
Copyright © The Sacramento Bee  
-----

[www.sacbee.com/state\\_wire/story/4528885p-5548378c.html](http://www.sacbee.com/state_wire/story/4528885p-5548378c.html)

Published 3:00 p.m. PDT Tuesday, September 24, 2002

Berkeley study finds youths more conservative than parents

BERKELEY, Calif. (AP) - Teenagers are more conservative on issues such as school prayer and abortion than their parents, according to a study released Tuesday.

Political science professors Merrill Shanks and Henry Brady of the University of California, Berkeley, found the generation gap was most pronounced on issues such as school prayer - on which 69 percent of teenagers surveyed said it should be allowed, compared to 59 percent of adults 27 to 59.

When it came to federal funding of faith-based charities, 59 percent of college-aged adults supported it along with 67 percent of younger teenagers. That compares to 40 percent of adults in the older age bracket.

On the issue of abortion, 44 percent of those 15 to 22 supported restrictions while 34 percent of adults over 26 shared that feeling.

But when it came to issues of social security and education, the results differed. Only 52 percent of those over 60 supported increasing education funding.

As traditionally has been the case, youths continue to want more federal protection of women and minorities and also are more likely to be troubled by job discrimination against gays and lesbians as compared to their older counterparts. Younger Americans also want more federal dollars spent on the poor and protecting the environment.

There were no major differences between young and old when it came to military defense, gun control, tax policy, criminal punishment and government spending on health care.

The survey consisted of 1,258 telephone interviews between April 23 and Nov. 20, 2001, with 84 percent of the polling conducted before Sept. 11. The poll has a margin of error of 3.5 percentage points.

(C) Copyright 2002 The Associated Press

[www.sacbee.com/state\\_wire/story/4528885p-5548378c.html](http://www.sacbee.com/state_wire/story/4528885p-5548378c.html)

-----  
Copyright © The Sacramento Bee  
-----

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Wed, 25 Sep 2002 12:24:44 -0400  
Subject: RE: Opt Out Lists  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3  
content-class: urn:content-classes:message  
Message-ID: <312BE9128EC85D4DBAD9285473844FB3386418@DELMAR.m-s-g.com>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Dale Kulp" <DKulp@M-S-G.com>  
To: <mail@marketsharescorp.com>, <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id g8PGNtI06592

As Nick pointed out, there are a number of errors. Most importantly survey research is exempted, either explicitly or implicitly from all State Do-Not-call (DNC) legislation. However, the large database compilers do, as a rule, exclude DNCs from lists/databases purchased from them unless prior arrangements and special dispensation has been

made. Neither DNC regulations nor database supplier DNC impositions will affect telephone RDD sampling - which of course is at odds with the results of the listed household-only samples supposedly employed by Zogby, which could be missing both unlisted and DNC records.

Dale Kulp

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

From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2002 9:10 AM  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Opt Out Lists

Dick Morris got so many things wrong in his opening paragraph that I hesitate to ask this question.

Specifically, some national polls were closer to Gore's winning margin than +2 points. In New York, all polls (except Zogby) showed Clinton ahead and some were close to her winning +12 point margin; e.g., Quinnipiac +12 points, CBS/NY Times, +8 points.

My question: Which states allow public opinion surveys to be included along with telemarketing in opt out lists?

<http://www.hillnews.com/issues/092502/morris.shtm>  
Dick Morris, The Hill, Sept. 25

The perils of polling

Polling is in trouble. Big trouble. The data is no longer reliable and won't be for several more years. Why were all the national polls (except Zogby) wrong in predicting that George Bush would get more votes than Al Gore in 2000? Why were all the polls wrong again in predicting a close Senate race between Rep. Rick Lazio (R) and Hillary Clinton in New York that same year? The telephone poll is no longer a credible method of measuring public opinion. In 28 states, the state legislatures have passed laws giving telephone users the right to opt out of receiving telemarketing phone calls, including public opinion surveys. More and more voters are availing themselves of this right and the pickings for telephone polling firms are getting more and more scarce.

---

Date: Wed, 25 Sep 2002 12:38:42 -0400  
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>  
To: <DKulp@M-S-G.com>, <mail@marketsharescorp.com>, <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: Re: Opt Out Lists  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Hi Dale --

Are you saying that DNC-instructing households are not included in Listed Household telephone samples?

Out of approximately 108 million 2002 US households, how many have a listed number and, of those, how many have issued DNC instructions?

JIM

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

Voice (610) 408-8800

Fax (610) 408-8802

jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

From: Dale Kulp <DKulp@M-S-G.com>

To: mail@marketsharescorp.com <mail@marketsharescorp.com>; aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>

Date: Wednesday, September 25, 2002 12:24 PM

Subject: RE: Opt Out Lists

>As Nick pointed out, there are a number of errors. Most importantly  
>survey research is exempted, either explicitly or implicitly from all  
>State Do-Not-call (DNC) legislation. However, the large database  
>compilers do, as a rule, exclude DNCs from lists/databases purchased  
>from them unless prior arrangements and special dispensation has been  
>made. Neither DNC regulations nor database supplier DNC impositions will  
>affect telephone RDD sampling - which of course is at odds with the  
>results of the listed household-only samples supposedly employed by  
>Zogby, which could be missing both unlisted and DNC records.

>

>Dale Kulp

>

>-----Original Message-----

>From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]

>Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2002 9:10 AM

>To: aapornet@usc.edu

>Subject: Opt Out Lists

>

>

>

>Dick Morris got so many things wrong in his opening paragraph that I  
>hesitate to ask this question.

>

>Specifically, some national polls were closer to Gore's winning margin  
>than +2 points. In New York, all polls (except Zogby) showed Clinton  
>ahead and some were close to her winning +12 point margin; e.g.,  
>Quinnipiac +12 points, CBS/NY Times, +8 points.

>

>My question: Which states allow public opinion surveys to be included  
>along with telemarketing in opt out lists?

>

><http://www.hillnews.com/issues/092502/morris.shtm>

>Dick Morris, The Hill, Sept. 25

>

>The perils of polling

>  
>Polling is in trouble. Big trouble. The data is no longer reliable and  
>won't be for several more years. Why were all the national polls (except  
>Zogby) wrong in predicting that George Bush would get more votes than  
>Al Gore in 2000? Why were all the polls wrong again in predicting a  
>close Senate race between Rep. Rick Lazio (R) and Hillary Clinton in New  
>York that same year? The telephone poll is no longer a credible method  
>of measuring public opinion. In 28 states, the state legislatures have  
>passed laws giving telephone users the right to opt out of receiving  
>telemarketing phone calls, including public opinion surveys. More and  
>more voters are availing themselves of this right and the pickings for  
>telephone polling firms are getting more and more scarce.  
>  
>

---

Date: Wed, 25 Sep 2002 13:04:02 -0400  
Subject: Poll: 70% of Palestinians support Iraq against US  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3  
Message-ID:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F9603956E@CMPA01.smallbusiness.local>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Howard Fienberg" <HFienberg@stats.org>  
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g8PH5MI10681

Sep. 24, 2002  
Poll: 70% of Palestinians support Iraq against US  
The Jerusalem Post  
By HILARY LEILA KRIEGER  
<<http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?pagename=JPost/A/JParticle/ShowFull&cid=1032275870789>>  
Slightly more than 70 percent of Palestinians would support Iraq if it is attacked by the US, according to a poll released yesterday. The survey also found that 51.3% of Palestinians think suicide attacks within the Green Line should continue, while 35.1% think they should stop. The Palestinian Center for Public Opinion (PCPO) asked 1,085 Palestinian adults if they agree that "Palestinians ought to support Iraq as they did in 1991, if the United States of America strikes it again." Of those polled, 41.4% strongly agreed and 30.4% somewhat agreed (71.8% combined), compared to 9.2% who strongly disagreed and 8.4% who somewhat disagreed (17.6% combined). Another 10.6% had no opinion. The poll has a 2.98% margin of error. A PCPO survey asking the same question in March found that those who strongly supported or somewhat supported Iraq totaled 79.9%. This week's poll also showed that 46.5% of Palestinians back a halt to the intifada; 45.4% want it to continue. In June, a Palestinian Jerusalem Media and Communication Center survey indicated 68% approval for suicide attacks among 1,179 adult Palestinians polled, with a 3% margin of error. In March, the PCPO found that 64.3% of 571 respondents supported suicide attacks and 66.5% wanted the intifada to continue, significantly higher than the recent results. Yesterday's poll also found that 57.8% of Palestinians say they are pessimistic about the future; 28% that are optimistic. And 60.6% are concerned or highly concerned about their means of subsistence. Dr. Nabil

Kukali, president of the PCPO, directed the poll, which was conducted between September 8 and 12. Women comprised 49% of the sample and men 51%. Palestinians from cities, villages, and refugee camps were interviewed.

-----  
Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) hfienberg@stats.org  
<http://www.stats.org>

=====  
Date: Wed, 25 Sep 2002 13:51:52 -0400  
Subject: RE: Opt Out Lists  
From: "Dale Kulp" <DKulp@M-S-G.com>  
To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>, <mail@marketsharescorp.com>, <aapornet@usc.edu>

Jim,

That all depends. The listed household database suppliers (i.e., InfoUSA, Experian, etc.) as a rule exclude all DNC HHs from their databases. Remember, most of their clients are not research companies, but direct marketers. In this way, they do not have to police the ultimate use of their lists.

I can not speak for all sample suppliers, you need to ask those questions yourself if your supplier hasn't briefed you on this potential problem. However, it is almost a certainty that if you purchase lists directly from database suppliers, DNCs would be eliminated, and this goes for purchases of secondary targeted and specialty lists as well.

As far as the numbers, there are approximately 79 million listed residential numbers, of which about 6 million are on state DNC lists or the DMA's Telephone Preference Service (TPS) File. But it looks like this could at least double within the next three to six months as a number of large states have recently instituted DNC options. Due to the state sponsored nature of this, coverage impact is "lumpy" and can be problematic. For example, about 50% of Missouri HHs are on the state DNC list and early reports indicate that the PA list could initiate with 35% or more.

Dale

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

From: James P. Murphy [mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2002 12:39 PM  
To: Dale Kulp; mail@marketsharescorp.com; aapornet@usc.edu

Subject: Re: Opt Out Lists

Hi Dale --

Are you saying that DNC-instructing households are not included in Listed Household telephone samples?

Out of approximately 108 million 2002 US households, how many have a listed number and, of those, how many have issued DNC instructions?

JIM

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
Voice (610) 408-8800  
Fax (610) 408-8802  
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

From: Dale Kulp <DKulp@M-S-G.com>  
To: mail@marketsharescorp.com <mail@marketsharescorp.com>; aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Date: Wednesday, September 25, 2002 12:24 PM  
Subject: RE: Opt Out Lists

>As Nick pointed out, there are a number of errors. Most importantly  
>survey research is exempted, either explicitly or implicitly from all  
>State Do-Not-call (DNC) legislation. However, the large database  
>compilers do, as a rule, exclude DNCs from lists/databases purchased  
>from them unless prior arrangements and special dispensation has been  
>made. Neither DNC regulations nor database supplier DNC impositions will  
>affect telephone RDD sampling - which of course is at odds with the  
>results of the listed household-only samples supposedly employed by  
>Zogby, which could be missing both unlisted and DNC records.

>  
>Dale Kulp

>  
>-----Original Message-----

>From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]  
>Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2002 9:10 AM  
>To: aapornet@usc.edu  
>Subject: Opt Out Lists

>  
>  
>

>Dick Morris got so many things wrong in his opening paragraph that I  
>hesitate to ask this question.

>  
>Specifically, some national polls were closer to Gore's winning margin  
>than +2 points. In New York, all polls (except Zogby) showed Clinton  
>ahead and some were close to her winning +12 point margin; e.g.,  
>Quinnipiac +12 points, CBS/NY Times, +8 points.

>  
>My question: Which states allow public opinion surveys to be included  
>along with telemarketing in opt out lists?

>  
><http://www.hillnews.com/issues/092502/morris.shtm>



>Dick Morris, The Hill, Sept. 25  
>  
>The perils of polling  
>  
>Polling is in trouble. Big trouble. The data is no longer reliable and  
>won't be for several more years. Why were all the national polls (except  
>Zogby) wrong in predicting that George Bush would get more votes than  
>Al Gore in 2000? Why were all the polls wrong again in predicting a  
>close Senate race between Rep. Rick Lazio (R) and Hillary Clinton in New  
>York that same year? The telephone poll is no longer a credible method  
>of measuring public opinion. In 28 states, the state legislatures have  
>passed laws giving telephone users the right to opt out of receiving  
>telemarketing phone calls, including public opinion surveys. More and  
>more voters are availing themselves of this right and the pickings for  
>telephone polling firms are getting more and more scarce.  
>  
>

---

Date: Wed, 25 Sep 2002 14:24:01 -0700  
From: "Lance Hoffman" <lhoffman@opinionaccess.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: RE: Opt Out Lists  
Message-ID: <001a01c264d9\$dea79280\$7301a8c0@LHOFFMAN>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
    boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_001B\_01C2649F.3248BA80"  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook, Build 10.0.2627  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6700  
In-Reply-To: <312BE9128EC85D4DBAD9285473844FB30625F0@DELMAR.m-s-g.com>

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----\_NextPart\_000\_001B\_01C2649F.3248BA80  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hello all. It has been my experience when purchasing sample on behalf of my clients from sample companies that there is no consideration taken on screening any lists against DNC list/subscriptions. These numbers remain in the sample, and it appears as though this will continue to be SOP for the sample companies.

Just to expand, I have had conversations regarding this matter with some colleagues that work for various sample companies. Since I am in a production environment, and of course, given the nature of the study I am working on, it would be preferable for the sample to be screened against DNC listings prior to my receiving the sample. However, the fact that these numbers are not removed usually results in the purchase of more sample from the sample companies because although the DNC's apply to telemarketing, most people who subscribe are not willing to participate in research, so these numbers result, for the most part, in initial refusals, necessitating the purchase of more sample.

Lance Hoffman  
Account Executive  
Opinion Access Corp.  
P: 718.729.2622 x.157  
F: 718.729.2444  
C: 646.522.2012

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

From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu] On Behalf Of Dale Kulp  
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2002 10:52 AM  
To: James P. Murphy; mail@marketsharescorp.com; aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: Opt Out Lists

Jim,

That all depends. The listed household database suppliers (i.e., InfoUSA, Experian, etc.) as a rule exclude all DNC HHs from their databases. Remember, most of their clients are not research companies, but direct marketers. In this way, they do not have to police the ultimate use of their lists.

I can not speak for all sample suppliers, you need to ask those questions yourself if your supplier hasn't briefed you on this potential problem. However, it is almost a certainty that if you purchase lists directly from database suppliers, DNCs would be eliminated, and this goes for purchases of secondary targeted and specialty lists as well.

As far as the numbers, there are approximately 79 million listed residential numbers, of which about 6 million are on state DNC lists or the DMA's Telephone Preference Service (TPS) File. But it looks like this could at least double within the next three to six months as a number of large states have recently instituted DNC options. Due to the state sponsored nature of this, coverage impact is "lumpy" and can be problematic. For example, about 50% of Missouri HHs are on the state DNC list and early reports indicate that the PA list could initiate with 35% or more.

Dale

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

From: James P. Murphy [mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2002 12:39 PM  
To: Dale Kulp; mail@marketsharescorp.com; aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Opt Out Lists

Hi Dale --

Are you saying that DNC-instructing households are not included in Listed Household telephone samples?

Out of approximately 108 million 2002 US households, how many have a listed

number and, of those, how many have issued DNC instructions?

JIM

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

Voice (610) 408-8800

Fax (610) 408-8802

jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

From: Dale Kulp <DKulp@M-S-G.com>

To: mail@marketsharescorp.com <mail@marketsharescorp.com>;

aapornet@usc.edu

<aapornet@usc.edu>

Date: Wednesday, September 25, 2002 12:24 PM

Subject: RE: Opt Out Lists

>As Nick pointed out, there are a number of errors. Most importantly  
>survey research is exempted, either explicitly or implicitly from all  
>State Do-Not-call (DNC) legislation. However, the large database  
>compilers do, as a rule, exclude DNCs from lists/databases purchased  
>from them unless prior arrangements and special dispensation has been  
>made. Neither DNC regulations nor database supplier DNC impositions  
will

>affect telephone RDD sampling - which of course is at odds with the  
>results of the listed household-only samples supposedly employed by  
>Zogby, which could be missing both unlisted and DNC records.

>

>Dale Kulp

>

>-----Original Message-----

>From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]

>Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2002 9:10 AM

>To: aapornet@usc.edu

>Subject: Opt Out Lists

>

>

>

>Dick Morris got so many things wrong in his opening paragraph that I  
>hesitate to ask this question.

>

>Specifically, some national polls were closer to Gore's winning margin  
>than +2 points. In New York, all polls (except Zogby) showed Clinton  
>ahead and some were close to her winning +12 point margin; e.g.,  
>Quinnipiac +12 points, CBS/NY Times, +8 points.

>

>My question: Which states allow public opinion surveys to be included  
>along with telemarketing in opt out lists?

>

><http://www.hillnews.com/issues/092502/morris.shtm>

>Dick Morris, The Hill, Sept. 25

>

>The perils of polling

>

>Polling is in trouble. Big trouble. The data is no longer reliable and  
>won't be for several more years. Why were all the national polls  
(except

>Zogby) wrong in predicting that George Bush would get more votes than  
>Al Gore in 2000? Why were all the polls wrong again in predicting a  
>close Senate race between Rep. Rick Lazio (R) and Hillary Clinton in  
New  
>York that same year? The telephone poll is no longer a credible method  
>of measuring public opinion. In 28 states, the state legislatures have  
>passed laws giving telephone users the right to opt out of receiving  
>telemarketing phone calls, including public opinion surveys. More and  
>more voters are availing themselves of this right and the pickings for  
>telephone polling firms are getting more and more scarce.  
>  
>

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_001B\_01C2649F.3248BA80  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\*           ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED---           \*  
\*       This post contains a forbidden message format           \*  
\*   (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting)       \*  
\*       This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT       \*  
\*   If your postings display this message your mail program     \*  
\*   is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting     \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_001B\_01C2649F.3248BA80--

=====  
Date: Wed, 25 Sep 2002 14:41:15 -0400  
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>  
Subject: RE: Berkeley study finds youths more conservative than parents (AP)  
In-reply-to: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209250826260.13580-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
To: "'AAPORNET'" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <002601c264c3\$21a29a60\$0d0a010a@leo>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1106  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-priority: Normal

Here is a story with a little more background on the survey

YOUTHFUL CONSERVATISM  
Baby Boomers' kids take right turn on prayer in school, abortion, survey  
says  
Charles Burress, Chronicle Staff Writer  
Wednesday, September 25, 2002  
i¿½2002 San Francisco Chronicle.

URL:  
<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/2002/09/25/MN189810.DTL>

Apologies to Bob Dylan, but the times they may be a-changin' -- again. A

new nationwide survey shows today's youth have become more conservative than their elders about religion in schools and abortion.

High-school and college-age youth show stronger support than their parents' generation for school prayer, federal aid to faith-based charities, religious conservatives and government restriction of abortion, according to the survey, released Tuesday by the UC Berkeley Survey Research Center.

But the findings are puzzling because the study also found that young people are less likely to attend religious services or see religion as a guide to daily life, said survey director Douglas Strand.

The findings were included in a broad range of political and "citizen engagement" issues addressed by the survey, which polled 1,258 people from age 15 to 92 by phone. Supported by the Pew Charitable Trusts, it was conducted between April 23 and Nov. 20 last year.

Younger people are as liberal or more liberal than older generations on several issues, but religion and abortion stand out because in those areas, "youth do not consistently show the kind of liberalism that one might expect from the writings of some scholars or from those who point to the growing 'permissiveness' of the culture," the study's executive summary said.

"Explaining it is mere speculation at this point," Strand said. "But it could be that politically conservative churches have done a much better job in socializing their young attendees to a conservative political position."

A study released last week, sponsored by the Association of Statisticians of American Religious Bodies, shows that conservative churches grew faster than other denominations in the past 10 years.

Some Bay Area students sided with the majority in the survey, while others said they are more liberal.

"They wonder why kids are fighting and not listening," said Bryan Douglas, 15, a student at Concord's Mount Diablo High School. "If they don't learn about God at home, they need to have him in school."

UC Berkeley, perhaps the nation's most prominent symbol of campus liberalism, has seen a blooming of recruiting tables by student religious groups on busy Sproul Plaza in recent years.

But Berkeley students interviewed Tuesday were divided over whether the campus reflects the results from the latest poll.

"Not at Berkeley!" declared Briana Lau, 20, as she handed out flyers for the Cal Hawaii Club. But elsewhere could be different, she said: "I always think there's an alternating pendulum where kids tend to rebel against what their parents think. Kids of hippie parents tend to be more conservative."

Student Matt Daugavietis, 22, past president of Victory Campus Ministries, said today's students reject the campus radicalism of the past. "A pattern of rebellion -- dishonoring your parents and dishonoring authority -- doesn't work," he said. "Kids are starting to wake up to that."

Students staffing the Berkeley College Republicans table said they are now

the largest group on campus, with nearly 500 members, while ponytailed David Banuelos at the Honor Students' Society table said the survey results don't square with his experience.

"Most of the young people I contact are for abortion rights and against school prayer," Banuelos said.

The results could point to a significant shift in America's "culture wars" over family values, Strand said. As the older generation dies off and the younger generation moves into the mainstream, the difference in attitude "may transform American public opinion as a whole toward becoming more conservative on abortion," he said.

Yet, at the same time, youth expressed more liberal views than older people on sex and violence on television, the environment, and government protections against discrimination based on race, gender and sexual orientation.

And the study found no appreciable generation gap on several other traditional tests of the liberal-conservative divide, including gun control, military defense, taxes and criminal punishment.

The lead researchers on the survey released Tuesday are UC Berkeley political science professors Merrill Shanks and Henry Brady, along with professor Edward Carmines of Indiana University.

Chronicle staff writer Jason B. Johnson contributed to this report. / E-mail Charles Burress at cburress@sfchronicle.com.

--

Leo G. Simonetta  
Art & Science Group, LLC  
simonetta@artsci.com

=====  
Date: Wed, 25 Sep 2002 12:52:26 -0700  
To: beniger@almaak.usc.edu, AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
From: Douglas Strand <dstrand@csm.Berkeley.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Berkeley study finds youths more conservative than parents (AP)  
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209250826260.13580-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
    boundary="====\_5564229==\_.\_ALT"  
  
-----\_5564229==\_.\_ALT  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Hi, folks,

For those interested, the executive summary of our report is available as a=20.pdf file at the site of our sponsors, The Pew Charitable Trusts (a fact=20 unfortunately dropped in the AP story that was posted here, but fortunately=

=20  
present in a number of the news accounts of the study appearing out here in=  
=20  
the West). I attach the link below, along with a link to the original=20  
press release. The second page of that document has a box around a=20  
hyperlink that takes you to the Appendix to the Exec. Summary, which=20  
presents basic information on the survey's methodology as well as the=20  
wording of the key questions/batteries.

We expect to produce at least one more press release soon on aspects of the=  
=20  
study other than our portrait of the "generation gap" in political opinions.

Questions, criticisms, and kudos are, of course, welcome.

Thanks to those who have posted news of our study.

Regards,

Douglas Strand, Ph.D.  
Project Director  
Public Agendas and Citizen Engagement Survey (PACES)  
Survey Research Center  
Univ. of California, Berkeley  
510-642-0508

The Executive Summary (with technical appendix link):

[http://www.pewtrusts.com/pdf/pp\\_paces.pdf](http://www.pewtrusts.com/pdf/pp_paces.pdf)

The original press release (before news media surgery):

[http://www.berkeley.edu/news/media/releases/2002/09/24\\_youth.html](http://www.berkeley.edu/news/media/releases/2002/09/24_youth.html)

At 08:27 AM Wednesday 9/25/02 -0700, James Beniger wrote:

>-----  
> Copyright =A9 The Sacramento Bee  
>-----  
> [www.sacbee.com/state\\_wire/story/4528885p-5548378c.html](http://www.sacbee.com/state_wire/story/4528885p-5548378c.html)  
>  
> Published 3:00 p.m. PDT Tuesday, September 24, 2002  
>  
>  
> Berkeley study finds youths more conservative than parents  
>  
>  
> BERKELEY, Calif. (AP) - Teenagers are more conservative on issues such  
> as school prayer and abortion than their parents, according to a study  
> released Tuesday.





-----\_5564229==\_.ALT--

=====  
Date: Thu, 26 Sep 2002 00:23:22 -0400  
From: allenbarton@mindspring.com  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: The meaning of "invading Iraq" questions  
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

The latest Gallup poll ([www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr020924](http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr020924)) is an excellent example of using varied wording to explore the meaning of questions. The "general" question "Would you favor or oppose sending American troops to the Persian Gulf in an attempt to remove Saddam Hussein from power" produces 57% in favor from a split half sample. However when the matching half is asked "For each of the following conditions, please say if you would favor or oppose invading Iraq with U.S. ground troops if it were true," support for invading Iraq shifts from 79% "If the United Nations supported invading Iraq" to 38% "If the United States had to invade Iraq alone" and 37% "if the United Nations opposed invading Iraq."

It is thus clear that the 57% who "favor invasion" on the general question are a mixture of people making various assumptions about conditions, a figure which cannot be used to demonstrate support for simply "invading Iraq" regardless of circumstances. Only 38% support the Bush policy of invading regardless of United Nations support and 59% oppose that policy. Another 40% would invade only with UN support.

But the Gallup survey with its ingenious set of questions demonstrates problems for the "doves" too. 68% believe that "If the United Nations does conduct inspections" these "would not be effective in eliminating the threat of Iraq using weapons of mass destruction against the United States." So the opposition to "going it alone" is not exactly firm on relying on the United Nations inspection to solve the problem. The majority actually supports the position that inspections would not work, while at the same time wanting UN support before invading, and believing that Saddam Hussein will get them out of this dilemma by refusing inspections. So far he is not cooperating with this solution.

This presents a challenge to advocates of an inspection solution to the Iraq problem -- powerful elements in the administration are committed to a unilateral "regime changing" invasion because they too don't believe in inspection. Can an inspection regime be devised and win Security Council approval which would make the public feel secure? Is the Bush administration interested in trying to do this? Will the public distrust of inspection provide the basis for the "hawks" winning over a public now skeptical of a unilateral American invasion? Or will public opinion cause the Bush administration to try to avoid a unilateral war by either imposing some effective level of inspection on Hussein, thus avoiding war altogether, or by securing UN approval of military action if Hussein rejects such a level of inspection?

Allen Barton

=====  
Date: Thu, 26 Sep 2002 06:22:27 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: New Pew/Kaiser Reports Examining Latino Voting Behaviors to be Released  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209260616440.7850-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

From KaiserUpdate@kff.org Thu Sep 26 06:16:43 2002  
Date: Wed, 25 Sep 2002 21:06:08 -0400  
Subject: New Reports Examining Latino Voting Behaviors to be Released

Media Advisory  
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:  
September 25, 2002

For further information contact:  
Jennifer Morales, 202/347-5270 or jmorales@kff.org  
Dianne Saenz, 202/292-3304 or dianne@pewhispanic.org  
Stephen Chavez, 626/793-9335 or stephen@vpepr.com

TWO NEW REPORTS EXAMINE VOTING BEHAVIORS OF LATINO ELECTORATE

New National Survey Provides Comprehensive Look at Latino Political Beliefs

Separate Analysis Reports on Latino Voter Registration and Turnout in Two U.S. Counties

A new national survey of U.S. Latinos by the Pew Hispanic Center and the Kaiser Family Foundation provides an in-depth look at Latinos' political beliefs, party loyalties, and policy positions, as well as the effect of new immigrants on the Hispanic electorate. The Latino Electorate is an excerpt from the larger National Survey of Latinos, a nationally representative telephone survey of 4,213 adults, including 2,929 Hispanic adults.

The Tomi¿s Rivera Policy Institute will present findings from its studies of recent Latino voter registration and turnout in Harris Co., TX (Houston) and Los Angeles, CA, two counties with large Latino populations.

Roberto Suro, Director, Pew Hispanic Center; Mollyann Brodie, Ph.D., Vice President and Director, Public Opinion and Media Research, Kaiser Family Foundation; Harry Pachon, Ph.D., President, Tomás Rivera Policy Institute; and Rodolfo de la Garza, Ph.D., Vice President of Research, Tomás Rivera Policy Institute and Professor of Political Science, Columbia University, will present the findings.

What: A briefing on the results of the National Survey of Latinos: The Latino Electorate and a separate analysis of Latino voting patterns in Harris Co., TX (Houston) and Los Angeles Co., CA.

When: Thursday, October 3, 2002, 9:00 a.m., EDT  
(Registration and Breakfast at 8:30 a.m.)

Where: National Press Club, Holeman Lounge  
14th and F Streets, NW, Washington, DC

RSVP: Tiffany Ford at (202) 347-5270, or email tford@kff.org

OUT-OF-TOWN PRESS CALL-IN OPPORTUNITY: To listen to the press briefing in real time, call 800.550.7368 at 9:00am EDT. International callers may listen in by dialing 212.271.4762. Thirty telephone lines will be available.

A full transcript of the briefing will be posted on [www.pewhispanic.org](http://www.pewhispanic.org) and [www.kff.org](http://www.kff.org) by mid-day, Oct. 3.

A webcast of the event will be available at 1pm EDT on Oct. 3 at <http://www.kaisernetwork.org/healthcast/kff/03oct02> .

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Thu, 26 Sep 2002 15:52:44 -0500  
Subject: need some reaction  
Message-ID:  
<A17AA9D6C953D640B218FCB1EB216196170721@EXCHANGE.campus.stcloudstate.edu>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Frank, Stephen" <sfrank@stcloudstate.edu>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=\_NextPart\_001\_01C2659E.A97697B8  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Hi this is Steve Frank in Minnesota. A Twins Cities TV station has a =  
poll conducted in MN. regarding the U.S. MN. Senate race. Two other =  
media state surveys about 10 days ago shows a virtual dead heat with 5% =  
undecided.=20

This firm (Survey USA) found one of the candidates with a 12% -15% lead = and about 1% undecided. At first blush this doesn't make sense to us. = They used automatic calling and a prerecorded message and automated = survey. Their demographics (other than party) appear to match state = demographics.=20

The station is wondering if they should run the results. We are thinking = the automation and computer survey skewed the respondents.

Your thoughts. thanks sf

Dr. Steve Frank, Department of Political Science-Professor & Chair  
St. Cloud State University St. Cloud, MN. 56301=20  
FAX (320)-654-5422 VOICE (320)-255-4131 =20  
email : sfsurvey@stcloudstate.edu  
Homepage: <http://web.stcloudstate.edu/sfrank>  
Prelaw Homepage: <http://web.stcloudstate.edu/prelaw>  
SCSU Survey Homepage: <http://web.stcloudstate.edu/scsusurvey>=20

-----  
So what this Jefferson dude was saying is: We left this England place = because it was bogus.=20  
If we don't get us some cool rules pronto, we'll just be bogus too.=20  
Jeff Spicoli Fast Times At Ridgemont High

-----\_NextPart\_001\_01C2659E.A97697B8  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*  
\* This post contains a forbidden message format \*  
\* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*  
\* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \*  
\* If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
\* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

-----\_NextPart\_001\_01C2659E.A97697B8--

=====  
Date: Thu, 26 Sep 2002 16:57:09 -0400  
Subject: RE: need some reaction  
Message-ID:  
<0ED62F7DC6311240A5F3A251086F74510FDB3A@gsg-mail01.globalstrategygroup.com>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Jason Boxt" <jboxt@globalstrategygroup.com>  
To: <sfrank@stcloudstate.edu>, <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g8QKvii20845

I believe it is a fairly safe (and accurate) conclusion on the part of the

station that the results were skewed by the automation and computer survey.

Jason Boxt

Vice President  
Global Strategy Group  
1825 Connecticut Ave, NW  
Fifth Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20009

(202) 265-4676  
(202) 265-4619 (fax)

[www.globalstrategygroup.com](http://www.globalstrategygroup.com)

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

From: Frank, Stephen [mailto:[sfrank@stcloudstate.edu](mailto:sfrank@stcloudstate.edu)]  
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2002 4:53 PM  
To: [aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)  
Subject: need some reaction

Hi this is Steve Frank in Minnesota. A Twins Cities TV station has a poll conducted in MN. regarding the U.S. MN. Senate race. Two other media state surveys about 10 days ago shows a virtual dead heat with 5% undecided.

This firm (Survey USA) found one of the candidates with a 12% -15% lead and about 1% undecided. At first blush this doesn't make sense to us. They used automatic calling and a prerecorded message and automated survey. Their demographics (other than party) appear to match state demographics.

The station is wondering if they should run the results. We are thinking the automation and computer survey skewed the respondents.

Your thoughts. thanks sf

=====  
Dr. Steve Frank, Department of Political Science-Professor & Chair  
St. Cloud State University St. Cloud, MN. 56301  
FAX (320)-654-5422 VOICE (320)-255-4131  
email : [sfsurvey@stcloudstate.edu](mailto:sfsurvey@stcloudstate.edu)  
Homepage: <http://web.stcloudstate.edu/sfrank>  
Prelaw Homepage: <http://web.stcloudstate.edu/prelaw>  
SCSU Survey Homepage: <http://web.stcloudstate.edu/scsusurvey>  
-----

So what this Jefferson dude was saying is: We left this England place because it was bogus.  
If we don't get us some cool rules pronto, we'll just be bogus too.  
Jeff Spicoli Fast Times At Ridgemont High

=====

Date: Thu, 26 Sep 2002 17:06:19 -0400  
From: Joe Lenski <jlenski@edisonresearch.com>  
To: "'sfrank@stcloudstate.edu'" <sfrank@stcloudstate.edu>, aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: need some reaction  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

I would be very careful with Survey USA results. Their numbers are hit or miss. In New York Channel 7 WABC-TV ran a Survey USA poll earlier this year for the Newark, NJ mayoral race showing the challenger Cory Booker with a seven-point lead over incumbent Sharpe James. In the election the results were exactly the reverse - James won 53-47.

Rasmussen Research uses a similar methodology and their numbers in the 2000 Presidential election were the furthest off. Their final poll had Bush winning by 6 or 7 points.

I don't think that anyone knows enough about who is responding to these types of polls and how accurate the responses are without a live human doing the interview to make any guess on the potential biases that are introduced with this methodology.

Joe Lenski  
edison media research

---

Date: Thu, 26 Sep 2002 14:25:54 -0700  
From: "steve johnson" <stevej@nsdssurvey.org>  
To: <sfrank@stcloudstate.edu>, <aapornet@usc.edu>  
References:  
<A17AA9D6C953D640B218FCB1EB216196170721@EXCHANGE.campus.stcloudstate.edu>  
Subject: Re: need some reaction  
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 6.00.2600.0000  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000

I agree with other who have commented that the method used is suspect. However, if the previous survey showed a close heat, say 51% vs 49% and had a 5% margin of error, it is possible that the true difference could be as much as 56% vs 44%, especially if some of the undecided have come to an opinion. There is also the chance that the Survey USA results are just plain wrong (happens 5% of the time at a 95% confidence level). Finally, I would be interested in the question wording (was it exactly the same), the question order, and any other details of the survey before coming to a conclusion.

Best  
Stephen Johnson, PhD  
President, Northwest Survey & Data Services

---

Date: Fri, 27 Sep 2002 08:28:53 -0400  
From: Lew Horner <horner.43@osu.edu>  
Subject: Re: need some reaction  
In-reply-to: <A17AA9D6C953D640B218FCB1EB216196170721@EXCHANGE.campus.stc  
loudstate.edu>  
X-Sender: horner.43@pop.service.ohio-state.edu  
To: sfrank@stcloudstate.edu, aapornet@usc.edu  
Message-id: <4.2.0.58.20020927081017.013d7da0@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Survey USA's web site says they can turn around a "true random" survey the same day it's ordered. Among other things, they may be using a one-size-fits-all approach to decide likely voters and such. That wouldn't work well in Minnesota where eligible adults can register at the polls.

Credible pollsters in Minnesota, such as Rob Daves, factor this into their likely voter models.

Lew Horner  
Center for Survey Research  
Ohio State University

At 03:52 PM 9/26/2002 -0500, Frank, Stephen wrote:

>Hi this is Steve Frank in Minnesota. A Twins Cities TV station has a poll  
>conducted in MN. regarding the U.S. MN. Senate race. Two other media state  
>surveys about 10 days ago shows a virtual dead heat with 5% undecided.

>

>This firm (Survey USA) found one of the candidates with a 12% -15% lead  
>and about 1% undecided. At first blush this doesn't make sense to us. They  
>used automatic calling and a prerecorded message and automated survey.  
>Their demographics (other than party) appear to match state demographics.

>

>The station is wondering if they should run the results. We are thinking  
>the automation and computer survey skewed the respondents.

>

>

>Your thoughts. thanks sf

---

Date: Fri, 27 Sep 2002 08:45:19 -0400  
To: sfrank@stcloudstate.edu, <aapornet@usc.edu>  
From: "Ronald E. Langley" <langley@uky.edu>  
Subject: Re: need some reaction  
In-Reply-To: <A17AA9D6C953D640B218FCB1EB216196170721@EXCHANGE.campus.stc  
loudstate.edu>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g8RCjhI09515

Steve:

Others may disagree, but my opinion is that the methodology produced the results and you should not release them. (In my opinion) people that will respond to such auto-dialed recorded message are by nature different than the general public, despite the apparent demographic representativeness. A local media outlet (Lexington, KY) also contracted with Survey USA and provided survey results that did not make sense and contradicted other reputable polls. When I saw these results I visited Survey USA's web site, and while their description of the methodology is terse, it is clear that they specialize in overnight polls which I would argue by definition are not representative. Regardless of how the original sample is drawn, if you dial a number once and then throw it out if you do not happen to get anyone to answer, what you really have at the end of the day is a convenience sample of easy to reach respondents and not a true random sample.

As to the apparent demographic representativeness, it is not clear from your message whether the UNweighted results were representative? The SurveyUSA web site indicates that their results are weighted to make them look representative.

Also, when I see results that are that much different from other recent results, I first wonder about the question wording.

Ron Langley

At 03:52 PM 9/26/2002 -0500, Frank, Stephen wrote:

>Hi this is Steve Frank in Minnesota. A Twins Cities TV station has a poll  
>conducted in MN. regarding the U.S. MN. Senate race. Two other media state  
>surveys about 10 days ago shows a virtual dead heat with 5% undecided.

>

>This firm (Survey USA) found one of the candidates with a 12% -15% lead  
>and about 1% undecided. At first blush this doesn't make sense to us. They  
>used automatic calling and a prerecorded message and automated survey.  
>Their demographics (other then party) appear to match state demographics.

>

>The station is wondering if they should run the results. We are thinking  
>the automation and computer survey skewed the respondents.

>

>

>Your thoughts. thanks sf

>

>=====

>Dr. Steve Frank, Department of Political Science-Professor & Chair

>St. Cloud State University St. Cloud, MN. 56301

>FAX (320)-654-5422 VOICE (320)-255-4131

>email : sfsurvey@stcloudstate.edu

>Homepage: <http://web.stcloudstate.edu/sfrank>

>Prelaw Homepage: <http://web.stcloudstate.edu/prelaw>

>SCSU Survey Homepage: <http://web.stcloudstate.edu/scsusurvey>

>

>So what this Jefferson dude was saying is: We left this England place  
>because it was bogus.

>If we don't get us some cool rules pronto, we'll just be bogus too.

>Jeff Spicoli Fast Times At Ridgemont High





2003. The winner will be announced in late April, 2003. Send entries to:

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

For further information:

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

---

Date: Fri, 27 Sep 2002 10:34:52 -0500  
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@marketsharescorp.com>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 (Macintosh; I; PPC)  
X-Accept-Language: en,pdf  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Libertarian Candidates  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

It is generally assumed that Libertarians take more votes away from GOP candidates, but it is hard to prove in a poll. On party ID questions they are "not in support of either party (i.e., GOP or Dems) and on other ballot questions they vote for other libertarian candidates. And since they generally draw only 4%-6% of the vote, the samples are always too small to analyze independently.

Here is some commentary on a Libertarian candidate running in The 7th CD in Indiana.

> The bad news for the Republican is that Horning is siphoning off his  
> 6  
> percent from voters who would otherwise tend to vote Republican. Now  
> Horning stands to play the role of spoiler.

Here in Illinois, the Libertarian Gov/Lite Gov ticket is a couple of anti-tax, pro-abortion, pro-gun GOP party outcasts running a sour grapes campaign against the Republican nominee - a "dream ticket" for some of my suburban Republican neighbors.

Has anyone seen any quantification of the assumption that Libertarians do, in fact, hurt GOP candidates more than Dem. candidates?

Nic

---

Date: Fri, 27 Sep 2002 12:05:27 -0400  
From: jennifer.m.rothgeb@census.gov  
Subject: Overflow HOTEL Information for QDET Conference - Charleston, South Carolina

To: aapornet@usc.edu  
X-Mailer: Lotus Notes Release 5.0.7 March 21, 2001  
Message-ID: <OFBBCA11BA.968D954C-ON85256C41.0055EFC1@tco.census.gov>  
X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on LNHQ08MTA/HQ/BOC (Release 5.0.8 | June 18, 2001) at 09/27/2002  
12:05:28 PM  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

(Apologies for cross-posting)

International Conference on Questionnaire Development, Evaluation, and Testing Methods  
Charleston, South Carolina, USA, November 14-17, 2002  
[www.jpsm.umd.edu/qdet](http://www.jpsm.umd.edu/qdet)

The QDET Conference Hotel - the Embassy Suites is sold out of rooms for Saturday night, November 16. ( They do have rooms available for the other nights of the conference. ) Because of this situation we made arrangements for an overflow hotel conveniently located near the conference hotel. Reserve your room now if you don't yet have a room. Keep in mind that rooms in both hotels are conducive to room sharing, given that all accommodations are 2-room suites and have sleeping accommodations, telephones, dataports, and televisions in each room. Information on the overflow hotel is provided below.

The OVERFLOW HOTEL for the QDET conference is:

Quality Suites Convention Center Hotel  
5225 N. Arco Lane  
North Charleston, South Carolina

Telephone: PH: 843-747-7300  
FAX: 843-747-6324

Visit the hotel website at: [www.charlestonqualitysuites.com](http://www.charlestonqualitysuites.com)

Hotel Suite Rates: \$114 per night.  
Room Guarantee: Your reservation requires a guarantee using a major credit card.

When making reservations, request the group rate for the International Conference on Questionnaire Development, Evaluation, and Testing Methods (Group Code - QDET).

All of the amenities of this hotel are very similar to that of the other conference hotel. All accommodations are 2-room suites. Amenities include a complimentary cooked-to-order breakfast and a 3-hour manager's cocktail reception (Monday to Saturday evenings - 5 - 8 p.m.) All rooms have refrigerators, microwaves, coffee makers, hairdryer, irons, ironing boards, sleep sofa in living room, computer dataport, and free local calls. Other amenities include a guest laundromat, in-room movies, outdoor pool, fitness center, and free airport shuttle. (When you arrive at the Charleston Airport, call the hotel (843-747-7300) and they will have a shuttle bus arrive within 5-10 minutes.)

The Quality Suites hotel is one mile from the conference hotel. A complimentary shuttle will be provided which will run continuously between the two hotels from 8:15 a.m. until 5:30 p.m. on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. It will run between 8:15 a.m. and 2 p.m. on Sunday. The evening dinner shuttle will run from 5:30 p.m. until 10:30 p.m. (Wednesday through Saturday nights) and will make stops at both hotels on its way to and from the historic district where many restaurants are located.

---

Date: Fri, 27 Sep 2002 10:08:36 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: GSS student paper competition  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209271006000.28176-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

---

General Social Survey Student Paper Competition

---

09/27/02 12:28 PM

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 1972-2000 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 \$500, 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, 2003. The winner will be announced in late April, 2003. Send entries to:

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

For further information:

Phone: 773-256-6288  
Fax: 773-753-7886  
Email: [smitht@norcmail.uchicago.edu](mailto:smitht@norcmail.uchicago.edu)

---

General Social Survey Student Paper Competition

---

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Fri, 27 Sep 2002 11:21:02 -0600  
Subject: Abraham Lincoln Quote  
Message-ID: <E7845AD819F4284DA94DAC70E7BE40713652C2@strong.byu.edu>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Quin Monson" <[jqm5@ad.byu.edu](mailto:jqm5@ad.byu.edu)>  
To: <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Dear AAPORnet,

A colleague of mine sent me the following question about a quote by Abraham Lincoln. "What I want to get done is what the people desire to have done, and the question for me is how to find that out exactly." It is sometimes invoked by public opinion scholars, so I thought that someone on the list might know of a source to verify with some level of certainty that Lincoln actually said this. If you know the source, or even have any ideas please respond to me directly with your suggestions for tracking down the facts about this quote.

Thanks,  
Quin Monson

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

From: jrm77@email.byu.edu [mailto:jrm77@email.byu.edu]  
Sent: Friday, September 27, 2002 11:11 AM  
To: quin.monson@byu.edu  
Subject: Lincoln Quote

Quin,

Here is the Abraham Lincoln quote for which I need a primary source:

"What I want to get done is what the people desire to have done, and the question for me is how to find that out exactly."

I have searched all of the collected works of Lincoln (which include everything that Lincoln wrote, said in speeches, and was written about him in newspapers). In doing this electronic search, I searched for the words people and desire next to each other, find and out, and get and done, and nothing came up. Furthermore, I also searched the "Recollected Words of Abraham Lincoln" edited by Don E. Fehrenbacher and Virginia Fehrenbacher. This includes things that Lincoln supposedly said. After all of this searching, I have not found the quote.

The odd thing is that this quote is on respected websites such as the site of the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) and other respected agencies mainly associated with the polling industry.

I need a primary source. When did Lincoln say it? Who heard him? Did he write it down?

Thanks, Jeff

Quin Monson  
Assistant Director  
Center for the Study of Elections and Democracy  
Brigham Young University  
112 KMB  
Provo, UT 84602  
phone (801) 422-8017  
fax (801) 422-0579  
<http://csed.byu.edu>  
email: [Quin.Monson@byu.edu](mailto:Quin.Monson@byu.edu)

---

Date: Fri, 27 Sep 2002 14:02:01 -0400  
Subject: Dick Morris: Polling faces its limitations  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3  
Message-ID:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F960395B3@CMPA01.smallbusiness.local>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Howard Fienberg" <[HFienberg@stats.org](mailto:HFienberg@stats.org)>  
To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g8RI3BI29044

Must-read article of the day: Dick Morris, writing on-line for Jewish World Review <<http://jewishworldreview.com/0902/morris.html>>, says that polling is facing its limits.

-----  
Howard Fienberg  
Senior Analyst  
The Statistical Assessment Service (STATS)  
2100 L. St. NW Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20037  
(ph) 202-223-3193  
(fax) 202-872-4014  
(e) [hfienberg@stats.org](mailto:hfienberg@stats.org)  
<http://www.stats.org>

=====  
Date: Fri, 27 Sep 2002 14:24:30 -0700  
From: Albert & Susan Cantril <[ascantril@mindspring.com](mailto:ascantril@mindspring.com)>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.04 (Win16; I)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: [jqm5@ad.byu.edu](mailto:jqm5@ad.byu.edu)  
CC: [aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)  
Subject: Re: Abraham Lincoln Quote  
References: <[E7845AD819F4284DA94DAC70E7BE40713652C2@strong.byu.edu](mailto:E7845AD819F4284DA94DAC70E7BE40713652C2@strong.byu.edu)>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

My late father, Hadley Cantril, used the quote in his 1942 article, "Public Opinion in Flux," (Annals, March 1942: 136) and the preface to "Gauging Public Opinion" (Princeton, 1944).

I have used a similar quote from Lincoln: "While acting as their [the people's] representative, I shall be governed by their will on all subjects upon which I have the means of knowing what their will is; and upon all others, I shall do what my own judgment teaches me will best advance their interests." This was in a letter from Lincoln to the editor of the "Sangamo Journal" (June 13, 1836) as quoted in "Lincoln's Complete Works" edited by John Nicolay and John Hay (New York: Francis D. Tandy, 1905), Vol. I, page 15.

Albert H. Cantril

=====  
Date: Fri, 27 Sep 2002 14:53:58 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <[beniger@almaak.usc.edu](mailto:beniger@almaak.usc.edu)>  
Subject: Public Opinion on Invading Iraq (fwd)  
To: AAPORNET <[aapornet@usc.edu](mailto:aapornet@usc.edu)>  
Message-id: <[Pine.GSO.4.33.0209271449210.28175-100000@almaak.usc.edu](mailto:Pine.GSO.4.33.0209271449210.28175-100000@almaak.usc.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

---

A A P O R N E T <aapornet@usc.edu>

---

From: PIPA <listserv@americans-world.org>  
Reply-To: tperrotto@pipa.org  
To: PIPA <listserv@americans-world.org>  
Subject: Public Opinion on Invading Iraq

BRIEFING: PUBLIC OPINION ON INVADING IRAQ

Wednesday, 9-10:15 am, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace  
building (1779 Massachusetts Ave., NW), Choate Room

PIPA's director, Steven Kull, will present a briefing on the new  
PIPA/Knowledge Networks new poll on invading Iraq as well as a  
comprehensive review of polls from other organizations - explaining  
apparent contradictions.

In addition to broader issues about invading Iraq, new data will be  
presented on attitudes on:

- what the Congressional resolution should say
- the urgency of taking action
- the goal of regime change versus disarmament
- the potential effectiveness of inspections
- the potential for Iraq using WMD

Continental breakfast will be served at 8:45; the briefing will begin  
at 9 and end at 10:15.

If you wish to attend, please R.S.V.P. by telephone to Trent Perrotto at  
202-232-7500.

---

A A P O R N E T <aapornet@usc.edu>

---

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Date: Fri, 27 Sep 2002 17:56:27 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: London Rally to Protest Iraq Action (Audrey Woods, WashPost)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209271754040.24565-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit



X-MIME-Autoconverted: from QUOTED-PRINTABLE to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id g8S0uSI00729

POLLING ABSTRACT

Large sections of the British public appear doubtful about the government's Iraq policy. A Guardian/ICM poll published Sept. 16 found opposition to removing Saddam through military action was at 40 percent, down from 50 percent three weeks earlier. The "don't knows" had increased from 17 percent to 24 percent. Support for an attack rose from 33 percent to 36 percent. A MORI poll for ITV News on Wednesday said 70 percent of Britons oppose their country joining U.S.-led military action, but that 71 percent would support it if it were backed by the United Nations.

---

(C) 2002 The Washington Post Company

---

[www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A6118-2002Sep26](http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A6118-2002Sep26)

Thursday, September 26, 2002; 1:01 PM

London Rally to Protest Iraq Action

By Audrey Woods  
Associated Press Writer

LONDON -- As Prime Minister Tony Blair tries to rally support for possible military action against Iraq, dissenters in his own party have called on the British public to join a massive London anti-war protest this weekend.

The Stop the War Coalition hopes to rally 100,000 marchers to the protest on Saturday. "An enormous demonstration on 28 September can make Tony Blair think again," the group said.

In other European nations where governments have made clear their opposition to U.S. action without United Nations support, there has been little public protest. The anti-globalization movement, however, has taken up the anti-Iraq war banner and will wave it at demonstrations planned in Italy in October and November.

Widespread German opposition to a war against Iraq has been channeled through Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder's successful electoral campaign, not onto the streets, as he repeatedly ruled out German support for an assault.

Blair has been the strongest ally of President Bush, but some of the most vocal opponents of U.S. policy are legislators from the prime minister's Labor Party. Some of his Cabinet ministers have voiced reservations about the U.S. determination to achieve a "regime change" in Baghdad.

Saturday's march could be a delicate moment for Blair.

"There is some risk, of which the government must be aware, that a very strong expression of anti-war feeling could embolden Saddam Hussein and could make it more difficult to get a peaceful solution through weapons inspection and dismantlement," said Sir Adam Roberts, professor of international relations at Oxford University.

Even if the protest draws 100,000 people, that would still be a fourth as many as marched last weekend to oppose a ban on fox hunting and to highlight other rural issues. A protest against attacking Iraq drew several thousand people in London in March -- police put the crowd at 7,500, but organizers claimed 20,000.

Blair's publication on Tuesday of a dossier of evidence alleging that Iraq has stockpiled chemical and biological weapons, and is trying to develop nuclear arms, has not blunted opposition from the restive left wing of the party.

Laborite Alan Simpson called the dossier "deeply flawed."

"Sadly, I think Bush will hit Iraq in much the same way that a drunk will hit a bottle," Simpson said. "He needs to satisfy his thirst for power and for oil."

Parliament member George Galloway, whose visits to Iraq and dogged opposition to U.N. sanctions have earned him the nickname "the MP for Baghdad West," let loose another warning on Wednesday.

"If Bush lands half-a-million boots in Iraq, attached only to American feet and cheered only by (Israel Prime Minister) Gen. Ariel Sharon, he will end up marching through hell and many a Yankee Doodle Dandy will be going home in a plastic suit," Galloway said. "The wrath of the Arab masses will come pouring off the streets of their capitals like molten lava and who knows who will be scorched."

Simpson and Galloway are leading members of the Stop the War Coalition, which is co-organizing Saturday's anti-war protest with the Muslim Association of Britain. Speakers at the rally include London Mayor Ken Livingstone and former weapons inspector Scott Ritter.

Large sections of the British public appear doubtful about the government's Iraq policy.

A Guardian/ICM poll published Sept. 16 found opposition to removing Saddam through military action was at 40 percent, down from 50 percent three weeks earlier. The "don't know" had increased from 17 percent to 24 percent. Support for an attack rose from 33 percent to 36 percent.

A MORI poll for ITV News on Wednesday said 70 percent of Britons oppose their country joining U.S.-led military action, but that 71 percent would support it if it were backed by the United Nations.

-----

Stop the War Coalition, <http://www.stopwar.org.uk>

i;½ 2002 The Associated Press

www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A6118-2002Sep26

-----  
(C) 2002 The Washington Post Company  
-----

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Fri, 27 Sep 2002 19:09:00 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Frustrated US Muslims Feel Marginalized Again (T Watanabe, LATimes)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209271843080.24565-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

POLLING ABSTRACT

Polls show that although Americans have gained familiarity with Islam, their increased knowledge has not led to greater approval. In a recent Los Angeles Times poll, 37% of those surveyed said they had a negative impression of Islam, compared with 28% whose impression was favorable. While those surveyed had a more positive impression of American Muslims than of their faith, roughly a quarter said they had a negative impression of American Muslims. Politicians appear to be responding to those developments and are shying away from Islamic conferences, Muslim activists say. Not a single national politician appeared at a recent convention of 30,000 Muslims in Washington, D.C., for example. And Americans clearly feel they know more about Islam now than in the past. In 1993, when the Los Angeles Times poll asked Americans their impression of Islam, fully 64% said they did not know enough to have an opinion. Asked again last month, only 34% said they knew too little. That greater knowledge, however, has not improved the overall view that Americans hold of Islam. In the poll a decade ago, 22% had an unfavorable impression of Islam, compared to 14% with a favorable view--a margin virtually identical to the one in the recent poll. The Times poll showed that unfavorable impressions of Muslims are stronger among Republicans than among either Democrats or political independents. Among evangelical Christians, such influential leaders as evangelist Franklin Graham and the Rev. Jerry Vines, former president of the 16-million-member Southern Baptist Convention, have sharply criticized Islam in recent months. In remarks that made national headlines, Vines called Muhammad a "demon-possessed pedophile," and Graham has repeatedly portrayed Islam as an evil and violent religion.

-----  
Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times

September 27 2002

Frustrated U.S. Muslims Feel Marginalized Again

By TERESA WATANABE

TIMES STAFF WRITER

A year after the Sept. 11 attacks, American Muslim leaders increasingly fear their community is being pushed to the margins of the American political system.

"On the political scene, we are back to square one," said Hussam Ayloush of the Council on American-Islamic Relations. "In general, there is a fear that associating too closely with Muslims could be a liability."

Until the attacks, Muslims had been making steady gains in moving into the American mainstream. Muslims were just beginning to win appointments to government commissions. Politicians were knocking on the doors of their mosques, asking for support. Muslims were becoming politically emboldened to run for office themselves--producing 700 candidates for local, state and federal offices in 2000, according to Agha Saeed of the American Muslim Alliance.

In the weeks directly following the attacks, it seemed possible that trend would continue. National leaders, following the lead of President Bush, insisted that the U.S. war on terror should not become an occasion for turning against the nation's Muslims. And many Muslims say that ordinary Americans have reached out to them since the attacks--church members who offered to guard an Islamic school, women who donned head scarves to escort Muslim women on errands, casual acquaintances who have become friends.

Since January, however, the landscape has shifted.

Evidence of a hardening of attitudes against Muslims--at least on the part of some Americans--comes in several forms. So far this year, more than 20 books on the "Islamic menace" have been published. Two of those books are the best-selling titles among 7,219 books on Islam at Amazon.com: "American Jihad: The Terrorists Among Us," by Steven Emerson, and "Militant Islam Reaches America," by Daniel Pipes.

Leading figures among evangelical Christian denominations have made a series of public statements denouncing Islam as an evil.

And polls show that although Americans have gained familiarity with Islam, their increased knowledge has not led to greater approval. In a recent Los Angeles Times poll, 37% of those surveyed said they had a negative impression of Islam, compared with 28% whose impression was favorable.

While those surveyed had a more positive impression of American Muslims than of their faith, roughly a quarter said they had a negative impression of American Muslims.

Politicians appear to be responding to those developments and are shying away from Islamic conferences, Muslim activists say. Not a single national politician appeared at a recent convention of 30,000 Muslims in Washington, D.C., for example. Najee Ali, an activist with Project Islamic Hope, said one member of Congress even told him she would be in a photo with him only on the condition that it did not appear in any Muslim newspaper.

Muslim activists say the ostracism extends to the White House, where Bush met with a group of leaders shortly after the attacks, then went nearly a year before seeing any of them again.

Although Salam Al-Marayati of the Muslim Public Affairs Council called the recent meeting a useful "steppingstone" to reopen dialogue, the perceived snub came as a disappointment to activists in major Muslim organizations who had high hopes for political inclusion and impact when they gave Bush their first-ever coordinated presidential endorsement in 2000.

The dicey political environment has drastically reduced the number of Muslims running for political office this year--only about 100, one-seventh of the number two years ago, Saeed said.

The recent arrests of six Muslims in New York on charges of supporting terrorism and the 17-hour detention of three Muslim medical students in Florida on suspicion of terrorism have only added to the American Islamic community's worries.

To critics, the New York arrests amplified fears of an Islamic "fifth column" in America, while many Muslims see the Florida men, who were later released, as evidence of injustices caused by paranoia.

"The tragedy," said Aslam Abdullah of the Los Angeles-based Minaret magazine, "is that American Muslims were working so hard to be accepted as equal citizens, and now all of a sudden they find they have to prove their loyalty all over again."

American Muslims remain a small minority group; estimates have ranged from about 2 million to 7 million. Educating Americans about their faith has been a priority for Muslim activists.

The attacks clearly have increased the amount of information Americans have about Islam and its American followers. Books about the religion have become bestsellers; college courses have sprung up nationwide.

At the Islamic Society's national headquarters in Plainville, Ind., Sayyid Syeed said his speaking engagements last September topped 100, compared to 15 or so in a normal month, and hits on his organization's Web site have tripled to 3 million a month. In Southern California, Ayloush said the normally insular Muslim community has staged more than 70 open houses, interfaith events and other activities.

And Americans clearly feel they know more about Islam now than in the

past. In 1993, when the Los Angeles Times poll asked Americans their impression of Islam, fully 64% said they did not know enough to have an opinion. Asked again last month, only 34% said they knew too little.

That greater knowledge, however, has not improved the overall view that Americans hold of Islam. In the poll a decade ago, 22% had an unfavorable impression of Islam, compared to 14% with a favorable view--a margin virtually identical to the one in the recent poll.

Many Muslim activists blame what one called "a troika of evangelical Christians, right-wing conservatives and the pro-Israel lobby" for their plight.

Indeed, the Times poll showed that unfavorable impressions of Muslims are stronger among Republicans than among either Democrats or political independents.

Among evangelical Christians, such influential leaders as evangelist Franklin Graham and the Rev. Jerry Vines, former president of the 16-million-member Southern Baptist Convention, have sharply criticized Islam in recent months. In remarks that made national headlines, Vines called Muhammad a "demon-possessed pedophile," and Graham has repeatedly portrayed Islam as an evil and violent religion.

Islam, a monotheistic faith established by the Prophet Muhammad in Arabia in the 7th century, shares common roots with Judaism and Christianity. But negative perceptions of Islam have long been a current in some Christian churches and appear to be shared by many born-again Christians.

"Until a year ago, most evangelical Christians saw Islam as a problem because we believe it to be a false religion," said Richard Land of the Southern Baptists' ethics and religious liberty commission. "What's happened since 9/11 is that evangelical Christians as a community have become far more aware of the radicalization of significant elements of the Islamic population and the direct threat that represents to Western civilization and freedom of conscience."

Like a host of faith and political leaders, Land called on moderate Muslims to more aggressively denounce their extremist elements. Such calls, however, frustrate Muslim activists, who produce long lists of statements of condemnation they've made and wearily ask what more is demanded.

Many Muslims say they have found greater acceptance among ordinary Americans than among political or religious leaders.

That dichotomy is evident even in the Bible Belt, in places like Greenville, Texas, where Southern Baptist congregations thickly dot the landscape. Here, the Rev. Sam Douglass recently invited a Muslim convert to Christianity to give testimony to several hundred members of his Ridgecrest Baptist Church on how he had been saved by Jesus. Afterward, Douglass expounded on his own view of Islam, a faith he said he studied during years as a campus minister.

"The faith of Islam does not respect the value of human life as Christians do," declared Douglass. Stressing that he loves Muslim

people, Douglass said the faith itself "is a threat to anyone they can label an infidel, and that means that anyone not part of the Muslim world is in danger."

But sitting in his congregation, Gene and Karen Rhodes, both born-again Christians, were skeptical of the peril Douglass perceived. The couple said they had known nothing about Islam until meeting a visiting Muslim student four months ago. They quickly agreed to disagree about faith and put the matter aside, Karen Rhodes said; since then, what began as a shared professional interest in special education and children blossomed into a deep personal friendship that the couple says now feels like family.

The Rhodes say they have frequently invited their Muslim friend to their home for dinner, even throwing a birthday party for him--despite efforts by some of their Christian friends to dissuade them from the relationship.

"I have trouble believing Islam is violent," said Gene Rhodes, a specialist in special education. "Our friend is gentle, and doesn't promote violence. If he is representative of Muslims, they are quality people."

Muslims like Gail Kennard, manager of a Los Angeles architectural firm, say they are reaching out to their neighbors. The terrorist attacks prompted her non-Muslim colleagues to begin asking about her faith for the first time, Kennard said. The questions were surprisingly basic, with inquiries such as "Do Muslims believe in God?" and "Do Muslims believe in heaven?" (Yes and yes). Prompted by the experiences, she invited non-Muslim friends to a Ramadan fast-breaking meal for the first time last year.

"I realized how misunderstood we have been and that we have a responsibility to educate our fellow citizens about our values and heritage," Kennard said.

Among the Muslim community's new friends is Japanese American activist Kathy Masaoka of Nikkei for Civil Rights and Redress. Listening to the radio after the terrorist attacks, Masaoka said fears expressed by Muslims struck an instant emotional chord, reminding her of her own family's ordeals after Pearl Harbor. Two weeks after Sept. 11, she helped organize a candlelight vigil for the victims of terror and to express support for innocent Muslims, Arabs and South Asians. Since then, she has helped form a committee to forge friendships with her community through picnics, dinners, cultural exchanges and Buddhist-Muslim dialogues.

"I don't think they should have to feel responsible for all of the actions done by others from other countries who don't represent them," Masaoka said, adding that her Muslim friends have shown her a faith of compassion and good deeds. "We weren't responsible for Pearl Harbor, and we don't have to prove our loyalty any more than anyone else. They shouldn't have to, either."

The contrast between the ostracism on the political level and the often-positive encounters among individuals has led many Muslim activists to argue for a shift in where their organizations put their

political energy.

Abdullah, for instance, envisions a new phase of American Muslim activism focused on showcasing Islam's best ideals of justice and compassion through involvement in broader community issues of crime, homelessness and poverty.

Activists like Ayloush say they already have made the switch, spending far more time on community events than traditional political ones. "Gaining acceptance in America won't come through ad campaigns or meetings with elected officials," Ayloush said. "It's by winning the minds, hearts and trust of our neighbors."

[www.latimes.com/news/custom/timespoll/la-me-muslim27sep27.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/custom/timespoll/la-me-muslim27sep27.story)

---

Copyright 2002 Los Angeles Times

---

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Sat, 28 Sep 2002 17:21:08 EDT  
From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com  
Subject: Re: need some reaction  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="part1\_14e.14e0c28d.2ac77744\_boundary"  
X-Mailer: AOL 7.0 for Windows US sub 10638

--part1\_14e.14e0c28d.2ac77744\_boundary  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I very definitely agree. Perhaps someone can shed additional light. I think SurveyUSA simply asks the person who answers who they would vote for if they were in the voting booth TODAY. I don't think they have a pause feature so the answerer can put mommy or some other eligible voter on the phone.

Worse yet, a TV station in our market has analysis on its website of the 630 "voters" it contact, claiming that minorities are the swing group for this election. Now, keep in mind, that 2% of Iowans are black, 3% Hispanic. By population, that would be 13 and 19 people, respectively. Big surprise that their numbers changed from the last poll. But, hold on . . . they went further to say that those in the "other" category showed the biggest swing of all.

It's not credible research. And journalists who know enough not to report comments from sources they know not to be credible should not report poll findings that cannot be shown to be credible.



J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
Selzer & Company, Inc.  
Des Moines

In a message dated 9/27/2002 7:46:50 AM Central Daylight Time,  
langley@uky.edu writes:

>  
> Steve:  
> Others may disagree, but my opinion is that the methodology produced the  
> results and you should not release them. (In my opinion) people that will  
> respond to such auto-dialed recorded message are by nature different than  
> the general public, despite the apparent demographic representativeness. A  
> local media outlet (Lexington, KY) also contracted with Survey USA and  
> provided survey results that did not make sense and contradicted other  
> reputable polls. When I saw these results I visited Survey USA's web  
site,  
>  
> and while their description of the methodology is terse, it is clear that  
> they specialize in overnight polls which I would argue by definition are  
> not representative. Regardless of how the original sample is drawn, if you  
> dial a number once and then throw it out if you do not happen to get  
anyone  
>  
> to answer, what you really have at the end of the day is a convenience  
> sample of easy to reach respondents and not a true random sample.  
>  
> As to the apparent demographic representativeness, it is not clear from  
> your message whether the UNweighted results were representative? The  
> SurveyUSA web site indicates that their results are weighted to make them  
> look representative.  
>  
> Also, when I see results that are that much different from other recent  
> results, I first wonder about the question wording.  
>  
> Ron Langley  
>  
>

--part1\_14e.14e0c28d.2ac77744\_boundary  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

```
* * * * *  
*          ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED---          *  
*      This post contains a forbidden message format      *  
* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) *  
*      This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT  *  
* If your postings display this message your mail program *  
* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting *  
* * * * *
```

--part1\_14e.14e0c28d.2ac77744\_boundary--

=====

Date: Sat, 28 Sep 2002 14:58:08 -0700 (PDT)  
From: James Beniger <beniger@almaak.usc.edu>  
Subject: Fewer US Teens Becoming Sexually Active (CDC)  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Message-id: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0209281457060.23298-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

---

Copyright © 2002 Yahoo! Inc.

---

story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story2  
&cid=571&u=/nm/20020926/hl\_nm/teens\_active\_dc\_1

Sat, Sep 28, 2002

Fewer U.S. Teens Becoming Sexually Active: CDC

Thu Sep 26, 1:29 PM ET

NEW YORK (Reuters Health) - The percentage of sexually active US high school students has declined over the past 10 years, as have certain risky sexual behaviors, according to a government report. Yet too many teens are still taking risks that leave them vulnerable to sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) and unwanted pregnancy, report researchers at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) in Atlanta, Georgia.

Between 1991 and 2001, the number of high school students who had ever had sex fell, with steady declines among male and female and black and white teens. In 1991, 54% of high schoolers surveyed by the CDC said they'd had sex. By 2001, that percentage was less than 46%, according to results published in the CDC's Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report for September 27.

Among African-American teens, the percentage who had ever had sex dropped from about 81% in 1991 to less than 61% 10 years later. Half of white students in 1991 had had sex, compared with about 43% in 2001.

And in a finding that might come as an unwelcome surprise to parents, a separate report issued by the nonprofit group Child Trends found that the majority of teens have their first sexual experience in the family home.

"Half of teens experienced their first sexual intercourse in their family home (22%) or their partner's family home (34%)," the group reports, basing their findings on 1997 data from the US government's National Longitudinal Survey of Youth. Teens were most likely to report either evening or nighttime (6 PM to 7 AM) as the time at which they first had intercourse.

However, according to the CDC, more students in 2001 said they had used a condom during their last sexual intercourse compared with 1991 figures. More than half of Hispanic and white students said they had used a condom, as did more than two-thirds of black students. And fewer students overall reported having four or more lifetime sex partners.

Still, "too many youth remain at risk" for STDs and unintended pregnancy, according to the CDC.

"Despite decreases in some sexual risk behaviors, efforts to prevent sexual risk behaviors will need to be intensified," agency officials write.

Of particular concern was the finding that the percentage of teens drinking or using drugs before sex rose during the study period--from roughly 22% to 26%. "Interventions are needed" to reverse this trend, according to the CDC.

The agency credits school programs aimed at preventing HIV and other STDs, as well as parents, the media, and community and religious groups, for the recent declines in sexual activity and risky sex among teens.

-----

SOURCE: Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report 2002;51:856-859.

Copyright © 2002 Reuters Limited

-----  
Copyright © 2002 Yahoo! Inc.  
-----

\*\*\*\*\*

=====  
Date: Sun, 29 Sep 2002 00:40:42 -0400  
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>  
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.79 [en] (Windows NT 5.0; U)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>, AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Kohut on difficulties of polling about war  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Today's Washington Post contains the following thoughtful commentary on why it is difficult to determine through polls whether or not the public supports war with Iraq.

Jan Werner  
jwerner@jwdp.com

-----  
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A13977-2002Sep27.html>

-----  
Simply Put, The Public's View Can't Be Put Simply

By Andrew Kohut

Sunday, September 29, 2002; Page B05

Ask a pollster if there is public support for war with Iraq and the answer is likely to be "yes." Ask reporters doing man-in-the-street interviews or traveling around the country, and they are likely to say "no." As New York Times columnist Tom Friedman wrote on Sept. 18, "Don't believe the polls that a majority of Americans favor a military strike against Iraq. It is just not true."

Who's right here? From my vantage point, they both are. And therein lies the problem -- and the challenge -- in understanding the public's will on this important issue.

Public opinion about a potential war with Iraq does not lend itself to an easy thumbs-up, thumbs-down characterization. Almost all national surveys this year have found a broad base of potential support for using military force to rid the world of Saddam Hussein. In mid-September, for example, the Pew Research Center found that 64 percent favor taking military action to end the Iraqi president's rule. But when pollsters go beyond this initial question, they find lots of qualifications and caveats. Respondents' concerns about the lack of allied backing and the prospect of heavy casualties reduce general support levels dramatically.

Complicating the picture further, as many as four in 10 Americans still have not seriously considered the issue of war with Iraq. The polls also find that Americans may not ultimately judge a war with Iraq only on the basis of an initial military victory. For all that, there appears to be enough potential backing for President Bush to successfully sell war to the American public, as his father did 11 years ago. But he hasn't closed the deal.

Such a complex picture of public opinion is not what headline writers long for, nor is it easy material for the cable chat-show circuit. Press references rarely go beyond something along the lines of "the latest polls show a majority of Americans support a possible invasion of Iraq." So it's little wonder that both sides in the debate about Iraq have laid claim to public backing for their point of view.

The basis for potential backing for a war in Iraq stems from the strong support for the use of military force following the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks. In contrast, the public kicked and screamed about every intervention by the Clinton administration, whether in the distant Balkans or nearby Haiti. The Clinton White House got as much support as could be hoped for the air war in Kosovo, but over the short course of that campaign, Clinton's approval ratings fell more than they did over the entire span of the Monica Lewinsky scandal.

The attacks of Sept. 11 changed all that. Support for a defense spending hike hit a 25-year high, fueled by female support, as the once yawning gender gap on military issues narrowed significantly. More than 70 percent of men and women backed sending troops to Afghanistan, even

at the risk of casualties. And our polling has found that 58 percent of the public supports combating terrorism by using military force against countries attempting to develop nuclear weapons.

Given the new public mandate -- protect us -- it is not surprising that the idea of military action against Saddam Hussein has gotten such a positive reaction over the past year. He's a bad guy from a dangerous part of the world who wants to do us harm, say Americans. The latest CBS News national poll found that 77 percent think Hussein already possesses weapons of mass destruction, 61 percent believe he wants to use them against us and 51 percent say he was involved in the Sept. 11 attacks.

In the first polls after 9/11, support for using force against Iraq was at the 70 percent level. It fell to the low fifties in August, when some prominent Republicans voiced their concerns. However, public support has since rebounded: An average of this month's major national poll results finds more than 60 percent backing military action.

At the same time, the polls consistently find less than majority support when a tag line such as "even if it means thousands of casualties" is added to the question. This is a bit of an unfair test, because most of these questions mention only the cost of a war, not the benefit that might be achieved by such national sacrifice. It is always difficult to predict how the public will react to actual casualties. On the one hand, Americans know that war inevitably risks the lives of soldiers and civilians, and this is implicit in support for military action. On the other, they have grown accustomed to light American losses in military engagements.

The lack of allied backing is an even bigger drain on support for the use of force than the prospect of casualties. Our most recent poll found that 64 percent generally favor military action against Iraq, but that withers to 33 percent if our allies do not join us.

The first President Bush faced the same challenge, but turned public opinion to his favor with the November 1990 U.N. Security Council resolution demanding an Iraqi pullout from Kuwait. Prior to that resolution, Gallup found just 37 percent of the public favored going to war with Iraq. After the decision, majorities of the public favored going to war in every Gallup survey. Indeed, by January 1991 the only public tension was not over whether to go, but when.

It is unlikely that this President Bush will persuade the public to go to war without a coalition of traditional allies. In fact, the importance of the United Nations was underscored by public reaction to Bush's U.N. speech earlier this month. After his appearance there, the percentage of Americans who think that he has explained clearly what's at stake for the United States in Iraq rose from 37 percent to 52 percent. This was a step in the right direction for the president, but it still pales in comparison with the 77 percent who thought his father had a clear rationale for using force against Iraq in the fall of 1990.

While the current President Bush's approach is a work in progress, so is the public's thinking. Since his U.N. speech, an increasing number of respondents say they have thought a great deal about the issue -- 55 percent, up from 46 percent in August. But that is still below the 66

percent who had given careful thought to the question of war or peace on the eve of the Gulf War.

Part of this deliberative process may well raise the question of what will constitute a successful outcome in Iraq. We were surprised when our Sept. 11 anniversary polling found that, despite the quick rout of the Taliban in Afghanistan, relatively few Americans described that war as a success; fully 70 percent said it is too early to tell. Accordingly, two-thirds of our respondents believed we should keep forces in Afghanistan to maintain the peace. And a growing majority think that the U.S. will have to help rebuild the country.

No doubt, many Americans have the same vision of the end game in Iraq should U.S. forces quickly dispatch Hussein's troops. Both CBS and Pew surveys find Americans expecting that, unlike the Gulf War, the U.S. involvement in Iraq will be lengthy.

Al Gore and Tom Daschle's vocal criticism this past week of the Bush policy may encourage further public reflection and help influence how America makes up its mind in coming months. So far, a plurality of the public believes that Congress has asked too few questions about Bush's intentions. A dozen years ago, support for the Persian Gulf War deepened following a sometimes contentious debate. Today's polls do agree on one point: A conflicted public would welcome a comparable airing of the pros and cons of the Bush administration's Iraq policy.

Andrew Kohut is director of the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press.

© 2002 The Washington Post Company

-----

=====  
Date: Sun, 29 Sep 2002 11:52:34 -0400  
Subject: WP: Simply Put, The Public's View Can't Be Put Simply  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3  
Message-ID:  
<2B415613DF0BA44F98C54F828F9D0F9604A078@CMPA01.smallbusiness.local>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Howard Fienberg" <HFienberg@stats.org>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from base64 to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g8TFrfI09906

Simply Put, The Public's View Can't Be Put Simply

By Andrew Kohut  
Sunday, September 29, 2002; Page B05

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A13977-2002Sep27.html>>

Ask a pollster if there is public support for war with Iraq and the answer

is likely to be "yes." Ask reporters doing man-in-the-street interviews or traveling around the country, and they are likely to say "no." As New York Times columnist Tom Friedman wrote on Sept. 18, "Don't believe the polls that a majority of Americans favor a military strike against Iraq. It is just not true."

Who's right here? From my vantage point, they both are. And therein lies the problem -- and the challenge -- in understanding the public's will on this important issue.

---

Date: Sun, 29 Sep 2002 23:55:50 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@bellsouth.net>  
Subject: latest poll update Post-ABC Poll: War on Terrorism; Action on Iraq  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

For the latest poll update Post-ABC Poll: War on Terrorism; Action on Iraq Dated Saturday, September 28, 2002 click on:

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/polls/vault/stories/data092702.htm>

---

Date: Mon, 30 Sep 2002 00:18:54 -0600  
Subject: RE: need some reaction  
Message-ID: <E7845AD819F4284DA94DAC70E7BE4071365301@strong.byu.edu>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Quin Monson" <jqm5@ad.byu.edu>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id g8U6IuI13147

An additional reason to believe that the Survey USA numbers are suspect is that they are inconsistent with all of the other contemporary polling done in the Minnesota Senate race. Below are the numbers from polls conducted during September 2002 that are listed in the Polling Report. All of them have the race within the margin of sampling error. If you look at all of the polls done in the Minnesota Senate race over the past \*two years\* that are listed on the Polling Report web page, even polls conducted in early 2001 had the match up between Coleman and Wellstone dead even. Even if there were not any doubts about the methodology employed, the fact that the Survey USA numbers are so far off from everything else would give me pause about reporting them. Given the results below and the fact that the race has been very close for months on end, I would find it very difficult to believe that one of the candidates had actually pulled ahead by 15 points in anyone's survey.

If I were the manager at the TV station I would not run this story. However, perhaps Survey USA should make their numbers public and also take

the flack that will follow. A quick look at Survey USA's web site (<http://www.surveyusa.com>) shows that they make a big deal out of comparing their work to other polling firms as well as the final election results. They say, "SurveyUSA's public opinion polling work stands every day alongside the best work done by the largest and most prestigious research firms in the country."

To see their comparisons, go to the section labeled "Public Opinion" (<http://www.surveyusa.com/polling.html>) and then click on the tab at the top of the page labeled "Competition" ([http://www.surveyusa.com/polling\\_compet.html](http://www.surveyusa.com/polling_compet.html)) and also try the link on the left side labeled "Track Record" (<http://www.surveyusa.com/trackrecord.html>).

I also found a couple of interesting things about Survey USA on line. For a pretty good summary of some of the methodological issues involved see "Dialing Up a Controversy: Survey USA's Proud of Its Work, but Critics Question Methodology" from the August 1, 2002 issue of Roll Call. (<http://www.rollcall.com/pages/politics/00/2002/08/pol0801c.html>)

Also see this press release issued by the Bob Torricelli campaign in July 2002. They don't call him "the Torch" for nothing. (<http://www.politicsnj.com/torricelli072402.htm>). I imagine releasing their Minnesota numbers would generate similar criticism from one of the Minnesota candidates.

September 2002 MN Senate polls:

MSNBC/Zogby  
Coleman 47  
Wellstone 41

Star Tribune  
Coleman 42  
Wellstone 46

Mason/Dixon  
Coleman 44  
Wellstone 47

Public Opinion Strategies (for Coleman)  
Coleman 44  
Wellstone 40

Quin Monson  
Assistant Director  
Center for the Study of Elections and Democracy  
Brigham Young University  
112 KMB  
Provo, UT 84602  
phone (801) 422-8017  
fax (801) 422-0579  
<http://csed.byu.edu>  
email: [Quin.Monson@byu.edu](mailto:Quin.Monson@byu.edu)



> -----Original Message-----  
> From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com [mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com]  
> Sent: Saturday, September 28, 2002 3:21 PM  
> To: aapornet@usc.edu  
> Subject: Re: need some reaction  
>  
> I very definitely agree. Perhaps someone can shed additional light. I  
> think  
> SurveyUSA simply asks the person who answers who they would vote for if  
> they  
> were in the voting booth TODAY. I don't think they have a pause feature  
> so  
> the answerer can put mommy or some other eligible voter on the phone.  
>  
> Worse yet, a TV station in our market has analysis on its website of the  
> 630  
> "voters" in contact, claiming that minorities are the swing group for this  
> election. Now, keep in mind, that 2% of Iowans are black, 3% Hispanic.  
> By  
> population, that would be 13 and 19 people, respectively. Big surprise  
> that  
> their numbers changed from the last poll. But, hold on . . . they went  
> further to say that those in the "other" category showed the biggest swing  
> of  
> all.  
>  
> It's not credible research. And journalists who know enough not to report  
> comments from sources they know not to be credible should not report poll  
> findings that cannot be shown to be credible.  
>  
> J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
> Selzer & Company, Inc.  
> Des Moines  
>  
> In a message dated 9/27/2002 7:46:50 AM Central Daylight Time,  
> langley@uky.edu writes:  
>  
>  
>  
> > Steve:  
> > Others may disagree, but my opinion is that the methodology produced the  
> > results and you should not release them. (In my opinion) people that  
> > will  
> > respond to such auto-dialed recorded message are by nature different  
> > than  
> > the general public, despite the apparent demographic representativeness.  
> > A  
> > local media outlet (Lexington, KY) also contracted with Survey USA and  
> > provided survey results that did not make sense and contradicted other  
> > reputable polls. When I saw these results I visited Survey USA's web  
> > site,  
> >  
> > and while their description of the methodology is terse, it is clear  
> > that  
> > they specialize in overnight polls which I would argue by definition are  
> > not representative. Regardless of how the original sample is drawn, if  
> > you

> > dial a number once and then throw it out if you do not happen to get  
> anyone  
> >  
> > to answer, what you really have at the end of the day is a convenience  
> > sample of easy to reach respondents and not a true random sample.  
> >  
> > As to the apparent demographic representativeness, it is not clear from  
> > your message whether the UNweighted results were representative? The  
> > SurveyUSA web site indicates that their results are weighted to make  
> them  
> > look representative.  
> >  
> > Also, when I see results that are that much different from other recent  
> > results, I first wonder about the question wording.  
> >  
> > Ron Langley  
> >  
> >

=====  
Date: Mon, 30 Sep 2002 08:28:37 -0400  
Subject:  
Message-ID:  
<0ED62F7DC6311240A5F3A251086F74510FDBCC@gsg-mail01.globalstrategygroup.com>  
X-MS-Has-Attach:  
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:  
From: "Jason Boxt" <jboxt@globalstrategygroup.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g8UCT9I03177

Dick Morris recently wrote a piece bemoaning (perhaps not?) the decline of telephone research as a valid tool moving forward. Of the reasons he listed, however, one is certainly untrue.

Morris writes: "In 28 states, the legislatures have passed laws giving telephone users the right to opt out of receiving telemarketing phone calls, including public opinion surveys. More and more voters are availing themselves of this right, and the pickings for telephone polling firms are getting scarcer and scarcer.

In Connecticut, for example, 29 percent of the state's households have chosen to use the opt-out. These 500,000 people cannot be contacted by America's polling organizations. Five percent of Connecticut households join the ranks of those refusing to take telemarketing calls each year."

A very simple search of the State of Connecticut website reveals this to simply be untrue (though the number of people opting out of telemarketing may be correct, it is false that 500,000 people cannot be reached by polling organizations:

<http://www.state.ct.us/dcp/nocall.htm>

>From the CT "No Call" legislation (see number 6):

A law passed by the Connecticut General Assembly took effect on January 1, 2001 allowing consumers to place their names on a "No Call" list maintained by the Department of Consumer Protection, if they choose not to receive telephone solicitations. Businesses located both in and outside Connecticut will be prohibited from calling people on the "No Call" list and from including consumer's names on marketing lists compiled for sale to others. The law also prohibits businesses from blocking the caller ID feature on your telephone and from re-selling your name to other solicitors.

There are exemptions from the "No Call" policy. They are calls made:

- 1) with the consumer's prior express written or verbal permission;
- 2) in response to a consumer's visit to an establishment with a fixed location;
- 3) primarily in connection with an existing debt or contract that has not been paid or performed;
- 4) to an existing customer;
- 5) from a business that first began to do business in this state on or after January 1, 2001, that has operated in this state for less than one year;
- 6) for a non-commercial purpose, such as a poll or survey;
- 7) by a tax-exempt, non-profit organization and
- 8) by telephone companies, compiling their own directories.

This is not to say that market researchers and political pollsters must be vigilant when conducting research; this is simply to point out that reporting the untimely death of telephone polling may be somewhat premature.

Jason Boxt

Vice President  
Global Strategy Group  
1825 Connecticut Ave, NW  
Fifth Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20009

(202) 265-4676  
(202) 265-4619 (fax)

[www.globalstrategygroup.com](http://www.globalstrategygroup.com)

---

Date: Mon, 30 Sep 2002 13:04:18 -0400  
From: "Jay Leve" <jleve@surveyusa.com>  
To: "aapornet aapornet" <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: SurveyUSA Responds

Message-ID: <CHEIJDEKMLAFDEIEJNAFGEJIECAA.jleve@surveyusa.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
 charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000

I'm Jay Leve, the editor of SurveyUSA.

A number of you have expressed concerns about SurveyUSA's methodology following a recent post by Professor Stephen Frank, of St. Cloud State University. Here is my response:

Since inception in 1992, SurveyUSA has forecast the outcome of 397 separate election contests. Many of you also polled on these same contests. SurveyUSA has assembled what we believe to be an exhaustive accounting of how SurveyUSA's final pre-election poll in all 397 contests compared to the final poll of all known competing pollsters, and to the actual election outcome.

7 members of my staff, led by Joseph Shipman, PhD, SurveyUSA's Director of Election Polling, worked on compiling this comparative document for several months. Because thousands of polls were catalogued, and because SurveyUSA was working from published media accounts, not necessarily from the competing pollster's original source material, it is possible an error or omission may be discovered. If you find one, bring it to my attention. We believe our document to be balanced and exhaustive. Here's where to find it: <http://www.surveyusa.com/Reax/eleypollbyfreq.doc>

SurveyUSA conducts telephone research. It replaces the headset operator in the call center with the recorded voice of a professional announcer, often a TV anchor. The respondent answers questions by pressing keys on his/her touchtone phone. The other parts of the research process are largely the same.

Election polling is one part of our media polling business, and media polling is one part of our research business. We also conduct market research for the largest companies in America, either as a full-service supplier, or as a data-collection facility hired by a larger market research firm. Altogether, we have completed approximately 11,000 distinct research projects. Here's a representative list of the companies for whom we have done full-service research and/or subcontracted data collection: <http://www.surveyusa.com/Reax/SUSAclients0402.doc>

Some of you wonder whether it is possible to obtain a representative sample using our methodology; others wonder about mode effects of using IVR. Consider the following study, which was conducted by The NPD Group in 1999 (before NPD was acquired by IPSOS; IPSOS-NPD is now the nation's 12th largest market research firm). NPD's research-on-research study included 90,000 interviews. <http://www.surveyusa.com/Reax/WhitePaper0699.doc>

Some of you wonder about SurveyUSA's response rates. SurveyUSA publishes its response rates on its website; to my knowledge, we are the only research company to do this; correct me please if your firm does. To find

the industry's reported response rates, refusal rates and cooperation rates, look here:

[http://www.mra-net.org/docs/resources/coop\\_rates/coop\\_rates\\_avg.cfm](http://www.mra-net.org/docs/resources/coop_rates/coop_rates_avg.cfm) To see SurveyUSA's rates, look here: [http://surveyusa.com/trackrec\\_resprates.html](http://surveyusa.com/trackrec_resprates.html)

Now, on to the posts of the past 96 hours:

J. Ann Selzer expresses concern about a SurveyUSA poll on the Iowa governor's race, released by SurveyUSA on 9/25/02, as reported by our Des Moines client, WHO-TV. SurveyUSA stands by its research, which we believe to be sound. That said, I contacted Selzer and told her I share her concern at how this data was reported by our client, which drew unsupportable conclusions, and I will speak to the client. SurveyUSA includes the following language in its poll results, to prevent the problem Selzer identifies: "Exercise extreme caution in drawing conclusions from sub-populations smaller than 100." A copy of exactly what SurveyUSA released to WHO-TV is available here:

<http://www.surveyusa.com/Reax/IA02925govtrack.pdf> For perspective, in the 2000 presidential election, SurveyUSA's data on Gore v Bush in Iowa was the most accurate of competing pollsters.

Professor Ronald Langley of the University of Kentucky writes that a SurveyUSA poll conducted for WLEX-TV in Lexington, KY, "did not make sense and was at odds with reputable pollsters." I contacted the professor to ask which poll that was. The professor said he could not remember the topic or the date. When he does, I'll have further reaction. The professor wonders if SurveyUSA reattempts numbers that result in a busy signal or no answer. We do. Reattempts are made intraday and (on studies that run across multiple days) interday. The field period on SurveyUSA election polls is typically 3 days, though sometimes 2 and sometimes 4.

Joe Lenski of Edison Media Research, in New Jersey, brings to your attention that SurveyUSA got the Newark Mayor's election wrong in April 2002. True. SurveyUSA was the only pollster to work the race (others declined), so SurveyUSA had both the worst and best data in that race.

Lenski does not tell you about SurveyUSA's other work in New Jersey. SurveyUSA was the most accurate of 6 pollsters in the November 2001 NJ Governor's election. And, SurveyUSA was the only pollster in 1993 that said Christine Whitman would unseat incumbent Jim Florio.

Lenski separately states that a different company, Rasmussen Research, which has no affiliation with SurveyUSA and never has (the two firms have been incorrectly linked on AAPORnet previously), was inaccurate in its final nationwide poll in 2000 on Bush v Gore. (Rasmussen Research has since gone out of business.) What Lenski does not tell you is that in 1996, the most accurate nationwide pre-election poll on Clinton v Dole was SurveyUSA's.

Professor Lew Horner of Ohio State University asks if SurveyUSA uses a one-size-fits-all model for voter turnout. We don't.

Professor Frank precipitated the dialogue by posting that he had been contacted by SurveyUSA's client in Minneapolis, KARE-TV, about a poll SurveyUSA did on the U.S. Senate race in Minnesota. There have been four polls released in the past 3 weeks, not counting two taken by SurveyUSA. Of the four released polls: 2 have Coleman up, 2 have Wellstone up. None have

Coleman up as much as SurveyUSA, whose unreleased data is the most current. In data gathered September 19, 20 and 21, SurveyUSA has Coleman up by 12 points. In data gathered September 23, 24 and 25, SurveyUSA has Coleman up by 15 points. My client tells me that Frank is concerned that SurveyUSA has too many independents and not enough Democrats in its sample. For the record, SurveyUSA's 9/22 release was (GOP/Dem/Indy) 32%/34%/33% and SurveyUSA's 9/26 release was 33%/31%/36%. SurveyUSA does not balance to party. Rob Daves' Minnesota Poll asks the party question slightly differently (it appears from his published reports), and finds more Democrats. The VNS 2000 exit poll also found more Democrats than SurveyUSA in Minnesota. We've studied this; we like our numbers. Frank also is concerned that SurveyUSA had seemingly too few undecided voters in its sample. This is a function of how SurveyUSA chooses to ask its "who will you vote for" question, and is true across most of our election polls. We have reviewed how others ask the "who will you vote for" question, and we like the way we ask it. Bottom line: we stand by our research in Minnesota.

Stephen Johnson, of Northwest Survey & Data Services, wonders about the script that was used in Minnesota. It is here:  
<http://www.surveyusa.com/Reax/MNGovSenScript093002.doc>.

Finally, we have Professor Quin Monson of Brigham Young University. Monson joins others in making the argument that because SurveyUSA data in Minnesota is inconsistent with other polling data, the poll should not be released. He supports this in part by citing a press release from Robert Torricelli, US Senator from NJ. The events in NJ bear directly on the discussion in Minnesota, so let's look at NJ. SurveyUSA was the first pollster to show the Torricelli v Forrester race tied, 43% to 43%. Torricelli's spokesman Ken Snyder told our client KYW-TV in Philadelphia that if it aired the poll, no man would be left standing. KYW emailed me, "Put your helmets on. Torricelli is coming after you." Both SurveyUSA's New York City client, WABC-TV and KYW did air the poll. Torricelli's people, and the national Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, who need Torricelli's seat to control the Senate, then began systematically working to discredit SurveyUSA's work. Provocative quotes were fed to Roll Call, the URL for which Monson provides you, and other magazines and Internet sites. Quinnipiac University then released a poll that showed the race: 37% to 37%. Identical. SurveyUSA's most recent poll on this race shows Torricelli down 14 points. At the time it was released, no one else showed the race so lopsided. (3 polls showed the race closer.) Should our clients have withheld SurveyUSA's poll because it disagreed with the competition? They did not. The poll aired in New York and Philadelphia. And again, Torricelli's people eviscerated SurveyUSA. On Saturday, two days ago, The Eagleton Institute polling for the Newark Star Ledger released a poll showing Torricelli down by 13 points. SurveyUSA stands by its research in New Jersey.

It is easy for a politician trailing in a SurveyUSA poll to disparage SurveyUSA and to threaten a SurveyUSA client. Two minutes on any search engine will turn-up the fact that the name SurveyUSA and the expletive "crap" are now inextricably linked. The David Bonior for Governor campaign, waving "crap" citations, issued multiple press releases prior to last month's Michigan primary excoriating SurveyUSA, the last of which said that SurveyUSA produced "garage sale data." SurveyUSA's final poll showed Bonior down 19 points. He lost by 20.

We think the fact that Professor Michael Traugott of the University of

Michigan has repeatedly used an expletive to describe SurveyUSA's work reflects poorly on Traugott. We think the fact that you elected him to be your president reflects poorly on you.

Professor Don Dillman, in his farewell address to AAPOR at the 2002 annual convention, spoke about the need for AAPOR to have a big tent, to find a way for its members to embrace non-traditional methodologies. Dillman urged tolerance and open-mindedness.

A number of you - in particular Professor Terry Madonna of Millersville University, who explicitly advocates the use of the expletive to describe SurveyUSA - want a small tent, closed and restricted, with you on the inside and me and others on the outside. To me, that's not AAPOR. That's AAPORTHEID.

Jay H. Leve  
Editor  
SurveyUSA  
15 Bloomfield Ave  
Verona, NJ 07044

973-857-8500 x 551  
jleve@surveyusa.com

=====  
Date: Mon, 30 Sep 2002 13:08:09 -0400  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMontreal.CA>  
Subject: job posting - Montreal  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by listproc.usc.edu id  
g8UH8FI24954

The Department of Sociology of the Université de Montréal announces a search for full-time tenure track assistant professor position(s) to begin June 1, 2003.

Preference will be given to candidates whose research specialization is in one of the following areas:

- Sociology of Culture with emphasis in particular on information and communication;
- Sociology of Health;
- Sociology of Ethnic Relations and/or Immigration;
- Social Statistics and Quantitative Methodology with emphasis on longitudinal and multi-level analysis.

Description of Work: Teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels; research, supervision of master and doctoral students, Active involvement in a program of research and publication; participation in University activities; service to community.

Qualifications: A Ph.D. in Sociology or in a related field; proof of ability to teach at the university level and to do academic research; publication record.

Interested persons should send applications along with a formal description of their research programme (2-3 pages); a letter of application; a sample of recently published work or research; a curriculum vitae; a complete academic dossier including copy of their diplomas, as well as three letters of recommendation to: Prof. Arnaud Sales, Chair, Departement de Sociologie, Universite de Montreal, C.P. 6128, Succursale Centre-ville, Montreal (Quebec) H3C 3J7 no later than January 6, 2003.

Remuneration: The University of Montreal offers a competitive salary package tied to a complete range of benefits.

In accordance with Canadian immigration requirements, preference will be given to applicants who are Citizens or Permanent Residents of Canada, but applications from non-Canadians are also accepted. The University subscribes to the principle of equity and has an equal employment opportunity policy for women. Information on the Department of Sociology may be accessed at the following Website: <http://www.socio.umontreal.ca/>. With more than 45 000 students, the University of Montreal is one of the largest North-American public research universities. Teaching activities are conducted in French.

Claire Durand

Claire.Durand@umontreal.ca

<http://www.fas.umontreal.ca/socio/durandc/>

Universit  de Montr al, dept. de sociologie,  
C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,  
Montr al, Qu bec, Canada, H3C 3J7  
(514) 343-7447

```
=====
Date: Mon, 30 Sep 2002 15:19:06 -0400
From: "Jane Sheppard" <jsheppard@cmor.org>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: CMOR Respondent Cooperation Workshop - February 2003
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
    boundary="-----_NextPart_000_01A6_01C26894.B7A9C400"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2600.0000
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000
```

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

```
-----_NextPart_000_01A6_01C26894.B7A9C400
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="Windows-1252"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
```



CMOR Presents: Protecting Our Assets II - Respondent Cooperation =  
Workshops

What: A workshop to improve respondent cooperation

When: February 3 & 4, 2003

Where: Radisson Parkway Resort, 2900 Parkway Blvd., Kissimmee, FL 34727

Who: Company owners, managers, directors concerned about the increasing =  
costs of data collection, survey operations and research methodologies =  
due to rising refusals

All survey research professionals concerned about declining respondent =  
cooperation

Why: \* Make new connections and learn from other practitioners  
\* Obtain information and practices to implement in your own =  
organization  
\* Create solutions to safeguard our most important asset-the =  
respondent

How: Register at [www.cmor.org](http://www.cmor.org)

Fees are \$325 for CMOR members and \$425 for non-members

Price includes 2 day program plus all workshop materials, breakfast and =  
lunch each day, and a reception the first evening.

Hotel reservations: 407-396-7000 or 800-333-3333 or =

[Reservations@RadissonParkway.com](mailto:Reservations@RadissonParkway.com)

Special CMOR rate: \$84 per night

Questions: Contact Kim Hoodin at (513) 985-0001 or [khoodin@cmor.org](mailto:khoodin@cmor.org)

Jane M. Sheppard

Director Respondent Cooperation

CMOR

'Promoting and Advocating Survey Research'

Ohio Office: =20

2012 Penhurst Circle N.E.

North Canton, OH 44720

Phone: (330) 244-8616

Fax: (330) 244-8626

Visit CMOR's website [www.cmor.org](http://www.cmor.org) for your research resources.

=20

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_01A6\_01C26894.B7A9C400

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- \*  
\* This post contains a forbidden message format \*  
\* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) \*  
\* This Mail List at USC.EDU only accepts PLAIN TEXT \*  
\* If your postings display this message your mail program \*  
\* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_01A6\_01C26894.B7A9C400--

=====  
Date: Mon, 30 Sep 2002 18:28:47 -0400  
From: kristin.j.stettler@census.gov  
Subject: page length and response rates  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on LNHQ08MTA/HQ/BOC (Release 5.0.8 | June 18,  
2001) at 09/30/2002  
06:28:49 PM  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

For self-administered mail surveys, is anyone out there familiar with any empirical research on the effect of page length on response rates? Also, the trade-offs between response rates and data quality.

It seems like this is an issue that arises over and over, but I've not seen much published on the topic.

Thanks for any input.

Kristin Stettler  
ESMS, US Census Bureau  
301-457-8426  
kristin.j.stettler@census.gov