

From: LISTS.ASU.EDU LISTSERV Server (16.0) [LISTSERV@asu.edu]
Sent: Saturday, May 28, 2011 6:10 PM
To: Shapard Wolf
Subject: File: "AAPORNET LOG0303"

Date: Sat, 1 Mar 2003 16:24:58 -0500
Reply-To: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>
Subject: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Dear AAPOR members:=20

Here's an update from CMOR on various regulatory and legislative issues =
affecting survey research. AAPOR is a contributing organization to =
CMOR.=20

Most importantly, survey research has been implicitly exempted from =
the=20
newly approved Federal "do not call" registry. The registry restricts the =
telemarketing industry. However, please remember that listed samples=20
compiled by direct marketers will likely omit households in the "do not =
call" registry.=20

Here's the CMOR summary report:=20

FTC: National TELEMARKETING Do-Not-Call List Will Be in Place by=20
September=20

As reported in our December email alert, in late 2002 the Federal Trade =
Commission (FTC) amended its telemarketing regulations, the Telemarketing =
Sales Rule (a Rule that implicitly exempts survey research calls). As part =
of the changes, the FTC would establish a national telemarketing do-not-cal=
l registry. Like the over two-dozen state do-not-call registries, this =
national registry would impact sales-related calls -- survey research =
calls would be implicitly exempt. Congressional approval for funding of =
the FTC national do-not-call registry has recently been signed into law, =
for fiscal years 2003 through 2007.=20

According to the FTC, "consumers will have the opportunity to sign up for =
the registry sometime this summer, and the registry should be fully =
functional and available to telemarketers by=20
September. By fall, consumers should begin to notice fewer unwanted =
telemarketing calls." The FTC expects approx. 60 million people to sign=20
up for the list when it becomes available.=20

CMOR met with FTC staffers in June of last year, during which we offered =
our assistance in helping the FTC educate the public about the sales-relate=
d=20

scope of the national telemarketing do-not-call registry and our implicit exemption. Thus far, the FTC has provided information about survey research's exemption as part of its FAQ's for consumers about the do-not-call registry (see <http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/online/pubs/alerts/dncalrt.htm>). Similarly, news reports have made reference to our exemption from the new national do-not-call registry.

Further information about the FTC proposal is available on the CMOR website at http://www.cmor.org/govt_affairs_news0103.htm and the FTC site at <http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/online/edcams/donotcall/index.html>

FCC: CMOR's Continuing Efforts to Protect The Industry From the Provisions of the TCPA

As CMOR has previously reported, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently reviewing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) Rules.

The current Rules prohibit certain survey research calls made using automatic telephone dialing systems, including calls to cellular telephones where the called party is charged for the call. In response and on behalf of the survey research industry, CMOR authored and submitted formal Comments to the FCC, to seek exemptions for survey research in the TCPA Rules. CMOR proposed that survey research calls be made explicitly exempt from the TCPA Rules in its entirety and /or that an explicit exemption be made in the Rules for research calls to cellular phone lines. After the initial Comment period was over, CMOR reviewed submitted Comments - over 6,000 in total. To reinforce our position and address those few comments that referenced survey research, CMOR subsequently submitted Reply Comments in late January, emphasizing the points made in our Comments and responded to a few of the Comments previously posted. We likewise orchestrated the submission of several Reply Comments by industry members, to support CMOR's Comments and position and provide further evidence of the impact of the restrictions on the industry.

CMOR will continue our involvement in the FCC Rule review to protect the interest of survey research, with a meeting with FCC staff in upcoming weeks.

To read CMOR's submitted Comments, visit the FCC website at:

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=3Dpdf&id_doc=

ument=3D6513397572=20

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=3Dpdf&id_doc=
=20
ument=3D6513407818=20

A New Respondent-Friendly Privacy Law: Confidential=20
Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act of 2002=20

As reported in CMOR's Winter 2002 Legislative Watch, favorable federal=20
privacy legislation was introduced late in the 2002 session, which seeks, =
in=20
part, to protect the confidentiality of=20
information acquired by federal agencies from the public for statistical=20=

purposes. The bill, signed into law in mid-December, creates the=20
"Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act of =
2002."=20

Under the new law, government agencies and those who contract with the=20
agencies to perform exclusively statistical activities --=20
so-called "agents" (i.e. researchers) -- are bound to use data or =
information=20

acquired by an agency under a pledge of confidentiality for=20
exclusively statistical purposes. The law prohibits agencies from =
disclosing=20

data or information acquired by an agency under a pledge of=20
confidentiality, in identifiable form, for any use other than an exclusivel=
y=20

statistical purpose, without consent of the respondent. If=20
an agency wants to use data or information for nonstatistical purposes, =
it=20
must provide notice to the public (before the data or information is=20
collected) that the data or information could be used for nonstatistical=20=

purposes. The law imposes fines and penalties on officers, employees, =
or=20

agents of an agency, or anyone who, by contract, bounds themselves to =
the=20

confidentiality section of the law, who knowingly disclose information =
in=20

violation of the law.=20

As the law states, "ensuring that information provided under a pledge =
of=20

confidentiality for statistical purposes receives protection is essential =
in=20

continuing public cooperation in statistical programs." Additional details =
on=20

the law will soon be available on the CMOR website (www.cmor.org).=20

For further information on any of the material provided in this email, =
please=20

contact CMOR's Director of Government Affairs,=20

Donna Gillin, at dgillin@cmor.org.=20

Kimberly A. Hoodin=20
Membership & Marketing Manager=20
CMOR - Promoting & Advocating Survey Research=20
khoodin@cmor.org=20
Phone: (513) 985-0344=20
Fax: (513) 985-0119=20

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Mon, 3 Mar 2003 11:51:05 -0500
Reply-To: Dale Kulp <DKulp@M-S-G.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Dale Kulp <DKulp@M-S-G.COM>
Subject: Re: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Just wanted to elaborate on Mark's "Don-Not-Call" (DNC) information. =20

The major white page compilers (i.e., InfoUSA, Experian, Polk) and the =
myriad number of resellers automatically purge out DNC records. I would =
suspect that other sample suppliers, like us have special contractual =
arrangements with these compilers to retain DNC records since we sell to =
companies exempt from telemarketing restrictions. [Note: these =
arrangements are all but impossible to obtain from resellers.]=20

Researchers should specifically inquire as to the inclusion/exclusion of =
DNC records - these now total more than 10 million listed households =
records. At this point, the problem is more serious in some =
states/areas than others (e.g., MO, NY and PA) but it does raise the =
potential for even more listed telephone sample biases.=20

Dale W. Kulp
GENESYS Sampling Systems

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

From: Mark Schulman [mailto:M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM]
Sent: Saturday, March 01, 2003 4:25 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry

Dear AAPOR members:=20

Here's an update from CMOR on various regulatory and legislative issues =
affecting survey research. AAPOR is a contributing organization to CMOR. =

Most importantly, survey research has been implicitly exempted from the newly approved Federal "do not call" registry. The registry restricts the telemarketing industry. However, please remember that listed samples compiled by direct marketers will likely omit households in the "do not call" registry.

Here's the CMOR summary report:

FTC: National TELEMARKETING Do-Not-Call List Will Be in Place by September

As reported in our December email alert, in late 2002 the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) amended its telemarketing regulations, the Telemarketing Sales Rule (a Rule that implicitly exempts survey research calls). As part of the changes, the FTC would establish a national telemarketing do-not-call registry. Like the over two-dozen state do-not-call registries, this national registry would impact sales-related calls -- survey research calls would be implicitly exempt. Congressional approval for funding of the FTC national do-not-call registry has recently been signed into law, for fiscal years 2003 through 2007.

According to the FTC, "consumers will have the opportunity to sign up for the registry sometime this summer, and the registry should be fully functional and available to telemarketers by September. By fall, consumers should begin to notice fewer unwanted telemarketing calls." The FTC expects approx. 60 million people to sign up for the list when it becomes available.

CMOR met with FTC staffers in June of last year, during which we offered our assistance in helping the FTC educate the public about the scope of the national telemarketing do-not-call registry and our implicit exemption. Thus far, the FTC has provided information about survey research's exemption as part of its FAQ's for consumers about the do-not-call registry (see <http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/online/pubs/alerts/dncalrt.htm>). Similarly, news reports have made reference to our exemption from the new national do-not-call registry.

Further information about the FTC proposal is available on the CMOR website at http://www.cmor.org/govt_affairs_news0103.htm and the FTC site at <http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/online/edcams/donotcall/index.html>

FCC: CMOR's Continuing Efforts to Protect The Industry From the Provisions of the TCPA

As CMOR has previously reported, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently reviewing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) Rules.

The current Rules prohibit certain survey research calls made using automatic telephone dialing systems, including calls to cellular telephones where the called party is charged for the call. In response and on behalf of the survey research industry, CMOR authored and submitted formal Comments to the FCC, to seek exemptions for survey research in the TCPA Rules. CMOR proposed that survey research calls be made explicitly exempt from the TCPA Rules in its entirety and /or that an explicit exemption be made in the Rules for research calls to cellular phone lines. After the initial Comment period was over, CMOR reviewed the submitted Comments - over 6,000 in total. To reinforce our position and address those few comments that referenced survey research, CMOR subsequently submitted Reply Comments in late January, emphasizing the points made in our Comments and responded to a few of the Comments previously posted. We likewise orchestrated the submission of several Reply Comments by industry members, to support CMOR's Comments and position and provide further evidence of the impact of the restrictions on the industry.

CMOR will continue our involvement in the FCC Rule review to protect the interest of survey research, with a meeting with FCC staff in upcoming weeks.

To read CMOR's submitted Comments, visit the FCC website at:

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=3Dpdf&id_document=3D6513397572

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=3Dpdf&id_document=3D6513407818

A New Respondent-Friendly Privacy Law: Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act of 2002

As reported in CMOR's Winter 2002 Legislative Watch, favorable federal privacy legislation was introduced late in the 2002 session, which seeks, in part, to protect the confidentiality of information acquired by federal agencies from the public for statistical purposes. The bill, signed into law in mid-December, creates the "Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act of

2002."=20

Under the new law, government agencies and those who contract with the=20 agencies to perform exclusively statistical activities --=20 so-called "agents" (i.e. researchers) -- are bound to use data or = information=20 acquired by an agency under a pledge of confidentiality for=20 exclusively statistical purposes. The law prohibits agencies from = disclosing=20 data or information acquired by an agency under a pledge of=20 confidentiality, in identifiable form, for any use other than an = exclusively=20 statistical purpose, without consent of the respondent. If=20 an agency wants to use data or information for nonstatistical purposes, = it=20 must provide notice to the public (before the data or information is=20 collected) that the data or information could be used for nonstatistical = purposes. The law imposes fines and penalties on officers, employees, or = agents of an agency, or anyone who, by contract, bounds themselves to = the=20 confidentiality section of the law, who knowingly disclose information = in=20 violation of the law.=20

As the law states, "ensuring that information provided under a pledge of = confidentiality for statistical purposes receives protection is = essential in=20 continuing public cooperation in statistical programs." Additional = details on=20 the law will soon be available on the CMOR website (www.cmor.org).=20

For further information on any of the material provided in this email, = please=20 contact CMOR's Director of Government Affairs,=20 Donna Gillin, at dgillin@cmor.org.=20

Kimberly A. Hoodin=20
Membership & Marketing Manager=20
CMOR - Promoting & Advocating Survey Research=20
khoodin@cmor.org=20
Phone: (513) 985-0344=20
Fax: (513) 985-0119=20

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 3 Mar 2003 12:02:28 -0500

Reply-To: CTalkov@AOL.COM

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Cynthia Talkov <CTalkov@AOL.COM>

Subject: Seeking Research/Public Relations Firm in Bosnia

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

Can anyone recommend--based on personal knowledge or experience--a research and/or public relations firm in Bosnia?

Please respond directly to me at cboyd@kema-xenergy.com

Thank you,

Cynthia Talkov Boyd

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 3 Mar 2003 12:20:22 -0500

Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>

Subject: Re: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry

Comments: To: Dale Kulp <DKulp@M-S-G.COM>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Thanks, Dale.

Related questions:

Is there full redundancy across the activities of the major compilers -- =
i.e. do they all do essentially the same thing? Are we correct in =
assuming that "compiling" means having agreements with local telephone =
companies that provide the household listing information? And they then =
sell this to directory publishers and others down the food chain? Where =
could one get detailed descriptions of this compilation process?

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: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Date: Monday, March 03, 2003 12:00 PM
Subject: Re: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry

Just wanted to elaborate on Mark's "Don-Not-Call" (DNC) information. =20

The major white page compilers (i.e., InfoUSA, Experian, Polk) and the =
myriad number of resellers automatically purge out DNC records. I would =
suspect that other sample suppliers, like us have special contractual =
arrangements with these compilers to retain DNC records since we sell to =
companies exempt from telemarketing restrictions. [Note: these =
arrangements are all but impossible to obtain from resellers.] =20

Researchers should specifically inquire as to the inclusion/exclusion of =
DNC records - these now total more than 10 million listed households =
records. At this point, the problem is more serious in some =
states/areas than others (e.g., MO, NY and PA) but it does raise the =
potential for even more listed telephone sample biases. =20

Dale W. Kulp
GENESYS Sampling Systems

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

From: Mark Schulman [mailto:M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM]
Sent: Saturday, March 01, 2003 4:25 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry

Dear AAPOR members: =20

Here's an update from CMOR on various regulatory and legislative issues =
affecting survey research. AAPOR is a contributing organization to CMOR. =

Most importantly, survey research has been implicitly exempted from the =
newly approved Federal "do not call" registry. The registry restricts =
the telemarketing industry. However, please remember that listed samples =
compiled by direct marketers will likely omit households in the "do not =
call" registry. =20

Here's the CMOR summary report: =20

FTC: National TELEMARKEETING Do-Not-Call List Will Be in Place by =20
September =20

As reported in our December email alert, in late 2002 the Federal Trade =
Commission (FTC) amended its telemarketing regulations, the =
Telemarketing Sales Rule (a Rule that implicitly exempts survey research =

calls). As part of the changes, the FTC would establish a national telemarketing do-not-call registry. Like the over two-dozen state do-not-call registries, this national registry would impact sales-related calls -- survey research calls would be implicitly exempt. Congressional approval for funding of the FTC national do-not-call registry has recently been signed into law, for fiscal years 2003 through 2007.

According to the FTC, "consumers will have the opportunity to sign up for the registry sometime this summer, and the registry should be fully functional and available to telemarketers by September. By fall, consumers should begin to notice fewer unwanted telemarketing calls." The FTC expects approx. 60 million people to sign up for the list when it becomes available.

CMOR met with FTC staffers in June of last year, during which we offered our assistance in helping the FTC educate the public about the scope of the national telemarketing do-not-call registry and our implicit exemption. Thus far, the FTC has provided information about survey research's exemption as part of its FAQ's for consumers about the do-not-call registry (see <http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/online/pubs/alerts/dncalrt.htm>). Similarly, news reports have made reference to our exemption from the new national do-not-call registry.

Further information about the FTC proposal is available on the CMOR website at http://www.cmor.org/govt_affairs_news0103.htm and the FTC site at: <http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/online/edcams/donotcall/index.html>

FCC: CMOR's Continuing Efforts to Protect The Industry From the Provisions of the TCPA

As CMOR has previously reported, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently reviewing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) Rules.

The current Rules prohibit certain survey research calls made using automatic telephone dialing systems, including calls to cellular telephones where the called party is charged for the call. In response and on behalf of the survey research industry, CMOR authored and submitted formal Comments to the FCC, to seek exemptions for survey research in the TCPA Rules. CMOR proposed that survey research calls be made explicitly exempt from the TCPA Rules in its entirety and /or that an explicit exemption be made in the Rules for research calls to cellular phone lines. After the initial Comment period was over, CMOR reviewed the submitted Comments - over 6,000 in total. To reinforce our position and address those few comments that referenced survey research, CMOR

subsequently submitted Reply Comments in late January, emphasizing the points made in our Comments and responded to a few of the Comments previously posted. We likewise orchestrated the submission of several Reply Comments by industry members, to support CMOR's Comments and position and provide further evidence of the impact of the restrictions on the industry.

CMOR will continue our involvement in the FCC Rule review to protect the interest of survey research, with a meeting with FCC staff in upcoming weeks.

To read CMOR's submitted Comments, visit the FCC website at:

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=3Dpdf&id_document=3D6513397572

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=3Dpdf&id_document=3D6513407818

A New Respondent-Friendly Privacy Law: Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act of 2002

As reported in CMOR's Winter 2002 Legislative Watch, favorable federal privacy legislation was introduced late in the 2002 session, which seeks, in part, to protect the confidentiality of information acquired by federal agencies from the public for statistical

purposes. The bill, signed into law in mid-December, creates the "Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act of 2002."

Under the new law, government agencies and those who contract with agencies to perform exclusively statistical activities -- so-called "agents" (i.e. researchers) -- are bound to use data or information

acquired by an agency under a pledge of confidentiality for exclusively statistical purposes. The law prohibits agencies from disclosing

data or information acquired by an agency under a pledge of confidentiality, in identifiable form, for any use other than an exclusively

statistical purpose, without consent of the respondent. If an agency wants to use data or information for nonstatistical purposes, it

must provide notice to the public (before the data or information is collected) that the data or information could be used for nonstatistical

purposes. The law imposes fines and penalties on officers, employees, or

agents of an agency, or anyone who, by contract, bounds themselves to =
the=20
confidentiality section of the law, who knowingly disclose information =
in=20
violation of the law.=20

As the law states, "ensuring that information provided under a pledge of =
confidentiality for statistical purposes receives protection is =
essential in=20
continuing public cooperation in statistical programs." Additional =
details on=20
the law will soon be available on the CMOR website (www.cmor.org).=20

For further information on any of the material provided in this email, =
please=20
contact CMOR's Director of Government Affairs,=20
Donna Gillin, at dgillin@cmor.org.=20

Kimberly A. Hoodin=20
Membership & Marketing Manager=20
CMOR - Promoting & Advocating Survey Research=20
khoodin@cmor.org=20
Phone: (513) 985-0344=20
Fax: (513) 985-0119=20

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: =
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Mon, 3 Mar 2003 11:28:42 -0800
Reply-To: Christopher Barnes <cebuconn@YAHOO.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Christopher Barnes <cebuconn@YAHOO.COM>
Subject: Position Announcement
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

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.

Do you Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Tax Center - forms, calculators, tips, more

<http://taxes.yahoo.com/>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 3 Mar 2003 14:43:11 -0500

Reply-To: Lance Hoffman <lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Lance Hoffman <lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM>

Organization: Opinion Access Corp.

Subject: Re: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry

Comments: To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>

In-Reply-To: <006c01c2e1a9\$2d33fe60\$89fac3d1@default>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Based on "unofficial" information I have received from various vendors/compilers of sample, I am under the impression that what they

all do is not the same.

Furthermore, unless some has information to the contrary, I also believe that for research purposes, "do not call" numbers are not being purged from purchased sample. In a conversation that took place with a very well known sample supplier, it was expressed to me that companies would be selling less sample if the purged "do not call" numbers from a sample purchase. The greater frequency of these people, who would most likely result in an initial refusal, would necessitate buying more pieces of sample in order complete a particular study.

Lance Hoffman
Manager, Business Development
Opinion Access Corp.
P: 718.729.2622 x.157
F: 718.729.2444
C: 646.522.2012

This email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or organization to which it is addressed. Any opinions or advice presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Opinion Access Corp. DO NOT copy, modify, distribute or take any action in reliance on this email if you are not the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender and delete this email from your system. Although this email has been checked for viruses and other defects, no responsibility can be accepted for any loss or damage arising from its receipt or use.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of James P. Murphy
Sent: Monday, March 03, 2003 12:20 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry

Thanks, Dale.

Related questions:

Is there full redundancy across the activities of the major compilers -- i.e. do they all do essentially the same thing? Are we correct in assuming that "compiling" means having agreements with local telephone companies that provide the household listing information? And they then sell this to directory publishers and others down the food chain? Where could one get detailed descriptions of this compilation process?

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: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Date: Monday, March 03, 2003 12:00 PM
Subject: Re: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry

Just wanted to elaborate on Mark's "Don-Not-Call" (DNC) information.

The major white page compilers (i.e., InfoUSA, Experian, Polk) and the myriad number of resellers automatically purge out DNC records. I would suspect that other sample suppliers, like us have special contractual arrangements with these compilers to retain DNC records since we sell to companies exempt from telemarketing restrictions. [Note: these arrangements are all but impossible to obtain from resellers.]

Researchers should specifically inquire as to the inclusion/exclusion of DNC records - these now total more than 10 million listed households records. At this point, the problem is more serious in some states/areas than others (e.g., MO, NY and PA) but it does raise the potential for even more listed telephone sample biases.

Dale W. Kulp
GENESYS Sampling Systems

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

From: Mark Schulman [mailto:M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM]
Sent: Saturday, March 01, 2003 4:25 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry

Dear AAPOR members:

Here's an update from CMOR on various regulatory and legislative issues affecting survey research. AAPOR is a contributing organization to CMOR.

Most importantly, survey research has been implicitly exempted from the newly approved Federal "do not call" registry. The registry restricts the telemarketing industry. However, please remember that listed samples compiled by direct marketers will likely omit households in the "do not call" registry.

Here's the CMOR summary report:

FTC: National TELEMARKEETING Do-Not-Call List Will Be in Place by September

As reported in our December email alert, in late 2002 the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) amended its telemarketing regulations, the Telemarketing Sales Rule (a Rule that implicitly exempts survey research

calls). As part of the changes, the FTC would establish a national telemarketing do-not-call registry. Like the over two-dozen state do-not-call registries, this national registry would impact sales-related calls -- survey research calls would be implicitly exempt. Congressional approval for funding of the FTC national do-not-call registry has recently been signed into law, for fiscal years 2003 through 2007.

According to the FTC, "consumers will have the opportunity to sign up for the registry sometime this summer, and the registry should be fully functional and available to telemarketers by September. By fall, consumers should begin to notice fewer unwanted telemarketing calls." The FTC expects approx. 60 million people to sign up for the list when it becomes available.

CMOR met with FTC staffers in June of last year, during which we offered our assistance in helping the FTC educate the public about the sales-related scope of the national telemarketing do-not-call registry and our implicit exemption. Thus far, the FTC has provided information about survey research's exemption as part of its FAQ's for consumers about the do-not-call registry (see - <http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/online/pubs/alerts/dncalrt.htm>). Similarly, news reports have made reference to our exemption from the new national do-not-call registry.

Further information about the FTC proposal is available on the CMOR website at http://www.cmor.org/govt_affairs_news0103.htm and the FTC site at: <http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/online/edcams/donotcall/index.html>

FCC: CMOR's Continuing Efforts to Protect The Industry From the Provisions of the TCPA

As CMOR has previously reported, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently reviewing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) Rules.

The current Rules prohibit certain survey research calls made using automatic telephone dialing systems, including calls to cellular telephones where the called party is charged for the call. In response and on behalf of the survey research industry, CMOR authored and submitted formal Comments to the FCC, to seek exemptions for survey research in the TCPA Rules. CMOR proposed that survey research calls be made explicitly exempt from the TCPA Rules in its entirety and /or that an explicit exemption be made in the Rules for research calls to cellular phone lines. After the initial Comment period was over, CMOR reviewed the submitted Comments - over 6,000 in total. To reinforce our position and to address those few comments that referenced survey research, CMOR

subsequently submitted Reply Comments in late January, emphasizing the points made in our Comments and responded to a few of the Comments previously posted. We likewise orchestrated the submission of several Reply Comments by industry members, to support CMOR's Comments and position and provide further evidence of the impact of the restrictions on the industry.

CMOR will continue our involvement in the FCC Rule review to protect the interest of survey research, with a meeting with FCC staff in upcoming weeks.

To read CMOR's submitted Comments, visit the FCC website at:

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6513397572

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6513407818

A New Respondent-Friendly Privacy Law: Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act of 2002

As reported in CMOR's Winter 2002 Legislative Watch, favorable federal privacy legislation was introduced late in the 2002 session, which seeks, in part, to protect the confidentiality of information acquired by federal agencies from the public for statistical

purposes. The bill, signed into law in mid-December, creates the "Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act of 2002."

Under the new law, government agencies and those who contract with the agencies to perform exclusively statistical activities -- so-called "agents" (i.e. researchers) -- are bound to use data or information acquired by an agency under a pledge of confidentiality for exclusively statistical purposes. The law prohibits agencies from disclosing data or information acquired by an agency under a pledge of confidentiality, in identifiable form, for any use other than an exclusively statistical purpose, without consent of the respondent. If an agency wants to use data or information for nonstatistical purposes, it must provide notice to the public (before the data or information is collected) that the data or information could be used for nonstatistical purposes. The law imposes fines and penalties on officers, employees, or

agents of an agency, or anyone who, by contract, bounds themselves to the confidentiality section of the law, who knowingly disclose information in violation of the law.

As the law states, "ensuring that information provided under a pledge of confidentiality for statistical purposes receives protection is essential in continuing public cooperation in statistical programs." Additional details on the law will soon be available on the CMOR website (www.cmor.org).

For further information on any of the material provided in this email, please contact CMOR's Director of Government Affairs, Donna Gillin, at dgillin@cmor.org.

Kimberly A. Hoodin
Membership & Marketing Manager
CMOR - Promoting & Advocating Survey Research
khoodin@cmor.org
Phone: (513) 985-0344
Fax: (513) 985-0119

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 3 Mar 2003 17:44:21 -0500

Reply-To: Dale Kulp <DKulp@M-S-G.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Dale Kulp <DKulp@M-S-G.COM>
Subject: Re: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

For those of you who attended the CMOR Conference in FL, there was a very enlightening presentation on Do-Not-Call (DNC) HHs by Barbara Fernandez of MACRO International (ORC). Basically, she reported a "slightly" higher tendency to refuse, BUT a DNC record was more likely to result in an interview. Incongruous? Well, DNC records are virtually all HHs, so even if you do get a slightly higher refusal rate, from a production standpoint you need to make far fewer calls to secure a complete.=20

We are in the process of analyzing a dataset covering four months, and 17,500 interviews. Preliminary findings are that the relative refusal rates among DNC records ran about 10% higher. [Note: this was a blind posterior analysis - no flagging and no special treatment of DNCs.] But, each DNC record was 70% more likely to result in a completed interview. Although only about 9% of completes were conducted with DNC records, eliminating them would drive up sample requirements substantially; purging DNCs would remove about 10% of all HHs while reducing the RDD frame size only minimally.=20

As far as compilation practices are concerned, basic White Page compilation is pretty standard - in fact, most is now electronic but it continues to follow the pattern of the previous fifteen years or so: there is one primary White Page compiler (now InfoUSA, previously Donnelley). It's the additional multi-sourcing of databases and proprietary sources which differentiates the major suppliers - the best examples of course are Polk with their automotive data and AXXIOM with their credit data warehouse. There is a lot of "data trading" between the major providers - for example, some automotive data is available from all, but Polk retains the ultimate key - your vehicle's VIN number.

DNC records are eliminated by all the major compilers because their primary clients are telemarketers. Research sample suppliers do not compile their own listed household databases, they are licensed from one of the major database compilers. Having DNC records eliminated would make construction of RDD frames less comprehensive and severely restrict/bias the listed household samples supplied to research companies.=20

I don't know about other companies practices but our databases have DNC records flagged. In addition, we subscribe to both the DMA's Telephone Preference Service (TPS) and every state Do-Not-Call list currently available. Although we do not sell DNC information or the records which are not on the listed household database, it does provide us with a check on our database suppliers, improves the information for RDD frame definition, and enhances ability to provide analytic support.=20

Finally, when we talk about vendors and compilers I think it appropriate = to distinguish between the primary White Page suppliers (e.g., InfoUSA, = AXXIOM, etc.) of listed household databases; the hundreds of list = vendors who primarily repackage listed household data or enhance it in = certain ways; and research sample suppliers. The first two groups are = primarily in the business of supplying names to telemarketing/direct = marketing companies and one needs to take a close look at what you = purchase from them. =20

I hope this answers some previous questions.

Dale W. Kulp
GENESYS Sampling Systems

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

From: Lance Hoffman [mailto:lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM]
Sent: Monday, March 03, 2003 2:43 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry

Based on "unofficial" information I have received from various vendors/compilers of sample, I am under the impression that what they all do is not the same.

Furthermore, unless some has information to the contrary, I also believe that for research purposes, "do not call" numbers are not being purged from purchased sample. In a conversation that took place with a very well known sample supplier, it was expressed to me that companies would be selling less sample if the purged "do not call" numbers from a sample purchase. The greater frequency of these people, who would most likely result in an initial refusal, would necessitate buying more pieces of sample in order complete a particular study.

Lance Hoffman
Manager, Business Development
Opinion Access Corp.
P: 718.729.2622 x.157
F: 718.729.2444
C: 646.522.2012

This email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or organization to which it is addressed. Any opinions or advice presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Opinion Access Corp. DO NOT copy, modify, distribute or take any action in reliance on this email if you are not the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error please notify the

sender and delete this email from your system. Although this email has been checked for viruses and other defects, no responsibility can be accepted for any loss or damage arising from its receipt or use.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of James P. Murphy
Sent: Monday, March 03, 2003 12:20 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry

Thanks, Dale.

Related questions:

Is there full redundancy across the activities of the major compilers -- i.e. do they all do essentially the same thing? Are we correct in assuming that "compiling" means having agreements with local telephone companies that provide the household listing information? And they then sell this to directory publishers and others down the food chain? Where could one get detailed descriptions of this compilation process?

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: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Date: Monday, March 03, 2003 12:00 PM
Subject: Re: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry

Just wanted to elaborate on Mark's "Don-Not-Call" (DNC) information.

The major white page compilers (i.e., InfoUSA, Experian, Polk) and the myriad number of resellers automatically purge out DNC records. I would suspect that other sample suppliers, like us have special contractual arrangements with these compilers to retain DNC records since we sell to companies exempt from telemarketing restrictions. [Note: these arrangements are all but impossible to obtain from resellers.]

Researchers should specifically inquire as to the inclusion/exclusion of DNC records - these now total more than 10 million listed households records. At this point, the problem is more serious in some states/areas than others (e.g., MO, NY and PA) but it does raise the potential for even more listed telephone sample biases.

Dale W. Kulp
GENESYS Sampling Systems

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

From: Mark Schulman [mailto:M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM]
Sent: Saturday, March 01, 2003 4:25 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry

Dear AAPOR members:

Here's an update from CMOR on various regulatory and legislative issues affecting survey research. AAPOR is a contributing organization to CMOR.

Most importantly, survey research has been implicitly exempted from the newly approved Federal "do not call" registry. The registry restricts the telemarketing industry. However, please remember that listed samples compiled by direct marketers will likely omit households in the "do not call" registry.

Here's the CMOR summary report:

FTC: National TELEMARKETING Do-Not-Call List Will Be in Place by September

As reported in our December email alert, in late 2002 the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) amended its telemarketing regulations, the Telemarketing Sales Rule (a Rule that implicitly exempts survey research calls). As part of the changes, the FTC would establish a national telemarketing do-not-call registry. Like the over two-dozen state do-not-call registries, this national registry would impact sales-related calls -- survey research calls would be implicitly exempt. Congressional approval for funding of the FTC national do-not-call registry has recently been signed into law, for fiscal years 2003 through 2007.

According to the FTC, "consumers will have the opportunity to sign up for the registry sometime this summer, and the registry should be fully functional and available to telemarketers by September. By fall, consumers should begin to notice fewer unwanted telemarketing calls." The FTC expects approx. 60 million people to sign up for the list when it becomes available.

CMOR met with FTC staffers in June of last year, during which we offered our assistance in helping the FTC educate the public about the sales-related scope of the national telemarketing do-not-call registry and our implicit exemption. Thus far, the FTC has provided information about survey research's exemption as part of its FAQ's for consumers about the do-not-call registry (see - <http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/online/pubs/alerts/dncalrt.htm>). Similarly, news reports have made reference to our exemption from the new national do-not-call registry.

Further information about the FTC proposal is available on the CMOR website
at http://www.cmor.org/govt_affairs_news0103.htm
and the FTC site at:
<http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/online/edcams/donotcall/index.html>

FCC: CMOR's Continuing Efforts to Protect The Industry From the Provisions of the TCPA

As CMOR has previously reported, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently reviewing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) Rules.

The current Rules prohibit certain survey research calls made using automatic telephone dialing systems, including calls to cellular telephones where the called party is charged for the call. In response and on behalf of the survey research industry, CMOR authored and submitted formal Comments to the FCC, to seek exemptions for survey research in the TCPA Rules. CMOR proposed that survey research calls be made explicitly exempt from the TCPA Rules in its entirety and /or that an explicit exemption be made in the Rules for research calls to cellular phone lines. After the initial Comment period was over, CMOR reviewed the submitted Comments - over 6,000 in total. To reinforce our position and to address those few comments that referenced survey research, CMOR subsequently submitted Reply Comments in late January, emphasizing the points made in our Comments and responded to a few of the Comments previously posted. We likewise orchestrated the submission of several Reply Comments by industry members, to support CMOR's Comments and position and provide further evidence of the impact of the restrictions on the industry.

CMOR will continue our involvement in the FCC Rule review to protect the interest of survey research, with a meeting with FCC staff in upcoming weeks.

To read CMOR's submitted Comments, visit the FCC website at:

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=3Dpdf&id_doc

[ument=3D6513397572](http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=3Dpdf&id_doc=3D6513397572)

[http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=3Dpdf&id_doc=](http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=3Dpdf&id_doc=3D6513407818)

[ument=3D6513407818](http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=3Dpdf&id_doc=3D6513407818)

A New Respondent-Friendly Privacy Law: Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act of 2002

As reported in CMOR's Winter 2002 Legislative Watch, favorable federal privacy legislation was introduced late in the 2002 session, which seeks, in

part, to protect the confidentiality of information acquired by federal agencies from the public for statistical

purposes. The bill, signed into law in mid-December, creates the "Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act of 2002."

Under the new law, government agencies and those who contract with the agencies to perform exclusively statistical activities --

so-called "agents" (i.e. researchers) -- are bound to use data or information

acquired by an agency under a pledge of confidentiality for exclusively statistical purposes. The law prohibits agencies from disclosing

data or information acquired by an agency under a pledge of confidentiality, in identifiable form, for any use other than an exclusively

statistical purpose, without consent of the respondent. If

an agency wants to use data or information for nonstatistical purposes, it

must provide notice to the public (before the data or information is collected) that the data or information could be used for nonstatistical

purposes. The law imposes fines and penalties on officers, employees, or

agents of an agency, or anyone who, by contract, bounds themselves to the

confidentiality section of the law, who knowingly disclose information in

violation of the law.

As the law states, "ensuring that information provided under a pledge of

confidentiality for statistical purposes receives protection is essential in

continuing public cooperation in statistical programs." Additional details on

the law will soon be available on the CMOR website (www.cmor.org).

For further information on any of the material provided in this email, please

contact CMOR's Director of Government Affairs, Donna Gillin, at dgillin@cmor.org.

Kimberly A. Hoodin
Membership & Marketing Manager
CMOR - Promoting & Advocating Survey Research

khoodin@cmor.org
Phone: (513) 985-0344
Fax: (513) 985-0119

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: =
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Tue, 4 Mar 2003 09:27:37 -0500
Reply-To: Stephanie Berg <stberg@gtcinternet.com>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Stephanie Berg <stberg@GTCINTERNET.COM>
Subject: Fw: Question on Reading
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

All, below is an information request from a graduate student. I already =
sent him the typical AAPOR and CASRO docs, but I know there are other =
good sources available. You can reply to either me, my friend or the =
list if anyone wants a refresher in the basics. Thanks,

stberg@gtcinternet.com
cmaier@gwu.edu

StephanieBerg
NetworkSolutions
Research Manager
703.668.4959

----- Original Message -----=20

From: cmaier=20

To: stberg@gtcinternet.com=20

Sent: Monday, March 03, 2003 8:38 PM

Subject: Question on Reading

Berg--

I'm working on a project in my class on the ethics of polling. Do you =
know of=20

any resources that might be able to help me? I'm looking specifically =
on how=20

polls mislead the public, can be unethical and misrepresent. =20

Thanks! Hope all is well.

Maier.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Tue, 4 Mar 2003 11:26:55 -0500

Reply-To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>

Subject: In Britain the Mood Shifts on War with Iraq

MIME-version: 1.0

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

From MORI re British attitudes on war with Iraq.

Media Release

MORI House, 79-81 Borough Road, London, SE1 1FY

Telephone: 020 7347 3000

Fax: 020 7347 3800

4 March 2003

Mood Shifts on War with Iraq

'Smoking gun' would win Blair support for action

Tony Blair is starting to win the war of words over Iraq, with new research from MORI showing a strong increase in the number of Britons backing military action. In a luncheon speech to the D Group in London today, Wednesday, MORI chairman Professor Robert M. Worcester revealed that although a majority of the public still disapproves of Mr Blair's handling of the Iraq situation, there has been almost a ten per cent swing in his favour since mid-January as he has fought to justify his position.

Three quarters (75%) of people in Britain would now be prepared to support British troops joining any American-led military action against Iraq. However, this support is conditional both on UN inspectors finding proof that Iraq is trying to hide weapons of mass destruction, and on the UN Security Council voting in favour of military action. In the absence of these two conditions, only a quarter (24%) would support British involvement, and opposition rises from 18% to 67%.

This latest research from MORI shows Blair has finally turned a corner, following a steady decline in support for military action. In September 2002, 71% of people in Britain supported British troops joining any American-led military action against Iraq with UN approval. But this had dropped to 61% by January.

There has also been a fall in the number of people who would oppose military action without UN backing. In September 2002, seven in 10 Britons (70%) opposed action without the backing of the UN, and this opposition rose to 77% by January. However, MORI's new research shows opposition would depend as much on the findings of the inspectors as on any vote in the Security Council.

Two thirds (67%) of British people now oppose action if the UN inspectors come up empty-handed and the UN fails to back military action. But opposition falls to two in five (41%) if the inspectors do find evidence that Iraq is hiding weapons of mass destruction - even if the UN still does not vote in favour of action.

As was the case in previous surveys, men are considerably more likely than women to back a war: if the inspectors find proof of Iraqi weapons and the UN votes for military action, 84% of men but only 67% of women would approve of British troops joining in; with no proof of Iraqi weapons and no UN vote in favour, 28% of men would still send in British troops, but only 19% of women would do the same. Overall, men are almost evenly split on the Prime Minister's handling of the Iraq situation, 44% approving and 49% disapproving, but women disapprove by two-to-one, 57% to 27%.

Approval of Mr Blair's handling of the situation is highest among Labour supporters, of whom 52% back him while 39% are dissatisfied. He has the support of only 37% of Conservatives and 24% of Liberal Democrats.

Professor Worcester says: "If the inspectors report a smoking gun in

Saddam's hand and the UN second vote is passed then the British - by three to one - think British troops should be used alongside American troops on a war with Iraq.

"Without that, still a quarter (24%) of the British people would support military action, but two thirds would oppose it."

- ENDS

Technical Details: MORI Telephone Surveys interviewed a representative quota sample of 985 British adults aged 18+ on 28 February-2 March 2003. Data are weighted to match the population profile.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Tue, 4 Mar 2003 11:54:16 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Doubts Temper War Support
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

A nicely nuanced set of questions

Doubts Temper War Support
Gender, Age and Politics Fuel Gaps in Opinion on Attacking Iraq

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A37643-2003Mar3>

By Richard Morin and Claudia Deane
Washington Post Staff Writers
Tuesday, March 4, 2003; Page A17

Surveys conducted since the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks have consistently shown that a majority of Americans favor military strikes against Iraq. But this general agreement that force should be used is neither absolute, unconditional nor uniformly shared by key voting groups, an analysis of recent Washington Post-ABC News surveys suggests.

This ambivalence, most recently reflected in a Post-ABC News poll completed Sunday, raises questions about the depth and durability of public support for using force to topple Iraqi President Saddam Hussein. The poll found that 59 percent of respondents favor using military force against Iraq, even without the support of the U.N. Security Council. But

four in 10 supporters also said they had reservations about the looming conflict with Iraq. When these doubters are combined with opponents of military action, the result suggests that more than six in 10 Americans harbor at least some doubts about using force while only a third are unequivocally behind going to war.

SNIP

© 2003 The Washington Post Company

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Tue, 4 Mar 2003 12:50:44 -0500
Reply-To: Michael Bocian <michael_bocian@HOTMAIL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Michael Bocian <michael_bocian@HOTMAIL.COM>
Subject: 2 positions at GQR
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; format=flowed

SENIOR ANALYST

Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research, an international survey research firm, has an opening for a SENIOR ANALYST to assist in the development and analysis of polls and focus groups. The position requires an ability to work on qualitative and quantitative projects for corporate, political and public policy clients. Ideal candidate will have 5 to 10 years experience in qualitative and/or quantitative analysis. Analyst works with firm principals in the development of questionnaires and focus groups guidelines and interpretation of results. Analyst works as project manager with computing and field departments. Superior oral and written communication skills required. Position requires domestic/international travel and after hours availability. Campaign experience a plus. Competitive salary and benefits. Submit cover letter, resume and salary requirements to jobs@greenbergresearch.com or fax to 202-289-8648.

Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research specializes in strategic research for campaigns, organizations and corporations. The firm has worked for a broad range of public interest organizations, foundations, unions, political campaigns and parties across the globe. The firm's chairman, Stanley B. Greenberg, has served as pollster to President Bill Clinton, President Nelson Mandela, Prime Minister Tony Blair and former Israeli Prime Minister

Ehud Barak. You can learn more about Greenberg Quinlan Research at www.greenbergresearch.com.

ASSISTANT ANALYST

Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research has an immediate opening for an ASSISTANT ANALYST in their Washington, DC office. GQR is an internationally recognized survey research firm specializing in polls and focus groups across the globe for political campaigns and parties, public interest organizations and foundations as well as corporate crisis management and positioning. You can learn more about GQR at greenbergresearch.com.

Responsibilities include: Assist senior analysts and company Principals in all aspects of survey research process, drafting questionnaires and focus group guidelines, candidate and issue research, writing memos and proofing of documents and graphic presentations.

Candidate profile: Problem solver with a career interest in public opinion research or campaign management. Detail oriented person with good communication, writing and management skills. Experience with quantitative research and analysis highly desirable. Team player. Motivated, self starter. Ideal candidate will have two years or more work experience in survey research, and campaigns with appropriate education background.

Competitive salary and excellent benefits. Submit cover letter, resume and salary requirements to jobs@greenbergresearch.com or fax to 202-289-8648.

Add photos to your e-mail with MSN 8. Get 2 months FREE*.
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/featuredemail>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Tue, 4 Mar 2003 18:09:57 +0000
Reply-To: gso-gso@ATT.NET
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Gary Siegel <gso-gso@ATT.NET>
Subject: Position Announcement
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

RESEARCH ASSOCIATE

Chicago-based opinion & marketing research firm has immediate need for an experienced research associate.

RESPONSIBILITIES. The candidate will work on all aspects of survey research projects including questionnaire design, data collection, data analysis, report writing, and client presentations.

REQUIREMENTS: At least one year work experience in survey research. Coursework in the social sciences, statistics, or marketing research. The successful candidate must have excellent communication skills, analytical skills, and a thorough working knowledge of WORD, EXCEL, ACCESS, and SPSS (or other statistical package).

SALARY: negotiable and commensurate with experience.

THE COMPANY. The Gary Siegel Organization, Inc. (GSO) is a full-service opinion/marketing research firm with an excellent reputation and a 25-year history. We conduct mail, telephone, and focus group research for corporations, professional service firms, and trade and professional associations. Small, entrepreneurial, nonbureaucratic, growing. Ideal for an energetic, ambitious, talented person interested in career growth.

LOCATION. Charming Edgebrook community, across the street from forest preserve, northwest side of Chicago. One block from Metra station, two minutes off I-94.

Mail, email, or fax (no phone calls, please) letter of application and resume to:

Gary Siegel Organization, Inc.
6411 N. Caldwell
Chicago, IL 60646
FAX: 773-763-4302
Email: info@gsoresearch.com
www.GSOresearch.com

We're virus averse. So if you email, please do not send attachments. Include all information in the body of the email.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.
=====

Date: Wed, 5 Mar 2003 06:19:07 -0500
Reply-To: dawn.v.nelson@CENSUS.GOV
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Dawn V. Nelson" <dawn.v.nelson@CENSUS.GOV>
Subject: DC AAPOR - - A Special Event (Thursday evening 3/20)
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

DC AAPOR is happy to announce an upcoming social event (see details below).

-Dawn Nelson
President
DC AAPOR

----- Forwarded by Dawn V Nelson/DSD/HQ/BOC on 03/05/2003 06:12 AM -----

-

=

=20

DC-AAPOR =

=20

Administration To: dc-aapor.admin@erols.com =

=20

<dc-aapor.admin@erols.com> cc: =

=20

Thurs. eve. 3/20 Subject: Special event =

=20

=

=20

03/04/2003 05:50 =

=20

PM =

=20

=

=20

=

=20

Interested in?

?Meeting and networking with other local survey professionals?

?Meeting members of the National AAPOR Executive Council?

?Meeting candidates for the upcoming council elections of the Washington, DC/Baltimore chapter of AAPOR?

Then please join us on Thursday, March 20, from 5:30-7:30 PM at the Capitol City Brewing Company, 11th and H Streets, NW, in downtown Washington, DC. This event is open to all 2003 members of the DC/Baltimore chapter of AAPOR, as well as any new 2003 members joining that evening. (Membership is only \$10 annually / \$6 for students.) We are excited to be hosting this event in conjunction with the quarterly meeting of the National AAPOR Executive Council. It will be a great opportunity to meet the National Council members including AAPOR President Mark Schulman and Past President Don Dillman.

In addition, DC-AAPOR has set the ballot for its upcoming chapter council elections. Some of this year's candidates will be on hand for you to meet before the ballots are cast. And, as always, a DC-AAPOR event is a great venue to renew old friendships and network with other survey professionals.

It is important that you RSVP for this event so that we can provide Capitol City with a count of attendees prior to the event. Please RSVP by replying to <dc-aapor.admin@erols.com> no later than Friday, March 14. Or by phoning Jim Caplan, chapter secretary, at 703-696-5848.

DETAILS:

MENU: Bring your appetite because we plan to provide an array of tasty appetizers that will be restocked throughout the function.

BEVERAGES: Coffee, tea, and soda will be provided at no charge. Capitol City is also extending their Late Night Happy Hour prices for this event. All microbrews can be purchased for \$2.50 (nearly half the regular price). You can also purchase a variety of other alcoholic beverages.

DIRECTIONS: Located at the corner of 11th and H streets, NW. Across the street from the Convention Center. One block North from the "Metro Center" metro stop.

MAP: See Cap City's website at <http://www.capcitybrew.com/downtown.htm>

NOTE: This is **not** the Capitol City Brewing Company location where we had our "happy hour" last summer!

Unsubscribe: If you prefer not to receive emails about local DC/Baltimore AAPOR chapter events, just let us know by replying here and you will be removed from our announcement list immediately.

=

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 5 Mar 2003 13:44:32 -0500
Reply-To: "Mariolis, Peter" <pxm1@CDC.GOV>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Mariolis, Peter" <pxm1@CDC.GOV>
Subject: Re: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry
Comments: cc: "Dayton, James <VT>" <dayton@macroint.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

With permission of the authors, here are the overheads from the presentation that Dale Kulp referred to: Exploring Response Rate Differences Among Do Not Call List Respondents, Youjie Huang, MD, PHD; Kirsten Ivie, MPH; Barbara M. Fernandez, MSPH; James Dayton.

Peter Mariolis

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

From: Dale Kulp [mailto:DKulp@M-S-G.COM]

Sent: Monday, March 03, 2003 5:44 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry

For those of you who attended the CMOR Conference in FL, there was a very enlightening presentation on Do-Not-Call (DNC) HHs by Barbara Fernandez of MACRO International (ORC). Basically, she reported a "slightly" higher tendency to refuse, BUT a DNC record was more likely to result in an interview. Incongruous? Well, DNC records are virtually all HHs, so even if you do get a slightly higher refusal rate, from a production standpoint you need to make far fewer calls to secure a complete.

We are in the process of analyzing a dataset covering four months, and 17,500 interviews. Preliminary findings are that the relative refusal rates among DNC records ran about 10% higher. [Note: this was a blind posterior analysis - no flagging and no special treatment of DNCs.] But, each DNC record was 70% more likely to result in a completed interview. Although only about 9% of completes were conducted with DNC records, eliminating them would drive up sample requirements substantially; purging DNCs would remove about 10% of all HHs while reducing the RDD frame size only minimally.

As far as compilation practices are concerned, basic White Page compilation is pretty standard - in fact, most is now electronic but it continues to follow the pattern of the previous fifteen years or so: there is one primary White Page compiler (now InfoUSA, previously Donnelley). It's the additional multi-sourcing of databases and proprietary sources which differentiates the major suppliers - the best examples of course are Polk with their automotive data and AXIOM with their credit data warehouse. There is a lot of "data trading" between the major providers - for example, some automotive data is available from all, but Polk retains the ultimate key - your vehicle's VIN number.

DNC records are eliminated by all the major compilers because their primary clients are telemarketers. Research sample suppliers do not compile their own listed household databases, they are licensed from one of the major database compilers. Having DNC records eliminated would make construction of RDD frames less comprehensive and severely restrict/bias the listed household samples supplied to research companies.

I don't know about other companies practices but our databases have DNC records flagged. In addition, we subscribe to both the DMA's Telephone Preference Service (TPS) and every state Do-Not-Call list currently available. Although we do not sell DNC information or the records which are not on the listed household database, it does provide us with a check on our

database suppliers, improves the information for RDD frame definition, and enhances ability to provide analytic support.

Finally, when we talk about vendors and compilers I think it appropriate to distinguish between the primary White Page suppliers (e.g., InfoUSA, AXXIOM, etc.) of listed household databases; the hundreds of list vendors who primarily repackage listed household data or enhance it in certain ways; and research sample suppliers. The first two groups are primarily in the business of supplying names to telemarketing/direct marketing companies and one needs to take a close look at what you purchase from them.

I hope this answers some previous questions.

Dale W. Kulp
GENESYS Sampling Systems

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

From: Lance Hoffman [mailto:lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM]
Sent: Monday, March 03, 2003 2:43 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry

Based on "unofficial" information I have received from various vendors/compilers of sample, I am under the impression that what they all do is not the same.

Furthermore, unless some has information to the contrary, I also believe that for research purposes, "do not call" numbers are not being purged from purchased sample. In a conversation that took place with a very well known sample supplier, it was expressed to me that companies would be selling less sample if the purged "do not call" numbers from a sample purchase. The greater frequency of these people, who would most likely result in an initial refusal, would necessitate buying more pieces of sample in order complete a particular study.

Lance Hoffman
Manager, Business Development
Opinion Access Corp.
P: 718.729.2622 x.157
F: 718.729.2444
C: 646.522.2012

This email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or organization to which it is addressed. Any opinions or advice presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Opinion Access Corp. DO NOT copy, modify, distribute

or take any action in reliance on this email if you are not the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender and delete this email from your system. Although this email has been checked for viruses and other defects, no responsibility can be accepted for any loss or damage arising from its receipt or use.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of James P. Murphy
Sent: Monday, March 03, 2003 12:20 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry

Thanks, Dale.

Related questions:

Is there full redundancy across the activities of the major compilers -- i.e. do they all do essentially the same thing? Are we correct in assuming that "compiling" means having agreements with local telephone companies that provide the household listing information? And they then sell this to directory publishers and others down the food chain? Where could one get detailed descriptions of this compilation process?

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: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Date: Monday, March 03, 2003 12:00 PM
Subject: Re: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry

Just wanted to elaborate on Mark's "Don-Not-Call" (DNC) information.

The major white page compilers (i.e., InfoUSA, Experian, Polk) and the myriad number of resellers automatically purge out DNC records. I would suspect that other sample suppliers, like us have special contractual arrangements with these compilers to retain DNC records since we sell to companies exempt from telemarketing restrictions. [Note: these arrangements are all but impossible to obtain from resellers.]

Researchers should specifically inquire as to the inclusion/exclusion of DNC records - these now total more than 10 million listed households records. At this point, the problem is more serious in some states/areas than others (e.g., MO, NY and PA) but it does raise the potential for even more listed telephone sample biases.

Dale W. Kulp
GENESYS Sampling Systems

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

From: Mark Schulman [mailto:M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM]

Sent: Saturday, March 01, 2003 4:25 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry

Dear AAPOR members:

Here's an update from CMOR on various regulatory and legislative issues affecting survey research. AAPOR is a contributing organization to CMOR.

Most importantly, survey research has been implicitly exempted from the

newly approved Federal "do not call" registry. The registry restricts the telemarketing industry. However, please remember that listed samples

compiled by direct marketers will likely omit households in the "do not call" registry.

Here's the CMOR summary report:

FTC: National TELEMARKETING Do-Not-Call List Will Be in Place by September

As reported in our December email alert, in late 2002 the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) amended its telemarketing regulations, the Telemarketing Sales Rule (a Rule that implicitly exempts survey research calls). As part of the changes, the FTC would establish a national telemarketing do-not-call registry. Like the over two-dozen state do-not-call registries, this national registry would impact sales-related calls -- survey research calls would be implicitly exempt. Congressional approval for funding of the FTC national do-not-call registry has recently been signed into law, for fiscal years 2003 through 2007.

According to the FTC, "consumers will have the opportunity to sign up for the registry sometime this summer, and the registry should be fully functional and available to telemarketers by September. By fall, consumers should begin to notice fewer unwanted telemarketing calls." The FTC expects approx. 60 million people to sign up for the list when it becomes available.

CMOR met with FTC staffers in June of last year, during which we offered our assistance in helping the FTC educate the public about the sales-related

scope of the national telemarketing do-not-call registry and our implicit exemption. Thus far, the FTC has provided information about survey research's exemption as part of its FAQ's for consumers about the do-not-call registry (see - <http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/online/pubs/alerts/dncalrt.htm>). Similarly, news reports have made reference to our exemption from the new national

do-not-call registry.

Further information about the FTC proposal is available on the CMOR website at http://www.cmor.org/govt_affairs_news0103.htm and the FTC site at: <http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/online/edcams/donotcall/index.html>

FCC: CMOR's Continuing Efforts to Protect The Industry From the Provisions of the TCPA

As CMOR has previously reported, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently reviewing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) Rules.

The current Rules prohibit certain survey research calls made using automatic telephone dialing systems, including calls to cellular telephones where the called party is charged for the call. In response and on behalf of the survey research industry, CMOR authored and submitted formal Comments to the FCC, to seek exemptions for survey research in the TCPA Rules. CMOR proposed that survey research calls be made explicitly exempt from the TCPA Rules in its entirety and /or that an explicit exemption be made in the Rules for research calls to cellular phone lines. After the initial Comment period was over, CMOR reviewed the submitted Comments - over 6,000 in total. To reinforce our position and to address those few comments that referenced survey research, CMOR subsequently submitted Reply Comments in late January, emphasizing the points made in our Comments and responded to a few of the Comments previously posted. We likewise orchestrated the submission of several Reply Comments by industry members, to support CMOR's Comments and position and provide further evidence of the impact of the restrictions on the industry.

CMOR will continue our involvement in the FCC Rule review to protect the interest of survey research, with a meeting with FCC staff in upcoming weeks.

To read CMOR's submitted Comments, visit the FCC website at:

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6513397572

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6513407818

A New Respondent-Friendly Privacy Law: Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act of 2002

As reported in CMOR's Winter 2002 Legislative Watch, favorable federal privacy legislation was introduced late in the 2002 session, which seeks, in

part, to protect the confidentiality of information acquired by federal agencies from the public for statistical

purposes. The bill, signed into law in mid-December, creates the "Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act of 2002."

Under the new law, government agencies and those who contract with the agencies to perform exclusively statistical activities -- so-called "agents" (i.e. researchers) -- are bound to use data or information

acquired by an agency under a pledge of confidentiality for exclusively statistical purposes. The law prohibits agencies from disclosing

data or information acquired by an agency under a pledge of confidentiality, in identifiable form, for any use other than an exclusively

statistical purpose, without consent of the respondent. If an agency wants to use data or information for nonstatistical purposes, it

must provide notice to the public (before the data or information is collected) that the data or information could be used for nonstatistical

purposes. The law imposes fines and penalties on officers, employees, or

agents of an agency, or anyone who, by contract, binds themselves to the

confidentiality section of the law, who knowingly disclose information in

violation of the law.

As the law states, "ensuring that information provided under a pledge of

confidentiality for statistical purposes receives protection is essential in

continuing public cooperation in statistical programs." Additional details on

the law will soon be available on the CMOR website (www.cmor.org).

For further information on any of the material provided in this email, please

contact CMOR's Director of Government Affairs, Donna Gillin, at dgillin@cmor.org.

Kimberly A. Hoodin
Membership & Marketing Manager
CMOR - Promoting & Advocating Survey Research

khoodin@cmor.org
Phone: (513) 985-0344
Fax: (513) 985-0119

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Wed, 5 Mar 2003 11:07:00 -0800
Reply-To: Bill McCready <BMcCready@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Bill McCready <BMcCready@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM>
Subject: US Supreme Court encourages surveys ...
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The Supreme Court required that brand name businesses show they suffered
real harm, not just an unpleasant association, to collect damages from

upstart imitators. (Victoria's Secret brought suit for damages against Victor's Little Secret and lost). "They did not say how brand name companies could do that, although they suggested a survey of consumers might supply the evidence." =20
[Chicago Tribune, 03/05/03, David G. Savage with an LA Times footer.]

=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D

Bill McCready

Knowledge Networks

=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 5 Mar 2003 17:05:47 -0500

Reply-To: "Langer, Gary E" <Gary.E.Langer@ABC.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Langer, Gary E" <Gary.E.Langer@ABC.COM>

Subject: Re: US Supreme Court encourages surveys ...

Comments: To: Bill McCready <BMcCready@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

The actual reference is not quite so positive. The court cites, and = implicitly accepts, respondents' claim that surveys "are expensive and = often unreliable." As follows:

"Noting that consumer surveys and other means of demonstrating actual = dilution are expensive and often unreliable, respondents and their amici = argue that evidence of an actual 'lessening of the capacity of a famous = mark to identify and distinguish goods or services,' may be difficult to = obtain. It may well be, however, that direct evidence of dilution such = as consumer surveys will not be necessary if actual dilution can = reliably be proven through circumstantial evidence - the obvious case is = one where the junior and senior marks are identical. Whatever = difficulties of proof may be entailed, they are not an acceptable reason = for dispensing with proof of an essential element of a statutory = violation."

Hardly a ringing endorsement.

<http://www.supremecourtus.gov/opinions/02pdf/01-1015.pdf>=20

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

From: Bill McCready [<mailto:BMcCready@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM>]

Sent: Wednesday, March 05, 2003 2:07 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: US Supreme Court encourages surveys ...

The Supreme Court required that brand name businesses show they suffered real harm, not just an unpleasant association, to collect damages from upstart imitators. (Victoria's Secret brought suit for damages against Victor's Little Secret and lost). "They did not say how brand name companies could do that, although they suggested a survey of consumers might supply the evidence." =20
[Chicago Tribune, 03/05/03, David G. Savage with an LA Times footer.]

=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D
Bill McCready
Knowledge Networks
=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D=3D

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: =
aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Wed, 5 Mar 2003 17:40:48 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Re: US Supreme Court encourages surveys ...
In-Reply-To: <9220C93DC108294081CF79306B53C1F9079C3A@sm-nyny-xm02.nena.wdpr.disney.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Regarding consumer surveys I'd accept invalid before I accepted often unreliable.

And how expensive is a survey compared to taking a court case to the Supreme Court?

But it is important to keep in mind that it appears these are the arguments of the respondents (in a legal sense for a change) and their amici.

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC

6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Langer, Gary E

> Sent: Wednesday, March 05, 2003 5:06 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: US Supreme Court encourages surveys ...

>

> The actual reference is not quite so positive. The court cites, and
> implicitly accepts, respondents' claim that surveys "are expensive and
> often unreliable." As follows:

>

> "Noting that consumer surveys and other means of demonstrating actual
> dilution are expensive and often unreliable, respondents and their
amici

> argue that evidence of an actual 'lessening of the capacity of a
famous

> mark to identify and distinguish goods or services,' may be difficult
to

> obtain. It may well be, however, that direct evidence of dilution such
as

> consumer surveys will not be necessary if actual dilution can reliably
be

> proven through circumstantial evidence - the obvious case is one where
the

> junior and senior marks are identical. Whatever difficulties of proof
may

> be entailed, they are not an acceptable reason for dispensing with
proof

> of an essential element of a statutory violation."

>

> Hardly a ringing endorsement.

>

> <http://www.supremecourtus.gov/opinions/02pdf/01-1015.pdf>

>

>

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

> From: Bill McCready [mailto:BMcCready@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM]

> Sent: Wednesday, March 05, 2003 2:07 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: US Supreme Court encourages surveys ...

>

>

> The Supreme Court required that brand name businesses show they
suffered

> real harm, not just an unpleasant association, to collect damages from

> upstart imitators. (Victoria's Secret brought suit for damages against

> Victor's Little Secret and lost). "They did not say how brand name

> companies could do that, although they suggested a survey of consumers

> might supply the evidence."

> [Chicago Tribune, 03/05/03, David G. Savage with an LA Times footer.]

>

> =====

> Bill McCready

> Knowledge Networks

> =====

>

> -----

> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your

> main email address.

> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:

aapornet-request@asu.edu

>

> -----

> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your

> main email address.

> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:

aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====

Date: Wed, 5 Mar 2003 18:04:25 -0500

Reply-To: RFunk787@AOL.COM

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "G. Ray Funkhouser" <RFunk787@AOL.COM>

Subject: Re: US Supreme Court encourages surveys ...

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Has there been some sort of time-warp recently? I recall that, in the early 1970s, colleagues were conducting surveys to determine the extent of "consumer confusion" in trademark infringement suits. The issue investigated was, was a "significant" proportion of the public led by the alleged infringement to believe that the two products originated from the same source? Seems to me that sufficient precedents were in place to obviate the need for this decision. Or is there more to the current case than mentioned in the blurb we saw? Or is it just that lawsuits have gone over the top? In connection with the Victor's/Victoria's flap, I heard it reported that Ralph Lauren had sued some national polo association for infringing on his "Polo" brand (a new definition of chutzpah?)

Ray Funkhouser

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Wed, 5 Mar 2003 15:17:35 -0800

Reply-To: steve johnson <stevej@nsdssurvey.org>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: steve johnson <stevej@NSDSSURVEY.ORG>

Subject: Re: US Supreme Court encourages surveys ...

Comments: To: "Langer, Gary E" <Gary.E.Langer@ABC.COM>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

We have done survey work for trademark and class action suits and the issues of survey admissibility hinge on adherence to very strict guidelines and standards for how the work is conducted. However, if the standards are met case law strongly supports the use of surveys. If you fail to meet any of the standards (some of which are not exactly the same as scientific survey standards) then you are open to the charge of "junk science." If you want to know more about this see: 1) Federal Judicial Center's Manual for Complex Litigation; and 2) West Keycite survey research section (this has the case law).

Best

Stephen Johnson, Ph.D.

President, Northwest Survey & Data Services

970 W. 7th Ave.

Eugene, OR 97402

(541) 687-8976

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

From: "Langer, Gary E" <Gary.E.Langer@ABC.COM>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, March 05, 2003 2:05 PM

Subject: Re: US Supreme Court encourages surveys ...

> The actual reference is not quite so positive. The court cites, and implicitly accepts, respondents' claim that surveys "are expensive and often unreliable." As follows:

>

> "Noting that consumer surveys and other means of demonstrating actual dilution are expensive and often unreliable, respondents and their amici argue that evidence of an actual 'lessening of the capacity of a famous mark to identify and distinguish goods or services,' may be difficult to obtain.

It may well be, however, that direct evidence of dilution such as consumer surveys will not be necessary if actual dilution can reliably be proven through circumstantial evidence - the obvious case is one where the junior and senior marks are identical. Whatever difficulties of proof may be entailed, they are not an acceptable reason for dispensing with proof of an

essential element of a statutory violation."

>

> Hardly a ringing endorsement.

>

> <http://www.supremecourtus.gov/opinions/02pdf/01-1015.pdf>

>

>

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

> From: Bill McCready [mailto:BMcCready@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM]

> Sent: Wednesday, March 05, 2003 2:07 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: US Supreme Court encourages surveys ...

>

>

> The Supreme Court required that brand name businesses show they suffered

> real harm, not just an unpleasant association, to collect damages from

> upstart imitators. (Victoria's Secret brought suit for damages against

> Victor's Little Secret and lost). "They did not say how brand name

> companies could do that, although they suggested a survey of consumers

> might supply the evidence."

> [Chicago Tribune, 03/05/03, David G. Savage with an LA Times footer.]

>

> =====

> Bill McCready

> Knowledge Networks

> =====

>

> -----

> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your

> main email address.

> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

>

> -----

> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your

> main email address.

> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your

main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Thu, 6 Mar 2003 13:58:12 -0500

Reply-To: "Jon A. Krosnick" <krosnick@OSU.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Jon A. Krosnick" <krosnick@OSU.EDU>

Subject: AAPOR Conference Chairs and Discussants

MIME-version: 1.0

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

We have nearly finalized the presentation schedule for the upcoming AAPOR conference and are now ready to turn to selecting session chairs and discussants.

All authors whose papers or posters will be included in the program will automatically be considered for selection as a chair or discussant.

If you are currently NOT scheduled to present a paper or poster at the conference (all authors have been notified of their acceptances by now) and would like to serve as a chair or discussant, please email a note expressing your interest and attach your cv to Michael Tichy at tichy.1@osu.edu.

We will begin making the chair and discussant assignments next week.

New updates on the conference were recently posted at www.aapor.org - check it out.

One last thing: Hotel rooms at the Sheraton are going fast - if you are dilly-dallying instead of making your reservation, now might be a good time to rethink that strategy.

See you in Nashville,

Jon Krosnick
Program Chair

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 7 Mar 2003 09:49:20 -0500

Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>

Subject: What the public thinks (about the war with Iraq)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/media/jan-june03/polls_3-6.html

A transcript of an interview with Andy Kohut and Rich Morin

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209

410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Fri, 7 Mar 2003 10:24:18 -0500
Reply-To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>
Subject: Re: What the public thinks (about the war with Iraq)
Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
In-Reply-To: <000101c2e4b8\$bcc18630\$130a010a@LEO>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Thanks, Leo: This was an excellent segment of the Newshour.

Inevitably, however, there are transcript typos and small mislocutions on
the part of panelists: I suppose we might call these "verbos?"

Did Andy mean to say that 'seculars' are LESS likely to OPPOSE the war?

And what was Richard trying to tell us about partisanship and gender? The
part about the Republican men and Republican women didn't come through
clearly in the transcript.

Rich, Andy: I'm sure others on AAPOR would be interested in clarification.

Again, my compliments on an excellent 10 minutes of TV!

Tom

--On Friday, March 07, 2003 9:49 AM -0500 "Leo G. Simonetta"
<simonetta@ARTSCI.COM> wrote:

> http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/media/jan-june03/polls_3-6.html

Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434)243-5223
 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 Charlottesville, VA 22903
 e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Fri, 7 Mar 2003 10:41:40 -0500
Reply-To: Sid Groeneman <sid.grc@VERIZON.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Sid Groeneman <sid.grc@VERIZON.NET>
Subject: Re: What the public thinks (about the war with Iraq)
Comments: To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu>
In-Reply-To: <1458422441.1047032658@d-128-55-134.bootp.Virginia.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I agree with Tom: I also think that the relationship of war opposition and a secular religious orientation was mistakenly reversed. Most recent research I've seen has it just the opposite: Church-goers (or those with some religious identity) are likely to be more in favor of the war effort than their more secular counterparts.

Sid Groeneman

Groeneman Research & Consulting
Bethesda, Maryland
sid.grc@verizon.net
301 469-0813
www.groeneman.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Thomas M. Guterbock
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2003 10:24 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: What the public thinks (about the war with Iraq)

Thanks, Leo: This was an excellent segment of the Newshour.

Inevitably, however, there are transcript typos and small mislocutions on the part of panelists: I suppose we might call these "verbos?"

Did Andy mean to say that 'seculars' are LESS likely to OPPOSE the war?

And what was Richard trying to tell us about partisanship and gender? The part about the Republican men and Republican women didn't come through clearly in the transcript.

Rich, Andy: I'm sure others on AAPOR would be interested in clarification.

Again, my compliments on an excellent 10 minutes of TV!

Tom

--On Friday, March 07, 2003 9:49 AM -0500 "Leo G. Simonetta"
<simonetta@ARTSCI.COM> wrote:

> http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/media/jan-june03/polls_3-6.html

Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434)243-5223
 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 Charlottesville, VA 22903
 e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====

Date: Fri, 7 Mar 2003 10:57:32 -0500
Reply-To: Richard Morin <morinr@WASHPOST.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Richard Morin <morinr@WASHPOST.COM>
Subject: Re: What the public thinks (about the war with Iraq)
Comments: To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Tom,

Here are the relevant gender by party identification breaks that I made fleeting reference to on the NewsHour segment. These numbers were displayed in a graphic that was shown as I prattled on. The figures are the percent who support taking military action to disarm Iraq and remove Saddam Hussein.

Men	67%
Women	51
Republican men	89%
Republican women	82
Democratic men	42%

Complete survey results, exact question wording and The Washington Post story summarizing the poll findings may be found at:

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A37643-2003Mar3.html>

Best,
Rich

"Thomas M.
Guterbock" To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
<tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU> cc:
Subject: Re: What the public
thinks (about the war with Iraq)
Sent by: AAPORNET
<AAPORNET@asu.edu>

03/07/2003 10:24
AM
Please respond to
"Thomas M.
Guterbock"

Thanks, Leo: This was an excellent segment of the Newshour.

Inevitably, however, there are transcript typos and small mislocutions on the part of panelists: I suppose we might call these "verbos?"

Did Andy mean to say that 'seculars' are LESS likely to OPPOSE the war?

And what was Richard trying to tell us about partisanship and gender? The part about the Republican men and Republican women didn't come through clearly in the transcript.

Rich, Andy: I'm sure others on AAPOR would be interested in clarification.

Again, my compliments on an excellent 10 minutes of TV!

Tom

--On Friday, March 07, 2003 9:49 AM -0500 "Leo G. Simonetta"
<simonetta@ARTSCI.COM> wrote:

> http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/media/jan-june03/polls_3-6.html

Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434)243-5223
 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 Charlottesville, VA 22903
e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Fri, 7 Mar 2003 11:37:58 -0500
Reply-To: "Peyton M. Craighill" <craighillp@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Peyton M. Craighill" <craighillp@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG>
Subject: Re: What the public thinks (about the war with Iraq)
Comments: To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

In response to Tom's question about secular support for war, Andy misspoke.
What he meant was that seculars are LESS likely to APPROVE of the war. Here
is the breakdown from our latest poll.

Total White Protestant	77%
White Evangelical Protestant	85
White Non-Evangelical Protestant	70
Catholic Non-Hispanic	70
Secular	62

Thanks for picking that up and sorry for the confusion.

Peyton M. Craighill
Project Director
Pew Research Center
1150 18th Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20037

202-293-3126

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

From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Friday, March 07, 2003 10:24 AM

Subject: Re: What the public thinks (about the war with Iraq)

> Thanks, Leo: This was an excellent segment of the Newshour.

>

> Inevitably, however, there are transcript typos and small mislocations on
> the part of panelists: I suppose we might call these "verbos?"

>

> Did Andy mean to say that 'seculars' are LESS likely to OPPOSE the war?

>

> And what was Richard trying to tell us about partisanship and gender?

The

> part about the Republican men and Republican women didn't come through
> clearly in the transcript.

>

> Rich, Andy: I'm sure others on AAPOR would be interested in clarification.

>

> Again, my compliments on an excellent 10 minutes of TV!

>

> Tom

>

> --On Friday, March 07, 2003 9:49 AM -0500 "Leo G. Simonetta"

> <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM> wrote:

>

> > http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/media/jan-june03/polls_3-6.html

>

>

>

> Thomas M. Guterbock Voice: (434)243-5223

> 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 Charlottesville, VA 22903

> e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

>

> -----

> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

> You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
> the messages from the web page above, for instance.

>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Fri, 7 Mar 2003 12:36:13 -0500
Reply-To: "Chun, Young" <YChun@AIR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Chun, Young" <YChun@AIR.ORG>
Subject: Americans on North Korea
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Greetings,

Polls on North Korean issues are emerging as a nuclear crisis is heightened. Below are the latest survey findings on North Korea conducted by Program on International Policy Attitudes and Knowledge Networks. Please note most of them are pdf files. You may get to all of them at www.pipa.org

From my reading of their methodology, it's an interestingly designed panel survey. The sample is initially recruited by RDD, and provided with free Web access for those who agree to participate in the panel. The panel members then participate in surveys a few times a month with an email notification that the survey is available for self-completion.

A couple of observations

Regarding the most important foreign policy problem facing the nation, the results in Part 1 and Part 2 are surprisingly the same. It can't be right.

Next, oversampling Asian/Pacific Americans in the panel would have done sample design and analysis better along with more cross tabulations of each question by major demographic variables. The Korean question is certainly more salient to Asian-Americans specially Chinese, Japanese, and Korean who all share political and economic interests in the Korean peninsula.

(Part 1) Feb. 4, 2003

- Report of Findings - Americans on North Korea I
http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/N_Korea/report_nkr.pdf

- Americans on North Korea I: Questionnaire and tabulations
http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/N_Korea/quest_nkr.pdf

- Press release: Public favors negotiating with North Korea
http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/N_Korea/press_nkr.pdf

(Part 2) Feb. 24, 2003

- New PIPA/Knowledge Networks Poll Finds If Diplomacy Fails With N. Korea,
Only a Minority Supports Moving Toward Military Action If S. Korea
Opposed
http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/N_Korea/NK_feb24/commentary.htm

- Americans on North Korea II: Qustionnaire and tabulations
http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/N_Korea/NKFeb_q.pdf

Your colleague Young Chun

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Sun, 9 Mar 2003 17:08:00 -0600
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Request for information
Comments: cc: stewart@periscopeltd.co.uk
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Would anyone have information for this individual? Respond directly to: =
stewart@periscopeltd.co.uk =20

To whom it may concern;=20

I work for an English Market Research Agency, we have been asked to =
quote for a project which involves conducting telephone interviews into =
the United States.=20

However we believe there is a form of telephone preference system in =
operation in the US, where by to connect to your call you have to enter =
a code to speak to the person, in order to avoid unwanted/unsolicited =
calls.=20

I was wondering if you had any further information available on this, =
regarding restrictions and exemptions (i.e. in the UK market research is =
except from this) to aid us in the presentation of the quote.=20

Thank you in advance,=20

Stewart.=20

Stewart Watson

Periscope=20

501 Glossop Road

Sheffield

S10 2QE

T. 0114 281 6777

F. 0114 281 6999

www.periscopeltd.co.uk <<http://www.periscopeltd.co.uk>>=20

Delivering research and survey based solutions to market, customer and =
employee based issues.

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 10 Mar 2003 00:01:00 -0500

Reply-To: Stephanie Bushey <Stephanie.Bushey@HOFSTRA.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Stephanie Bushey <Stephanie.Bushey@HOFSTRA.EDU>

Subject: Re: AAPORNET Digest - 7 Mar 2003 to 9 Mar 2003 (#2003-55)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Thank you for your email. I will be out of the office until Wednesday
March 12th. If you need assistance, please contact Anne Michiels at
516-463-6809 or anne.michiels@hofstra.edu.

Thanks,

Stephanie

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 10 Mar 2003 13:04:43 -0500

Reply-To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>

Subject: POSITION ANNOUNCEMENT: Assistant Director for CSR at UVa

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

POSITION ANNOUNCEMENT
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

CENTER FOR SURVEY RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

Leading academic survey research center seeks an experienced
survey researcher to serve as Assistant Director.

DUTIES: Assists the Center Director in day-to-day management of
the Center, coordinates functional and project staff, and manages
operations for multiple survey projects, conducted concurrently.

Oversees project managers and assists them as needed with project planning, preparation of budgets and time-lines, project management, and cost control. Coordinates project tasks with CATI lab manager and self-administered surveys manager. Responsible for coordinating Center resources across competing projects and keeping Director updated on project and proposal status. Assists Director and project coordinators in keeping clients and principal investigators informed of project status and responding to their inquiries. Reviews questionnaire drafts, reports of results, and other survey products and assists in their preparation as needed. Assists Director in ensuring that CSR projects are of highest quality and that survey products are delivered on time and on-budget. May act as project director or project coordinator on some survey projects as time allows.

OUR ORGANIZATION: Founded in 1987, CSR became part of UVa's Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service in July 2000, and has doubled its business volume since then. CSR provides survey services for state agencies and local governments in Virginia, while continuing its more academically visible projects. Our Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing lab features 23 stations running Sawtooth WinCATI, equipped for audio and remote monitoring. Several part-time positions in the Center were recently made full-time as part of our expansion; when this position is filled CSR will have six full-time staff members. The Director (a tenured member of the UVa faculty) will continue in an active management and research role within the Center, and will work closely with the Assistant Director to coordinate project management and management of the enterprise. Our staffing includes, in addition to the Director and Assistant Director: a full-time Fiscal Technician, full-time CATI lab manager, full-time manager for self-administered surveys, full-time Senior Research Analyst, several part-time programmer/analysts, several part-time project coordinators (some with faculty appointments), part-time project assistants, part-time CATI lab shift supervisors, interviewers and student interns.

POSITION REQUIREMENTS: This is a full-time, renewable, non-tenure track, Research Professional Staff position with benefits. It could start as early as April 2003. It requires an MA and a minimum of three years experience in telephone and mail surveys. Applicants should have familiarity with scientific survey practices and procedures used in CATI surveys and mail surveys. Applicants should have prior supervisory experience or field management experience on a variety of survey projects and successful experience in managing multiple projects. Ability to train, supervise, hire, and dismiss part-time personnel, as well as the ability to meet deadlines and motivate staff in a team environment, are needed. Moreover, candidates should demonstrate excellent organizational and coordination skills in situations with multiple demands. The position requires competency in word processing, developing and maintaining spreadsheets and databases, familiarity with the internet and E-mail. Knowledge of data coding and quality control procedures is a plus and

Poll: Divided On Iraq
NEW YORK, March 6, 2003
CBS NEWS

Americans continue to express patience with the pace of U.N. weapons inspections and want United Nations backing for any military action against Iraq. But that is not the approach they believe the Bush Administration is taking.

Americans would approve of U.S. military action to remove Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein from power, but by 48% to 27%, they say their concern is making sure that Iraq is disarmed. They are willing to give the U.N. more time to build a consensus around how to do that.

But most believe that President Bush sees things very differently -- 54% say he is more interested in ousting Saddam Hussein, and just 20% think his goal is to disarm Hussein. Even though less than half think enough evidence has been presented to justify an attack now, most believe the President has already decided to launch a military strike.

The public is divided on whether the Bush Administration has yet presented enough evidence against Iraq to justify military action right now. 47% say they have, 44% say they still have not.

For the rest of the story see:

<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2003/03/06/opinion/polls/main543034.shtml>

For the exact questions and some marginals by party see:

http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/CBSNews_polls/iraq_back306.pdf

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Mon, 10 Mar 2003 14:17:27 -0600
Reply-To: Andrew Rojecki <arojecki@UIC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Andrew Rojecki <arojecki@UIC.EDU>
Subject: request for 2000 campaign videotape
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

One of our graduate students is doing thesis research on the "Americanization" of campaign coverage in Europe. He is hoping that he can get a videotape of the last 6 weeks of TV coverage of the US presidential campaign on any broadcast network. He does not have the means to pay for taped excerpts from the Vanderbilt archives. Does any one know of any library or source that might loan him such a tape?

Thanks very much.

Andy Rojecki
University of Illinois at Chicago

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Mon, 10 Mar 2003 16:59:47 -0500
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Sen. Frist's web site kills wayward poll
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The following item was reported last Friday by the tech news site "The Register." The clear implication is that Senator Frist's office had actually instituted pretty good safeguards to prevent vote tampering but when the vote started going the wrong way, it pulled the poll.

Aside from the usual cautions about taking this kind of junk poll seriously, does anyone doubt that, had the vote gone the way the senator wanted, his office would have trumpeted the news to all comers?

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

<http://www.theregister.co.uk/content/55/29654.html>

Senate Leader scraps website war poll, blaming hackers
By Andrew Orłowski in San Francisco
Posted: 07/03/2003 at 22:55 GMT

Senate majority leader Bill Frist has yanked a "Bomb Iraq" poll from his website.

Frist's office told The Register that "tampering" was to blame for the removal of the poll, which asked "Should the United States use force to remove Saddam Hussein from power? Your opinion is

important to Senator Frist."

"Clever computer programmers created a program that generated 8,700 votes in a day," a spokesperson told us. Which is where the mystery really begins.

The spokesperson couldn't say whether the software was running inside the firewall, representing a major breach of the Senate IT security, or was a robot-style vote generator run by netizens.

The curious thing is that Frist's poll page already banned robots - including the Wayback Machine, archive.org - from the site. Respondents could vote once and then return to the site later to change their vote; only the latest response would be counted.

"As you know government computers are constantly being attacked by hackers," he suggested.

Nor could Frist's office explain why the website administrators simply didn't exclude the votes they didn't want to count - Florida-style.

One correspondent has noted the increasing tally of No votes:-

"At 1:35 pm Washington DC time on March 6, the Frist site reported 31,118 responses to the war poll. Anti-war respondents (55%) had gained a clear majority over pro-war respondents (44.6%). (These figures do not quite add up to 100%, apparently because of the rounding method used by Senator Frist's staff.)

"Within the hour, at 2:23 pm, the anti-war fever had risen, with 56.9% anti-war, 42.9% pro-war. By 4:29 pm, according a snapshot of the Frist site, with 37, 742 total responses, the anti-war vote registered 59.5%, with the pro-war vote ebbing at 39.8%."

The Senate site has been defaced before. Whether this represents a new and more serious breach - as Frist's office suggests - we don't know.

But our enquiries continue.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Mon, 10 Mar 2003 17:12:44 -0600
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Job Posting
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

If you have a job placement service, please post the following position:

http://www.oii.ox.ac.uk/SurveyResearchOfficer_0203.pdf

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Tue, 11 Mar 2003 07:41:16 -0600
Reply-To: smitht@NORCMail.UChicago.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Tom Smith <smitht@NORCMail.UChicago.edu>
Subject: No subject given
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The 2002 General Social Survey has been archived and is available as part of the 1972-2002 cumulative data file. This file contains 24 national cross-sections, has 43,698 respondents, and over 4,200 variables. The 1972-2002 codebook is now being printed and will be available in a couple weeks.

The 2002 GSS follows the biennial, double sample design first adopted in 1994. There are 10 topical modules and two International Social Survey Program (ISSP) modules.

The topical modules are on 1) computer and internet use which largely replicates the 2000 GSS items on this topic, 2) racial and ethnic prejudice, 3) child, mental-health stigma, 4) participation in the arts, 5) trust in doctors, 6) quality of working life, 7) non-wage compensation for workers, 8) altruism, 9) transition to adulthood, and 10) sexual behavior (continuing the series started in 1988).

The ISSP modules are on the family, gender, and work and social networks and social support. The family, gender, and work module builds on earlier ISSP modules on this topic in 1988 and 1994. As is usual, about two-thirds of the items are replications and one-third new content. The social networks and social support module is loosely based on an earlier ISSP module in 1986, but consists primarily of new measures.

In addition to the continued support of the National Science Foundation (NSF) the 2002 GSS received funds from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the MacArthur Foundation, the Fetzer Institute, the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Institute for Occupational Health and Safety, the National Institutes for Health, the National Institute for Mental Health, and Rutgers University.

For 1972-2002 GSS data contact the Roper Center, U-1164, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, 06269-1164. Phone (860) 486-4882 Fax: (860) 486-4882, marilyn@ropercenter.uconn.edu or 2) the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), Box 1248, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, 48106. Phone (313)

763-5010, jan@icpsr.umich.edu.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 11 Mar 2003 09:40:56 -0600
Reply-To: jankiley@soltec.net
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Kiley <jankiley@SOLTEC.NET>
Subject: Andrew Rojecki
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="Windows-1252"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I will respond to your request if you will provide an email address.

Jan Kiley
Research Survey Service, Inc.

rss@soltec.net

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 11 Mar 2003 12:52:52 -0500
Reply-To: Roman Czujko <rczujko@AIP.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Roman Czujko <rczujko@AIP.ORG>
Subject: job opportunity
Comments: To: dawn.v.nelson@CENSUS.GOV
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Senior Research Assistant

Not-for-profit, science-related organization seeks a bright, meticulous college graduate for a research team conducting surveys of the scientific

workforce. Position involves statistical programming, analytical strategies, database management, questionnaire development, data analysis, interpretation, and report production. Will oversee work of coders and clerical staff. Requires experience with statistical software packages (syntax-based SPSS preferred), attention to detail, and excellent oral and

written communication skills. Also requires experience with social science or survey research and ability to work independently and as part of a research team. Bachelor's degree in social science or statistics preferred.

Competitive salary and excellent benefits, on-site fitness center, free parking (or walk to metro). Send resume & cover letter including salary requirements via Email to: aiphr@aip.org or mail to: Human Resources Dept.,

American Institute of Physics, One Physics Ellipse, College Park, MD 20740.

EEO

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Tue, 11 Mar 2003 13:28:16 -0500

Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>

Subject: =?iso-8859-1?Q?Ifop_and_IPSOS_Polls--

Que_pensent_les_Fran=E7ais_des_Etats?=
=?iso-8859-1?Q?-Unis?=

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Following is a quick--and not perfect--translation of two recent nationally representative telephone surveys of French adults about the French state of mind regarding Americans, American policy toward Iraq, and the American President.

--Sondage Ifop - Le Journal du dimanche =95 Le 20-21 f=E9vrier 2003

--IPSOS - TV France 2 - March 7-8 2003

Thought some of you might be interested. mark

Sondage Ifop - Le Journal du dimanche =95 Feb. 20-21, 2003

<http://www.ifop.com/europe/=20>

Fiche technique/METHOD

Echantillon de 965 personnes, repr=E9sentatif de la population =

fran=E7aise

=E2g=E9e de 18 ans et plus. La repr=E9sentativit=E9 de l=E9chantillon =

a =E9t=E9

assur=E9e par la m=E9thode des quotas (sexe, =E2ge, profession du chef =

de

famille) apr=E8s stratification par r=E9gion et cat=E9gorie =
d=92agglom=E9ration.

Les interviews ont eu lieu par t=E9l=E9phone au domicile des personnes
interrog=E9es. Du 20 au 21 f=E9vrier 2003.

L=92=E9tat d=92esprit des Fran=E7ais =E0 l=92=E9gard des Am=E9ricains et =
de la guerre en

Irak=20

The French state of mind regarding Americans and the war in Iraq

Question: A propos d=92une intervention militaire en Irak, pouvez-vous =
me

d=E9crire votre =E9tat d=92esprit aujourd=92hui ? / Regarding a military
intervention in Iraq, which of the following describes your state of
mind today?

Like Americans--76%

--You like Americans and you are favorable to military intervention in
Iraq, 6%

--You like Americans but you are opposed to military intervention in
Iraq, 70%

Do not like Americans--17

--You do not like Americans and are opposed to military intervention in
Iraq, 15%

--You do not like Americans but you are favorable to military
intervention in Iraq, 2%

No opinion, 7%

Conducted by IPSOS - for TV FRANCE 2

Nationally representative telephone survey of adults 18+

FIELD DATES/DATE DU TERRAIN : Les 7 et 8 mars/MARCH 2003.

ECHANTILLON : 928 personnes, constituant un =E9chantillon national
repr=E9sentatif de la population fran=E7aise =E2g=E9e de 18 ans et plus. =

METHODE : Echantillon interrog=E9 par t=E9l=E9phone=20

M=E9thode des quotas : sexe, =E2ge, profession du chef de famille, =
cat=E9gorie

d'agglom=E9ration, r=E9gion.

Article:

<http://www.ipsos.fr/CanalIpsos/articles/1085.asp?rubId=3D19=20>

Tables:

<http://www.ipsos.fr/CanalIpsos/poll/7746.asp>

Q. Pour chacun des Etats ou puissances suivantes, dites-moi si vous
pensez que son poids sur la sc=E8ne internationale va progresser, =
diminuer

ou rester le m=EAmE dans les ann=E9es qui viennent ?/ For each of the

following nations or world powers, tell me if you think that the weight of the country will increase, decrease, or stay the same in the coming years?

China

--Increase, 65%
--Decrease, 6
--Stay the same, 19
--DK, 10

European Union

--Increase, 63%
--Decrease, 9
--Stay the same, 23
--DK, 5

France

--Increase, 45%
--Decrease, 16
--Stay the same, 35
--DK, 4

Russia

--Increase, 44%
--Decrease, 10
--Stay the same, 37=20
--DK, 9

Japan

--Increase, 35%
--Decrease, 12
--Stay the same, 40
--DK, 13

The United States

--Increase, 28%
--Decrease, 33
--Stay the same, 31=20
--DK, 8

Q. De mani=E8re g=E9n=E9rale, avez-vous une tr=E8s bonne, plut=F4t = bonne, plut=F4t mauvaise ou tr=E8s mauvaise image du pr=E9sident des Etats-Unis, George = W.

Bush ? In general, do you have a very good, somewhat good, somewhat bad, or very bad image/impression of the President of the United States, George W. Bush?

Good, 15%
--Very good, 2
--Somewhat good, 13
Bad, 82%
--Somewhat bad, 36
--Very bad, 46

No opinion, 3

Q. La position actuelle des Etats-Unis dans la crise irakienne vous para-t-elle justifiée, du point de vue américain ? / From the point of view of the U.S., do you think the actual position of the U.S. on the Iraq crisis is justified?

Yes, completely, 11%

Yes, somewhat, 14

No, not really, 25

Not, not at all, 46

No opinion, 4

Q. Que vous inspire principalement la position américaine dans la crise irakienne ? / What are your main thoughts about the American position on the Iraq crisis?

Percent mentioned at least one negative sentiment--86%

--Incomprehension, 56%

--Exasperation, 49

--Hostility, 44

Percent mentioned at least one positive sentiment--22%

--Comprehension, 14

--Respect, 9

--Solidarity, 9

No opinion, 3

Q. De laquelle de ces deux opinions vous sentez-vous le plus proche ?
Which of the following two opinions is closest to your own opinion?

--The U.S. policy is directly linked to the personality of George W. Bush, 76%

--The U.S. would have more or less the same policy with another president, 17

No opinion, 7

Q. Selon vous, si les Etats-Unis décident de se passer d'un vote du Conseil de sécurité des Nations Unies pour intervenir en Irak, quelle

doit être la position de la France ? / In your opinion, if the U.S. decides to skip/ignore (?) a vote of the UN Security Council to intervene in Iraq, which of the following should be France's position:

--Participate in military operations with the U.S., 3%

--Do not participate directly in military operations but support the U.S. logistically, 30

--Abstain from all participation in military operations, 64

--No opinion, 3

Q. Et si le Conseil de sécurité des Nations Unies vote une intervention militaire en Irak, quelle doit être la position de la France ? / And

if
the UN Security Council votes for a military intervention in Iraq, what
should France's position be?

- Participate in military operations with the U.S., 13%
- Do not participate directly in military operations but support the
U.S. logistically, 44
- Abstain from all participation in military operations, 41
- No opinion, 2

Q. Si les Etats-Unis et le Royaume-Uni parviennent à faire adopter par
l'ONU une résolution pour permettre l'usage de la force en Irak,
seriez-vous pour, ou contre, l'utilisation par la France de son droit de
veto pour s'opposer à cette résolution ? / If the U.S. and Great
Britain
bring a resolution to the UN to permit the use of force in Iraq, would
you be for or against France using its right of veto to oppose the
resolution?

- For, 69%
- Against, 24
- No opinion, 7

Q. Selon vous, qui porte le plus la responsabilité de la
détérioration
actuelle des relations franco-américaines ? / In your opinion, which
country carries the greatest responsibility for the actual deterioration
of Franco-American relations?

- The U.S., 81%
- France, 8%
- [Both], 5
- No opinion, 6

Q. Pensez-vous que la détérioration actuelle des relations
franco-américaines aura plutôt des conséquences positives, =
plutôt des
conséquences négatives ou n'aura pas de conséquences ? / Do you
think
that the actual deterioration of Franco-American relations will result
in positive consequences, negative consequences, or will have no
consequence for...

- France's standing in the world
- Positive, 30%
 - Negative, 29
 - No difference, 36
 - No opinion, 5

- For the French economy
- Positive, 9%
 - Negative, 62
 - No difference, 25
 - No opinion, 4

Q. De laquelle de ces deux opinions vous sentez-vous le plus proche ?
Which of the following two opinions is closest to your own opinion?

--The Iraqi crisis is an exception--France and the U.S. are more often than not in agreement on world political, economic, and cultural issues, 41%

--The Iraqi crisis is not an exception--France and the U.S. are increasingly opposed to one another on world political, economic, and cultural issues, 49%

--No opinion, 10

Mark David Richards

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Tue, 11 Mar 2003 13:28:02 -0500

Reply-To: Phillip Downs <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Phillip Downs <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>

Subject: Research Project Manager

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Need a problem-solving college graduate with 3 to 7 years of experience working for a research team conducting survey or market research. Position involves statistical programming, database management, questionnaire development, data analysis, interpretation, and report production. Will work with interviewer supervisors and data management team to ensure quality of data for your projects. Based on technical and leadership skills, you might lead a group of 3 other project managers. Requires experience with web-based surveys, statistical software packages (SPSS, Survey Systems), attention to detail, and excellent oral and written communication skills. Bachelor's degree in social science or statistics preferred. Send resume & cover letter including salary requirements via Email to pd@kerr-downs.com

Phillip E. Downs, PhD
Kerr & Downs Research
2992 Habersham Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32309
Phone: 850.906.3111
Fax: 850.906.3112

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Wed, 12 Mar 2003 13:05:34 -0500

Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>

Subject: Iranian Pollster

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Jailed pollster Abbas Abdi threatens to go on hunger strike: press

<http://www.irna.com/en/head/030312153013.ehe.shtml>

According to reports by IRNA from Tehran, Abbas Abdi, a leading journalist who is held in connection with a controversial polling which claimed most Iranians favored normal ties with US, has threatened to go on hunger strike if he is transferred to the solitary confinement, the Iranian press on Wednesday cited his daughter Maryam as saying.

The Persian daily Yas-e No further cited her as saying that she had not visited her father, who is suffering from a sore leg, at the prison for more than two weeks.

"Since imprisonment, my father has met only once with a physician and he has not been given any medical examination for the past three months," Maryam said, the paper added.

"I have not visited my father for the past 15 days but Mr. Saleh Nikbakht (Abdi's lawyer) met with my father two days before," it quoted her as saying further.

A Tehran court last month sentenced Abdi to eight years in prison for "propagating against the Islamic Republic" and "selling intelligence to foreigners".

Abdi, who was a student leader in the 1979 takeover of the US Embassy in Tehran, is a member of the mainstream Islamic Iran Participation Front (IIPF).

He was arrested last year along with another suspect in the case, Hossein Qazian, who was sentenced to a nine-year imprisonment on similar charges. Both worked at the Ayandeh research institute.

Another suspect in the case is Behrouz Geranpayeh, the head of the National Institute for Research and Opinion Polls, who has been released

on bail, pending a verdict.

Geranpayeh has been charged with "publishing false and poisonous information" as well as "selling information to foreigners".

The court has accused the defendants of carrying out the research on the order of the Washington-based Gallup Organization.

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 12 Mar 2003 13:22:52 -0500
Reply-To: "Chun, Young" <YChun@AIR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Chun, Young" <YChun@AIR.ORG>
Subject: Nutritional surveys with children in North Korea
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Below are the latest surveys of children in North Korea.
The two rare health surveys they have done in 1998 and 2002
in close partnership with UN agencies are important evidence of
survey activities in North Korea, an encouraging sign of more
survey opportunities ... hopefully public opinion surveys as well ...
in this very isolated country.

Your colleague Young Chun

=====
<http://www.reliefweb.int/w/rwb.nsf/480fa8736b88bbc3c12564f6004c8ad5/43349eb94958082949256cd30005948e?OpenDocument>

"Child nutrition survey shows improvements in DPRK, but
UN agencies concerned about holding onto gains"

PYONGYANG/GENEVA, 20 February 2003 -- Malnutrition rates among children in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) have improved considerably over the past four years, according to a new survey, but the UN agencies that announced the findings today said the gains could be lost if international support for humanitarian assistance to the country continues to slacken.

<http://www.reliefweb.int/w/rwb.nsf/480fa8736b88bbc3c12564f6004c8ad5/80d3b9468465edbac1256cd2004c8a40?OpenDocument>

In 2002, the Government of the D.P.R. Korea, in co-operation with the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the World Food Programme (WFP), carried out a nutrition assessment in seven provinces and three cities. Fieldwork for the assessment was completed in October 2002. The aim of the assessment was to determine the nutritional status of children less than seven years of age and of their mothers, and to analyse the importance of possible causal factors.

The report of the Central Bureau of Statistics, enclosed, presents the situation of the "youngest child of 6,000 selected households" as well as findings related to causal factors. The estimated malnutrition rates for children less than seven years in each of the provinces and cities surveyed is given in the enclosed table.

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Wed, 12 Mar 2003 13:46:24 -0500
Reply-To: "Chun, Young" <YChun@AIR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Chun, Young" <YChun@AIR.ORG>
Subject: Nutritional surveys with children in North Korea
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Below are the latest surveys of children in North Korea. The two rare health surveys they have done in 1998 and 2002 in close partnership with UN agencies are important evidence of survey activities in North Korea, an encouraging sign of more survey opportunities ... hopefully public opinion surveys as well ... in this very isolated country.

Your colleague Young Chun

<http://www.reliefweb.int/w/rwb.nsf/480fa8736b88bbc3c12564f6004c8ad5/43349eb94958082949256cd30005948e?OpenDocument>

"Child nutrition survey shows improvements in DPRK, but UN agencies concerned about holding onto gains"

PYONGYANG/GENEVA, 20 February 2003 -- Malnutrition rates among children in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) have improved considerably over the past four years, according to a new survey, but the UN agencies

that announced the findings today said the gains could be lost if international support for humanitarian assistance to the country continues to slacken.

<http://www.reliefweb.int/w/rwb.nsf/480fa8736b88bbc3c12564f6004c8ad5/80d3b9468465edbac1256cd2004c8a40?OpenDocument>

In 2002, the Government of the D.P.R. Korea, in co-operation with the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the World Food Programme (WFP), carried out a nutrition assessment in seven provinces and three cities. Fieldwork for the assessment was completed in October 2002. The aim of the assessment was to determine the nutritional status of children less than seven years of age and of their mothers, and to analyse the importance of possible causal factors.

The report of the Central Bureau of Statistics, enclosed, presents the situation of the "youngest child of 6,000 selected households" as well as findings related to causal factors. The estimated malnutrition rates for children less than seven years in each of the provinces and cities surveyed is given in the enclosed table.

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 12 Mar 2003 14:00:51 -0500

Reply-To: Scott McBride <smcbride@HCMRESEARCH.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Scott McBride <smcbride@HCMRESEARCH.COM>

Subject: Re: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Does anyone have a good standard statement for when we call and consumers tell us they are on the Do Not Call Registry? Many consumers will not differentiate between telemarketing and research and subsequently threaten the interviewer and firm. It needs to be short and clear. Something like.... "We are calling to conduct marketing research. Research is exempt under the Do Not Call statutes, as your answers are confidential and no attempt will be made to sell you anything. Your opinion is important in helping companies and organizations make decisions that can impact you."

Scott McBride

Hollander Cohen & McBride

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 12 Mar 2003 14:16:33 -0500

Reply-To: Lance Hoffman <lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Lance Hoffman <lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM>
Organization: Opinion Access Corp.
Subject: Re: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry
Comments: To: Scott McBride <smcbride@HCMRESEARCH.COM>
In-Reply-To: <00e301c2e8c9\$b358b180\$0700a8c0@SCOTT>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I am positive that CMOR has something they recommend. They offer an 800 number and even a website link for the consumer/respondent to go to in order to learn the differences between telemarketing and research.

Lance Hoffman
Manager, Business Development
Opinion Access Corp.
P: 718.729.2622 x.157
F: 718.729.2444
C: 646.522.2012

This email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or organization to which it is addressed. Any opinions or advice presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Opinion Access Corp. DO NOT copy, modify, distribute or take any action in reliance on this email if you are not the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender and delete this email from your system. Although this email has been checked for viruses and other defects, no responsibility can be accepted for any loss or damage arising from its receipt or use.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Scott McBride
Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2003 2:01 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry

Does anyone have a good standard statement for when we call and consumers tell us they are on the Do Not Call Registry? Many consumers will not differentiate between telemarketing and research and subsequently threaten the interviewer and firm. It needs to be short and clear. Something like.... "We are calling to conduct marketing research. Research is exempt under the Do Not Call statutes, as your answers are confidential and no attempt will be made to sell you anything. Your opinion is important in helping companies and organizations make decisions that can impact you."

Scott McBride
Hollander Cohen & McBride

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Wed, 12 Mar 2003 15:26:47 -0500
Reply-To: "Burkom, Diane R" <burkom@BATTELLE.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Burkom, Diane R" <burkom@BATTELLE.ORG>
Subject: Re: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

CMOR is also working on testing different introductory statements (that would include some of the wording listed below) to help identify the call as research. Their website includes very helpful documents for training interviewers to answer questions about research vs. telemarketing, Do Not Call regulations, time of calling laws, etc. Their site is www.cmor.org. I am sure that the results of their research will be available to all.

Diane Burkom, MA
Project Director
Battelle Centers for Public Health Research
and Evaluation (CPHRE)
6115 Falls Road, Suite 200
Baltimore, MD 21209
(410) 372-2702 FAX: (410) 377-6802
burkom@battelle.org

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

From: Lance Hoffman [mailto:lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM]
Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2003 2:17 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry

I am positive that CMOR has something they recommend. They offer an 800 number and even a website link for the consumer/respondent to go to in order to learn the differences between telemarketing and research.

Lance Hoffman
Manager, Business Development
Opinion Access Corp.
P: 718.729.2622 x.157

F: 718.729.2444
C: 646.522.2012

This email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or organization to which it is addressed. Any opinions or advice presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Opinion Access Corp. DO NOT copy, modify, distribute or take any action in reliance on this email if you are not the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender and delete this email from your system. Although this email has been checked for viruses and other defects, no responsibility can be accepted for any loss or damage arising from its receipt or use.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Scott McBride
Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2003 2:01 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Survey Research Exempt from "Do Not Call" Registry

Does anyone have a good standard statement for when we call and consumers tell us they are on the Do Not Call Registry? Many consumers will not differentiate between telemarketing and research and subsequently threaten the interviewer and firm. It needs to be short and clear. Something like.... "We are calling to conduct marketing research. Research is exempt under the Do Not Call statutes, as your answers are confidential and no attempt will be made to sell you anything. Your opinion is important in helping companies and organizations make decisions that can impact you."

Scott McBride
Hollander Cohen & McBride

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Thu, 13 Mar 2003 05:38:17 -0800
Reply-To: smitht@NORCMail.UChicago.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Tom Smith <smitht@NORCMail.UChicago.edu>

Subject: CNN.com - Census now estimates over count instead of undercount
in 2000 - Mar. 12, 2003

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

*Please note, the sender's email address has not been verified.

FYI

If you are having trouble with any of the links in this message, or if the URL's are not appearing as links, please follow the instructions at the bottom of this email.

Title: CNN.com - Census now estimates over count instead of undercount in 2000
- Mar. 12, 2003
CNN.com will expire this article on 04/11/2003.

Copy and paste the following into your Web browser to access the sent link:
<http://www.emailthis.clickability.com/et/emailThis?clickMap=viewThis&etMailToID=1417967857&pt=Y>

Copy and paste the following into your Web browser to SAVE THIS link:
<http://www.savethis.clickability.com/st/saveThisPopupApp?clickMap=saveFromET&partnerID=2004&etMailToID=1417967857&pt=Y>

Copy and paste the following into your Web browser to forward this link:
<http://www.emailthis.clickability.com/et/emailThis?clickMap=forward&etMailToID=1417967857&partnerID=2004&pt=Y>

Email pages from any Web site you visit - add the EMAIL THIS button to your browser, copy and paste the following into your Web browser:
<http://www.emailthis.clickability.com/et/emailThis?clickMap=browserButtons&pt=Y>

Instructions:

If your e-mail program doesn't recognize Web addresses:

1. With your mouse, highlight the Web Address above. Be sure to highlight the entire Web address, even if it spans more than one line in your email.
2. Select Copy from the Edit menu at the top of your screen.
3. Launch your Web browser.
4. Paste the address into your Web browser by selecting Paste from the Edit menu.
5. Click Go or press Enter or Return on your keyboard.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Thu, 13 Mar 2003 10:39:43 -0500
Reply-To: mmichaels@michaelsresearch.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Maureen Michaels <mmichaels@MICHAELSRESEARCH.COM>
Organization: Michaels Opinion Reserach, Inc.
Subject: Iranian Pollsters
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear AAPOR friends:

Nancy Belden and I have been closely following the Iranian pollsters' situation for the past few months and have consulted many different sources -- journalists, ex-State Department staff, Iranian scholars, human rights and Mideast experts -- regarding what the American research community could do that would be constructive or at least reflect that we are standing in solidarity. The common counsel of the professionals we talked with is that the most effective response is for each of us, as individual U.S. research professionals, to put a spotlight on the cases by informing international and national organizations, including the U.N., Amnesty International, as well as NGOs and U.S. Government officials, about our concerns. By all reports, these are clear human rights violations. To this end, we have attached a list of organizations to whom we are writing as individuals. We thought we would share it with those who may also wish to express their protest, though, please know that we have been cautioned that it may be counterproductive for Americans to communicate directly with Iranian officials.

Also you may recall, AAPOR President Mark Schulman recently announced Council's position on this issue. WAPOR and Esomar have also released strong statements condemning the convictions of these pollsters. Below are links to these statements along with a few background news articles on this international issue.

Best regards,

Maureen Michaels

Press Releases and News Articles:

AAPOR Statement:

http://www.aapor.org/default.asp?ID=37&page=news_and_issues/press_releases_and_official_statements

Esomar, Efamro, Wapor, Press Release <http://www.esomar.nl/press/Iran.htm>
(02/03)

Iranian Pollsters Jailed After Survey

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/worldlatest/story/0,1280,-2373739,00.html>
(02/03/03)

Pollsters Condemned to Heavy Sentences (Iran Free Press)

http://www.iran-press-service.com/articles_2003/Feb-2003/polsters_condemned_2203.htm (02/02/03)

Iranian Pollsters on Trial in US-Survey Backlash

<http://www.arabia.com/afp/news/mideast/article/english/0,10846,345083,00.html> (12/03/02)

Iranian Pollsters Arrested For Survey

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/worldlatest/story/0,1280,-2217479,00.html>
(12/02/03)

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Thu, 13 Mar 2003 11:01:32 -0500

Reply-To: mmichaels@michaelsresearch.com

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Maureen Michaels <mmichaels@MICHAELSRESEARCH.COM>

Organization: Michaels Opinion Reserach, Inc.

Subject: Contact Info for Iranian Pollsters

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Appears that APPORNET blocks file attachments. We need to reformat the contact list and embed it in an email. To come shortly. --

Maureen Michaels

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Thu, 13 Mar 2003 12:33:55 -0500
Reply-To: mmichaels@michaelsresearch.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Maureen Michaels <mmichaels@MICHAELSRESEARCH.COM>
Organization: Michaels Opinion Reserach, Inc.
Subject: Contact List for Iranian Pollsters
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Contact information re: Iranian pollsters

US Government

Secretary of State Colin Powell
U.S. Department of State=20
2201 C Street NW=20
Washington, DC 20520=09
(202) 647-7098 =09

Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, William Burns=09
Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs' Office of Public Affairs
Room 6242, Department of State
2201 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20520=09
(202) 647-5150 =09

Members of House of Representatives (generic)=09
Office of the Clerk
U.S. Capitol, Room H154
Washington, DC 20515-6601 =20
(202) 225-1908=09
<http://www.house.gov> (enter your zip code to find your representative)

Members of Senate (generic)=09
Office of Senator (Name)
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510=09
(202) 224-3121=09
<http://www.senate.gov> (enter your state to find your senator)

President George Bush=09
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20500=09
(202) 456-1414=09
(202) 456-2461=09
president@whitehouse.gov
=20

International Organizations

Amnesty International
322 8th Avenue
New York, NY 10001
212 807 8400
212 463 9193
212 627 1451
admin-us@aiusa.org

Executive Director Kenneth Roth=20
Human Rights Watch
350 Fifth Avenue, 34th Floor
New York, NY 10118-3299
212 290-4700
212 736-1300
hrwnyc@hrw.org

Secretary General Kofi Annan=09
UN Headquarters
First Avenue at 46th Street
New York, NY 10017
inquiries@un.org=20

Deputy Secretary-General Louise Fr=E9chette=09
UN Headquarters
First Avenue at 46th Street
New York, NY 10017 =09

Human Rights Commissioner, Sergio Vieira de Mello
UN Headquarters
First Avenue at 46th Street
New York, NY 10017 =09

=20
News Outlets

Fred Hiatt, Editor=09
Letters to the Editor
The Washington Post
1150 15th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20071
202-334-4845=09
Does not accept letters by fax
letters@washpost.com

Arthur Ochs Sulzberger Jr., Publisher=09
The New York Times=20
229 West 43d Street=20
New York, NY 10036=09
212-556-1234
fax: (212) 556-3622
publisher@nytimes.com.

John S. Carroll, Editor
Los Angeles Times
202 W. 1st St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 237-2121
(213) 237-7968
John.Carroll@latimes.com

Ann Marie Lipinski , Editor
Chicago Tribune
435 N. Michigan Ave.
Chicago, IL 60611
312-222-3232
ctc-editor@tribune.com

Phil Bennett, Assistant Managing Editor, Foreign News
The Washington Post
1150 15th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20071
202-334-6000
202-334-5651
bennettp@washpost.com

Naka Nathaniel, New York Times Foreign Editor
The New York Times=20
229 West 43d Street=20
New York, NY 10036
212-556-1234
212-556-3622=09

Marjorie Miller, LA Times Foreign Editor
Los Angeles Times
202 W. 1st St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012=09
(213) 237-7072=09
(213) 237-4712=09
Miller@latimes.com

Colin McMahan, Chicago Tribune Foreign Editor
435 N. Michigan Ave.=20
Chicago, IL 60611=09
312-222-3232=09
cmcmahan@tribune.com

Iran (recommended for non-US protestors)

University of Tehran
President Dr. R. Faraji Dana
Enghelab Ave.=20
16 Azar Street=20
Central Administration of University of Tehran,=20
Tehran , Iran
(+9821) 6462699

(+9821) 6419831=20
(+9821) 6405047
(+9821) 6409348

President of Iran
His Excellency, Mr. President Khatami
khatami@president.ir

The Ayotollah
His Excellency, Ayatollah Udhma Khamenei
webmaster@wilayah.org

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Fri, 14 Mar 2003 08:51:15 -0800
Reply-To: Ellis Godard <ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ellis Godard <ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU>
Subject: Regulations on Raffled Incentives?
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I'm consulting for a client that, in a survey of nonprofit organizations, wants to raffle five \$100 cash prizes as an incentive to survey participants. I'm interested in any rules or regulations governing such incentives. I'm concerned that the element of chance may invoke state or federal restrictions, or perhaps acute human subjects issues. Any help would be much appreciated.

Regards,
Ellis Godard
Assistant Professor
Sociology Department
Cal State Northridge

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 14 Mar 2003 16:28:45 -0500
Reply-To: CTalkov@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Cynthia Talkov <CTalkov@AOL.COM>
Subject: NEAAPOR (New England Chapter)Annual Meeting
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=utf-8

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8BIT

NEAAPOR, The New England Chapter of AAPOR, is pleased to invite all AAPOR members (& their colleagues) to join us at our Eighth Annual Conference on Friday, April 4th in Sudbury, MA at Longfellow's Wayside Inn. We have a full day planned with excellent speakers. Our program will include discussions on methodological research findings and highlight public opinion in the new millennium, featuring speakers from The Vanishing Voter Project at the Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy, Harvard University, and the National Annenberg Election Survey Project from the Annenberg School for Communication, University of Pennsylvania.

Longfellow's Wayside Inn, a national Historic site, is situated among oaks and babbling brooks, with extensive grounds filled with gardens and charming buildings (grist mill, chapel, school house, gatehouse) and historic spaces. The main Inn will provide an appealing ambience for our gathering, and its Tavern will be the setting for our informal networking session at the end of the program. The Inn is centrally located between I-90 (the Mass Pike), Rte. 495, and Rte. 128 / I-95 . For details about the Inn and its history, their web-site is www.wayside.org.

Attached are materials with details on pre-registration information, the conference schedule, directions, etc. To pre-register, please complete and return the enclosed form by Wednesday, March 26. If you have any questions about the conference or wish to RSVP, you can contact Brian Robertson at brianr@marketdecisions.com or call Brian at 1-207-767-6440 x149. If you are unable to download the attached conference packet, please contact Brian.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 14 Mar 2003 14:07:50 -0800
Reply-To: Holly Hoegh <holly@CCR.CA.GOV>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Holly Hoegh <holly@CCR.CA.GOV>
Subject: Refusal conversion letter
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Hello,

We are trying to design a refusal conversion follow-up letter for a telephone survey. We do not want to repeat what the initial request for participation letter stated. Any good tips on what should be included or avoided in such a letter. Please respond to me directly, thank you!

Holly Hoegh, PhD
Survey Research Group
Sacramento, CA 95815

(916) 779-0334
holly@ccr.ca.gov

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Mon, 17 Mar 2003 08:18:52 -0500
Reply-To: Janice Ballou <JBallou@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Janice Ballou <JBallou@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM>
Subject: Employment Opportunity

Mathematica Policy Research, a national leader in social policy research, survey design, and data collection, seeks Senior Survey Researchers for our Princeton, NJ, and Washington, DC, offices. Successful candidates will lead national projects on significant policy issues such as health care and education, and will have:

- * A Ph.D. or advanced degree in social sciences, statistics, or related field
- * A minimum of 10 years of experience in survey research methods including survey design, directing large, complex surveys in health or education,, questionnaire development, data analysis, and report writing
- * Demonstrated ability to write and budget proposals * Excellent communication skills

MPR is employee-owned and offers competitive salaries, a comprehensive benefits package, and convenient office locations. Visit our web site at www.mathematica-mpr.com to learn more. Submit your resume and professional references to: Sherry Metzger, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., P.O. Box 2393, Princeton, NJ 08543-2393 or email to HRNJ@mathematica-mpr.com or fax to (609) 799-4394.

Janice Ballou
Vice President and Deputy Director
Surveys and Information Services
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
600 Alexander Park
Princeton, NJ 08540
PH:(609)750-4049
FAX: (609)799-0005

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your

main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 17 Mar 2003 09:51:25 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Push polling in Wisconsin?
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Sat, Mar 15, 2003

Actually sounds like it might be for a change.

Lassa alleges push polling
<http://www.wisinfo.com/journal/spjlocal/277245301960451.shtml>

By PAUL CHRONIS
Journal staff

State Rep. Julie Lassa charged Friday that someone is paying for illegal push polling against her state Senate campaign.

Push polling is a tactic where telemarketers call voters in a district, ostensibly to survey them about a race. But the questions they ask are leading and frequently try to sway a voter's opinion about a candidate in a negative fashion. The tactic is illegal in Wisconsin.

SNIP

Dave Diamond, 41, 2510 Pine Drive, Plover, said he received such a call at 1:07 p.m. Friday. The telemarketer, who identified herself as Kathy, asked to conduct the survey, but hung up when Diamond asked her who was paying for the poll. "I offered to (take the poll), but I wanted to know who was paying for it and who they were representing," he said.

Melanie Fonder, associate editor for the WisPolitics.com Web site, said push polling is a controversial tactic that usually means a race is close. She noted that the tactic became an issue in the South Carolina Republican presidential primary in 2000, when George W. Bush's campaign was accused of making such calls against Sen. John McCain of Arizona. Bush denied any knowledge of the push polls and won the primary.

SNIP

"We only have been able to get part of the survey, in terms of the questions that were asked," she said. "We're also asking people to ask who is paying for the call, and if they won't say or if they don't know, to ask for a supervisor to get additional information. Under Wisconsin law, the caller has to tell you, but in this instance, they're hanging up."

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Mon, 17 Mar 2003 14:11:08 -0500
Reply-To: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>
Subject: Data re : Women faculty
Comments: To: METHODS <METHODS@linux08.UNM.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/html; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

<html>
<body>
Apologies for cross posting

In the context of a survey that I conducted at University of Montreal, I
am looking for existing data on University professors in order to be able
to make some comparisons. My interests are in the socio-demographic
profile and more specifically : Presence of a spouse and of
children, spouse's occupation and wage. I would like to be able to
compare men and women, according to status and age group.

Thanks.

<x-sigsep><p></x-sigsep>
Claire Durand

Claire.Durand@umontreal.ca

<a href=3D"http://www.fas.umontreal.ca/"=
eudora=3D"autourl"><http://www.fas.umontreal.ca/>

Professeur,

Responsable des cycles sup=E9rieurs,

d=E9partement de sociologie,

Universit=E9 de Montr=E9al

C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,

Montr=E9al, Qu=E9bec, H3C 3J7

</body>
</html>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 17 Mar 2003 14:39:37 -0500
Reply-To: Michael Cohen <michael.cohen@BTS.GOV>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Michael Cohen <michael.cohen@BTS.GOV>
Subject: Re: Data re : Women faculty
Comments: To: Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Try

<http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/nsopf/>

for the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, a U.S. survey by the = National Center for Education Statistics. It has everything you mention = except possibly spouse's occupation (it does ask whether spouse is = employed at an institution of higher education).

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

>>> Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA> 03/17/03 02:11PM >>>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 17 Mar 2003 16:58:09 -0800
Reply-To: "H. Stuart Elway" <hstuart@ELWAYRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "H. Stuart Elway" <hstuart@ELWAYRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Rural Community Identity
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Greetings,

I am designing a survey for a client on the topic of health care in rural areas. The client wants to ask about health care services in "your community" so I am looking for community identity variables for residents of

rural areas. That is, how do people in rural areas define "your community."

Thanks for any suggestions.

H.Stuart Elway
Elway Research, Inc.
206/264-1500 x14

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 17 Mar 2003 21:28:20 -0500
Reply-To: "Jon A. Krosnick" <krosnick@OSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Jon A. Krosnick" <krosnick@OSU.EDU>
Subject: Conference Preliminary Program is Online
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

The preliminary program for the 2003 AAPOR Conference is now available online for downloading as a pdf file using Adobe Acrobat. The link is in the middle of this page: <http://www.aapor.org>

We hope to be mailing paper copies out in a little over a week.

Jon Krosnick
Program Chair

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Wed, 19 Mar 2003 10:22:20 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: The Poll Watchers The Poll Watchers: Poll Reinforces
U.S.-International Divide on Iraq
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Includes a report on a brief interview with Arianna Huffington re: her appearance at AAPOR.

The Poll Watchers
Poll Reinforces U.S.-International Divide on Iraq
But Overseas, Attitudes About Invading Iraq Continue to Be

Overwhelmingly Negative

By Richard Morin and Claudia Deane
Washington Post Staff Writers
Wednesday, March 19, 2003; 8:35 AM

Poised at the brink of war, the difference between American and European public attitudes on Iraq are as deep and wide as the Atlantic Ocean, with Americans rallying strongly behind President Bush while most Europeans still remain sharply critical of Bush and his foreign policy, according to surveys released on Tuesday.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A52020-2003Mar19.html>

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Wed, 19 Mar 2003 14:12:06 -0600
Reply-To: bzolling@FHSU.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Brett Zollinger <bzolling@FHSU.EDU>
Subject: Position Announcement
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Fort Hays State University is announcing the following position:

Docking Institute of Public Affairs/Department of Political Science and

Justice Studies
Fort Hays State University

Position Announcement

Joint Appointment as the Assistant Director in the Docking Institute of

Public Affairs and Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science and Justice Studies at Fort Hays State University

For the Assistant Director of the Docking Institute portion of the position, general responsibility is in assisting the Director in most

aspects of Institute activities. Primary job responsibilities include: conducting social scientific research, technical report writing, contract and grant proposal writing, supervision of Institute research scientists and students, presentation of research findings to clients, strategic planning for governmental and non-profit entities, occasional moderation of political forums, simultaneously managing multiple projects. Experience using social science research methods, analyzing primary and secondary quantitative data, writing technical reports, presenting research findings before an audience is necessary. Experience using SPSS, supervising others, writing contract or grant proposals, facilitating planning groups or focus groups, and moderating political forums is preferred. Knowledge of rural economic and community development issues is also preferred. This position is housed in the Docking Institute of Public Affairs. The Docking Institute is a university based consulting, research, and policy analysis organization. Its clients are non-profit and governmental entities. The Institute's University Center for Survey Research conducts telephone, mail, web surveys and focus groups. For more information about activities of the Docking Institute visit our website at: <http://www.fhsu.edu/docking>. Teaching responsibilities with the Department of Political Science and Justice Studies will include two classes each fall and spring semesters.

. Ph.D. in Political Science with an emphasis in American Government and Research Methods preferred; other appropriate terminal degrees (J.D.) with emphasis in American Government and Research Methods would be considered. The person will teach Research Methods and other courses, which may include American Government, State and Local Government, and/or Current Political Issues. In addition to these courses, the person is expected to conduct independent readings. A willingness to teach distance education coursework is desirable. The incumbent is also expected to engage in scholarly work and service, consistent with tenure requirements of the department.

.

Appointment Split and Compensation

This is a 12-month appointment teaching two courses each fall and spring semester, with full-time duties in the Docking Institute during the summer semester. Salary is commensurate with experience and education. The appointment can begin as early as June 10, 2003, and must be filled by August 15, 2003. Review of applications will begin immediately. Priority will be given to applications received by April 15, 2003, but review of applications will continue until the position is filled. An appropriate terminal degree is required by time of appointment. Please submit application materials including a letter of interest, vita, teaching evaluation summaries and three letters of reference to Docking Institute/Political Science Search Committee, Docking Institute of Public Affairs, Fort Hays State University, Hays, KS, 67601. You may direct inquiries to Dr. Brett Zollinger, Docking Institute Director at (785) 628-5881 [bzolling@fhsu.edu] and Dr. Richard Heil, Department of Political Science and Justice Studies, Chair (785) 628-4425 [rheil@fhsu.edu].

Notice of Non-discrimination: Fort Hays State University does not discriminate on the basis of sex, race, religion, national origin, age, disability, Vietnam era veteran status or special disabled veteran status in its programs and activities. Fort Hays State University is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer. The director of affirmative action, coordinator of Title IX, Title VI, Section 504 and ADA regulations, may be contacted at 600 Park Street, Hays, KS 67601-4099, (785) 628-4033.

(See attached file: jointposition.Asst Dir 2003.pdf)

Brett Zollinger, Ph.D.
Director, Docking Institute of Public Affairs
and Assistant Professor of Sociology
Fort Hays State University
600 Park Street
Hays, Kansas 67601
785-628-5881
785-628-4188 fax
<http://www.fhsu.edu/docking>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Wed, 19 Mar 2003 21:07:59 -0500
Reply-To: Johnhuffmanjr@CS.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Johnhuffmanjr@CS.COM
Subject: Position Announcement: Analyst, Statistician
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="UTF-8"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

POSITION ANNOUNCEMENT

=20

Capital One has multiple openings for Data Analysts and Statisticians at bot=
h=20
Entry and Senior Levels

=20

Requirements for candidates include the following:

Strong quantitative and analytical skills

Strong problem solving and conceptual thinking abilities

Ability to handle multiple concurrent projects while working independently=20
and in teams

Analyst experience; including, but not limited to academia,consulting,=20
financial services or information technology industries (multiple years of=20
experience required for more senior positions)

Ability to work in a fast-paced, entrepreneurial environment

Experience managing, coaching and developing a team of analysts (may be=20
required for more senior positions)

Bachelor=E2=80=99s degree in Business, Mathematics, Engineering, Science, Ma=
nagement=20

Information Systems, Computer Science; or equivalent data analysis experienc=
e

=20

Primary Responsibilities of these positions include:

Developing and implementing new strategic tests

Utilizing quantitative/analytical skills to conduct analysis

Leveraging data to help drive our information based strategy

Extracting data from existing data stores and performing ad-hoc queries

Contributing to the full life cycle of projects: driving to insightful analyses and achieving results

Collaborating across business units on cross-functional teams

Assisting in the design, coding and implementation of new production and data storage systems

Leveraging knowledge and skills to drive operational efficiency and effectiveness improvements

Ideal candidates will have the following:

Knowledge of Microsoft Office (Excel, Powerpoint, etc)

Knowledge of querying tools such as SQL and/or SAS

Experience with relational databases

Familiarity with database design principles and data flow processing

At Capital One you'll work side by side with the top analytical minds in the industry. Plus, you'll enjoy the comfort of business-casual dress and an entrepreneurial culture that not only encourages new ideas, but asks you to run with them too!

Please Post or forward to interested parties.

If interested please reply to this e-mail or to:

John Huffman

Data Analyst Channels Manager, Cross-Sell

Capital One

Richmond, VA

804.284.1249

For more information, please visit www.capitalone.com
=20

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Fri, 21 Mar 2003 09:28:00 -0500
Reply-To: allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Allen Barton <allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Are false beliefs the basis for public support of the war?
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Someone asked whether anyone had cross-tabulated the belief that Saddam Hussein was responsible for the September 11 attack on the US with support of our attack on Iraq.. I never saw an answer to that. Since several polls show 40% to 50% holding this false belief (as much as 70% in some wordings), and since the President has used fear of another September 11 as his prime justification for attacking Iraq, and has done nothing to dispel the convenient false belief that Saddam was responsible for September 11, it is possible that public support for the war is at least partly based on this erroneous piece of "knowledge." Who has the crosstab?

Allen Barton

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 21 Mar 2003 10:32:33 -0500
Reply-To: Ed Freeland <efreelan@PRINCETON.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ed Freeland <efreelan@PRINCETON.EDU>
Subject: Re: Are false beliefs the basis for public support of the war?
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

There is a fairly wide range of phrasing on this question. I think the 40-50% you mention refers to respondents who believe there is a link between Hussein and Al Q'aeda or that Hussein has given aid to Al Q'aeda. The polls show that most people find the Bush administration's argument on these links to be fairly

credible. And given the nature of the evidence, I think you'd have to go a long way to make the case that these are "false beliefs" or an "erroneous piece of knowledge."

Ed Freeland

Allen Barton wrote:

> Someone asked whether anyone had cross-tabulated the belief that Saddam
> Hussein was responsible for the September 11 attack on the US with support
> of our attack on Iraq.. I never saw an answer to that. Since several polls
> show 40% to 50% holding this false belief (as much as 70% in some wordings),
> and since the President has used fear of another September 11 as his prime
> justification for attacking Iraq, and has done nothing to dispel the
> convenient false belief that Saddam was responsible for September 11, it is
> possible that public support for the war is at least partly based on this
> erroneous piece of "knowledge." Who has the crosstab?
> Allen Barton

>
> -----

> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 21 Mar 2003 11:23:16 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Re: Are false beliefs the basis for public support of the war?
In-Reply-To: <3E7B3091.C0171B69@princeton.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

It appears that a slight majority of those polled do believe that Saddam was personally involved in the 9/11 attacks

CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll. Latest: March 14-15, 2003. N=3D1,007 adults nationwide. MoE =B1 3 (total sample).=20

"Do you think Saddam Hussein is involved in supporting terrorist groups that have plans to attack the United States, or not?" Form A (N=3D488, = MoE =B1 5)

	Yes	No	No Opinion	=20
3/03	88	9	3	=20

8/02 86 8 6 =20

=20

"Do you think Saddam Hussein was personally involved in the September 11th terrorist attacks, or not?" Form B (N=3D519, MoE =B1 5)

Yes No No Opinion =20

3/03 51 41 8 =20

8/02 53 34 13

The numbers are a little below an outright majority here:

CBS News/New York Times Poll. Latest: March 7-9, 2003. N=3D1,010 adults nationwide. MoE =B1 3 (total sample).=20

=20

"Do you think Saddam Hussein was personally involved in the September 11th, 2001, terrorist attacks against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon?"

=20

Yes No Don't Know =20

=20

3/7-9/03 45 40 15

(These and many more are available at The Polling Report
<http://www.pollingreport.com/>)

I was pretty sure I had seen a couple of others - but I can't find them right now.

--=20

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax
=20

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Ed Freeland

> Sent: Friday, March 21, 2003 10:33 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Are false beliefs the basis for public support of the war?

>=20

> There is a fairly wide range of phrasing on this question. I think the

> 40-50%

> you mention refers to respondents who believe there is a link between Hussein

> and Al Q'aeda or that Hussein has given aid to Al Q'aeda. The polls show

> that
> most people find the Bush administration's argument on these links to
be
> fairly
> credible. And given the nature of the evidence, I think you'd have to
go a
> long
> way to make the case that these are "false beliefs" or an "erroneous
piece
> of
> knowledge."

>=20

> Ed Freeland

>=20

> Allen Barton wrote:

>=20

>> Someone asked whether anyone had cross-tabulated the belief that
Saddam

>> Hussein was responsible for the September 11 attack on the US with

> support

>> of our attack on Iraq.. I never saw an answer to that. Since

several

> polls

>> show 40% to 50% holding this false belief (as much as 70% in some

> wordings),

>> and since the President has used fear of another September 11 as his

> prime

>> justification for attacking Iraq, and has done nothing to dispel the

>> convenient false belief that Saddam was responsible for September

11,

> it is

>> possible that public support for the war is at least partly based on

> this

>> erroneous piece of "knowledge." Who has the crosstab?

>> Allen Barton

>>

>> -----

>> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>> then click on 'Join or leave the list'

>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-

> request@asu.edu

>=20

> -----

> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

> then click on 'Join or leave the list'

> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:

aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 21 Mar 2003 10:23:39 -0600
Reply-To: Brian Cannon <brcannon@TTU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Brian Cannon <brcannon@TTU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Are false beliefs the basis for public support of the war?
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

I don't have the crosstabs originally requested by Allen Barton, but the poll results below (following Ed Freeland's comments) show that a substantial proportion

of the American public do believe that Hussein was involved in the 9/11 attacks and

that he has ties to Al Qaeda (81% in the Fox poll). Allen was also correct in noting that President Bush has allowed people to continue to believe that Hussein was directly involved in 9/11, as this seems to be the one solid foundation on which his justification for the war rests with the American public. Could this be considered manipulation of public opinion? I suppose you could argue either way.

--
Brian Cannon, Director
Earl Survey Research Laboratory
Texas Tech University
Ph: 806-742-4851 Fax: 806-742-4329
www.ttu.edu/~esrl
Ed Freeland wrote:

- > There is a fairly wide range of phrasing on this question. I think the 40-50%
- > you mention refers to respondents who believe there is a link between Hussein
- > and Al Q'aeda or that Hussein has given aid to Al Q'aeda.

- > CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll. Latest: March 14-15, 2003. N=1,007 adults nationwide.
- > MoE \pm 3 (total sample).

- > "Do you think Saddam Hussein is involved in supporting terrorist groups that have
- >
- > plans to attack the United States, or not?" Form A (N=488, MoE \pm 5)
- >
- > Yes, Involved 88% (3/03) 86% (8/02)
- > No, Not Involved 9% (3/03) 8% (8/02)
- > No Opinion 3% (3/03) 6% (8/02)
- >

>
> "Do you think Saddam Hussein was personally involved in the September 11th
> terrorist attacks, or not?" Form B (N=519, MoE ± 5)

>
> Yes, Involved 51% (3/03) 53% (8/02)
> No, Not Involved 41% (3/03) 41% (8/02)
> No Opinion 8% (3/03) 13% (8/02)

>
> CBS News/New York Times Poll. Latest: March 7-9, 2003. N=1,010 adults
nationwide.

>
> MoE ± 3 (total sample).

>
> "Do you think Saddam Hussein was personally involved in the September 11th,
> 2001, terrorist attacks against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon?"

>
> Yes 45%
> No 40%
> Don't 15%
> Know

>
> CBS News/New York Times Poll. Latest: Feb. 10-12, 2003. N=747 adults
nationwide.

> MoE ± 4.

>
> "Do you think Saddam Hussein was personally involved in the September 11th,
2001,

>
> terrorist attacks against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, or not?"

>
> Was 42% (2/03) 51% (9/02)
> Was Not 42% (2/03) 33% (9/02)
> Don't 16% (2/03) 16% (9/02)
> Know

>
>
> The Los Angeles Times Poll. Latest: Jan. 30-Feb. 2, 2003. N=1,385 adults
> nationwide. MoE ± 3 (total sample).

> "President Bush has claimed that there is a link between Saddam Hussein and
the

> Al
> Qaeda terrorist organization. Has President Bush provided enough evidence to
> convince you of that link, or not?"

>
> Has 34%
> Has Not 56%
> No Opinion 10%

>
>
> FOX News/Opinion Dynamics Poll. Latest: Jan. 29-30, 2003. N=900 registered
voters

>
> nationwide. MoE ± 3.

> "Do you believe Iraqi President Saddam Hussein has ties to the terrorist
group
> Al Qaeda?"

>
> Yes 81%
> No 6%
> Not 13%
> Sure

> The polls show that
> most people find the Bush administration's argument on these links to be
fairly
> credible. And given the nature of the evidence, I think you'd have to go a
long
> way to make the case that these are "false beliefs" or an "erroneous piece
of
> knowledge."

>
> Ed Freeland

>
> Allen Barton wrote:

>
>> Someone asked whether anyone had cross-tabulated the belief that Saddam
>> Hussein was responsible for the September 11 attack on the US with support
>> of our attack on Iraq.. I never saw an answer to that. Since several
polls
>> show 40% to 50% holding this false belief (as much as 70% in some
wordings),
>> and since the President has used fear of another September 11 as his prime
>> justification for attacking Iraq, and has done nothing to dispel the
>> convenient false belief that Saddam was responsible for September 11, it
is
>> possible that public support for the war is at least partly based on this
>> erroneous piece of "knowledge." Who has the crosstab?

>> Allen Barton
>>

>> -----
>> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

>
> -----
> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 21 Mar 2003 11:30:44 -0500

Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>

Subject: Here is an interesting UPI story on War & the demographics of public opinion

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Analysis: Which American groups back war?

By Steve Sailer

UPI National Correspondent

From the Washington Politics & Policy Desk

Published 3/20/2003 1:23 PM

LOS ANGELES, March 20 (UPI) -- Now that war has started, support by the American public for an invasion of Iraq can be expected to rise among all groups. But what segments of the public have been the strongest and most consistently supportive of a pre-emptive attack?

Just as Democrats and liberals were more hawkish in support of President Bill Clinton's attack on Serbian-led Yugoslavia in 1999, the core of President George W. Bush's support on Iraq are Republicans and conservatives who voted for him in 2000.

Pollsters have found, of course, that the level of backing war gets depends on the wording of the question. For many months, around 60 percent of the public has favored some kind of ground action, but that number falls if the pollster asks if America should fight even without a coalition. Surveys never quite agree, but there's consensus on which demographic groups are most hawkish and which are most dovish.

Overall, those sectors of the public that supported Bush in 2000 have been most eager for war today. White evangelical Protestants and rural citizens, for example, are big Bush advocates today, as they were in 2000.

SNIP

The heart of Bush's support appears to be those who believe that Saddam Hussein was involved with the World Trade Center atrocity. In the recent CBS/New York Times survey, 45 percent agreed that Hussein was "personally involved in the September 11th, 2001 terrorist attacks" and only 40 percent disagreed.

A February Pew Foundation poll found an even great 57-27 split in favor of the idea that "Saddam helped 9-11 attacks." Two thirds of those supporting the war thought he was involved.

A Knight-Ridder poll asked, "How many of the Sept. 11 hijackers were

Iraqi citizens?" Only 17 percent gave the right answer: none.

<http://www.upi.com/view.cfm?StoryID=20030314-022023-3781r>

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 21 Mar 2003 11:27:49 -0500

Reply-To: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>

Subject: Re: Are false beliefs the basis for public support of the war?

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Ed Freeland wrote:

>There is a fairly wide range of phrasing on this question. I think the 40-50%

>you mention refers to respondents who believe there is a link between Hussein

>and Al Q'aeda or that Hussein has given aid to Al Q'aeda. The polls show that

>most people find the Bush administration's argument on these links to be fairly

>credible. And given the nature of the evidence, I think you'd have to go a long

>way to make the case that these are "false beliefs" or an "erroneous piece of >knowledge."

>

That's a fair point in principle, I think. However, the 3/14-15 CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll asked a half-sample, "Do you think Saddam Hussein was personally involved in the September 11th terrorist attacks, or not?"

51% said yes, 41% no, and 8% voiced no opinion (versus 53%, 34%, and 13% in August 2002). (I'm relying on

<http://www.pollingreport.com/iraq.htm> for these figures.) This may not count as "false belief," but it at least goes well beyond available evidence. Then there's the widespread confusion about whether any of the hijackers were Iraqi.

However, a crosstab of this question with a war-support question (although, like Allen Barton, I'd like to see it) would probably exaggerate the impact of this belief on war support. Many arguments are

available for supporting the war and for opposing it. Many people presumably are inclined to use multiple arguments to bolster their positions on the war. Also, war supporters and war opponents tend to take their political cues from different sources. Anecdotally, my impression here at Bard is that many students hold some dubious assumptions about the Bush administration's war motives -- and I assume that, nationwide, adherence to these assumptions correlates rather strongly with war support. But I don't expect that challenging specific beliefs about, say, Dick Cheney's economic stake in Iraq would have much effect on war opposition here.

Arguing from there to the question posed in the subject header takes further leaps of armchair speculation. But I think most people who support the war would reason that in judging the future threat posed by Saddam Hussein, it doesn't matter very much whether he was specifically engaged in the 9/11 attacks. (Many who do not support the war would agree.) So I tend to view these dubious beliefs as epiphenomenal more than causal.

Mark Lindeman

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 21 Mar 2003 10:51:48 -0500
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Organization: Market Shares Corporation
Subject: Re: Are false beliefs the basis for public support of the war?
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

A caution.

There is probably a laundry list of beliefs by Americans who support the war.

Not all are false. Don't conclude "manipulation of public opinion" based on one belief.

Nick

Brian Cannon wrote:

>
> I don't have the crosstabs originally requested by Allen Barton, but the
poll
> results below (following Ed Freeland's comments) show that a substantial
proportion
>
> of the American public do believe that Hussein was involved in the 9/11

attacks and

>

> that he has ties to Al Qaeda (81% in the Fox poll). Allen was also correct

in

> noting that President Bush has allowed people to continue to believe that

Hussein

> was directly involved in 9/11, as this seems to be the one solid foundation

on

> which his justification for the war rests with the American public. Could

this be

> considered manipulation of public opinion? I suppose you could argue either way.

>

> --

> Brian Cannon, Director

> Earl Survey Research Laboratory

> Texas Tech University

> Ph: 806-742-4851 Fax: 806-742-4329

> www.ttu.edu/~esrl

> Ed Freeland wrote:

>

>> There is a fairly wide range of phrasing on this question. I think the

40-50%

>> you mention refers to respondents who believe there is a link between

Hussein

>> and Al Q'aeda or that Hussein has given aid to Al Q'aeda.

>

>> CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll. Latest: March 14-15, 2003. N=1,007 adults nationwide.

>> MoE ± 3 (total sample).

>

>> "Do you think Saddam Hussein is involved in supporting terrorist groups that have

>>

>> plans to attack the United States, or not?" Form A (N=488, MoE ± 5)

>>

>> Yes, Involved 88% (3/03) 86% (8/02)

>> No, Not Involved 9% (3/03) 8% (8/02)

>> No Opinion 3% (3/03) 6% (8/02)

>>

>>

>> "Do you think Saddam Hussein was personally involved in the September 11th

>> terrorist attacks, or not?" Form B (N=519, MoE ± 5)

>>

>> Yes, Involved 51% (3/03) 53% (8/02)

>> No, Not Involved 41% (3/03) 41% (8/02)

>> No Opinion 8% (3/03) 13% (8/02)

>>

>> CBS News/New York Times Poll. Latest: March 7-9, 2003. N=1,010 adults nationwide.

>>

>> MoE ± 3 (total sample).

>

>>

>> "Do you think Saddam Hussein was personally involved in the September 11th, 2001, terrorist attacks against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon?"

>>
>> Yes 45%
>> No 40%
>> Don't 15%
>> Know

>>
>> CBS News/New York Times Poll. Latest: Feb. 10-12, 2003. N=747 adults nationwide.
>> MoE ± 4.

>>
>> "Do you think Saddam Hussein was personally involved in the September 11th, 2001,

>>
>> terrorist attacks against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, or not?"

>>
>> Was 42% (2/03) 51% (9/02)
>> Was Not 42% (2/03) 33% (9/02)
>> Don't 16% (2/03) 16% (9/02)
>> Know

>>
>>
>> The Los Angeles Times Poll. Latest: Jan. 30-Feb. 2, 2003. N=1,385 adults nationwide. MoE ± 3 (total sample).

>>
>> "President Bush has claimed that there is a link between Saddam Hussein and the Al Qaeda terrorist organization. Has President Bush provided enough evidence to convince you of that link, or not?"

>>
>> Has 34%
>> Has Not 56%
>> No Opinion 10%

>>
>>
>> FOX News/Opinion Dynamics Poll. Latest: Jan. 29-30, 2003. N=900 registered voters

>>
>> nationwide. MoE ± 3.

>>
>> "Do you believe Iraqi President Saddam Hussein has ties to the terrorist group Al Qaeda?"

>>
>> Yes 81%
>> No 6%
>> Not 13%
>> Sure

>
>> The polls show that
>> most people find the Bush administration's argument on these links to be fairly
>> credible. And given the nature of the evidence, I think you'd have to go a long
>> way to make the case that these are "false beliefs" or an "erroneous piece of
of
>> knowledge."
>>
>> Ed Freeland
>>
>> Allen Barton wrote:
>>
>>> Someone asked whether anyone had cross-tabulated the belief that Saddam
>>> Hussein was responsible for the September 11 attack on the US with
support
>>> of our attack on Iraq.. I never saw an answer to that. Since several
polls
>>> show 40% to 50% holding this false belief (as much as 70% in some
wordings),
>>> and since the President has used fear of another September 11 as his
prime
>>> justification for attacking Iraq, and has done nothing to dispel the
>>> convenient false belief that Saddam was responsible for September 11,
it is
>>> possible that public support for the war is at least partly based on
this
>>> erroneous piece of "knowledge." Who has the crosstab?
>>> Allen Barton
>>>
>>> -----
>>> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
>>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-
request@asu.edu
>>
>> -----
>> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
> -----
> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 21 Mar 2003 11:14:48 -0600
Reply-To: Brian Cannon <brcannon@TTU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Brian Cannon <brcannon@TTU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Are false beliefs the basis for public support of the war?
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

With all due respect, no conclusion was drawn with regard to manipulation of public opinion, I simply posed the question. While President Bush purportedly does not rely on public opinion polls in making decisions to the degree that other presidents have, he certainly is aware of these results. And yes, there is a laundry list of beliefs by Americans who support the war, but I think it is legitimate to raise the question of whether remaining silent about an issue on which so many people are misinformed constitutes manipulation or not. I know aapornet is not a political forum (I raised the question with that in mind) and did not give my personal answer to the question. I'll leave it alone now ;-).

Brian Cannon

Nick Panagakis wrote:

> A caution.
>
> There is probably a laundry list of beliefs by Americans who support the war.
>
> Not all are false. Don't conclude "manipulation of public opinion" based
> on one belief.
>
> Nick
>
> Brian Cannon wrote:
>>
>> I don't have the crosstabs originally requested by Allen Barton, but the poll
>> results below (following Ed Freeland's comments) show that a substantial proportion
>>
>> of the American public do believe that Hussein was involved in the 9/11 attacks and
>>
>> that he has ties to Al Qaeda (81% in the Fox poll). Allen was also

correct in

>> noting that President Bush has allowed people to continue to believe that Hussein

>> was directly involved in 9/11, as this seems to be the one solid foundation on

>> which his justification for the war rests with the American public. Could this be

>> considered manipulation of public opinion? I suppose you could argue either way.

>>

>> --

>> Brian Cannon, Director

>> Earl Survey Research Laboratory

>> Texas Tech University

>> Ph: 806-742-4851 Fax: 806-742-4329

>> www.ttu.edu/~esrl

>> Ed Freeland wrote:

>>

>>> There is a fairly wide range of phrasing on this question. I think the 40-50%

>>> you mention refers to respondents who believe there is a link between Hussein

>>> and Al Q'aeda or that Hussein has given aid to Al Q'aeda.

>>

>>> CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll. Latest: March 14-15, 2003. N=1,007 adults nationwide.

>>> MoE ± 3 (total sample).

>>

>>> "Do you think Saddam Hussein is involved in supporting terrorist groups that have

>>>

>>> plans to attack the United States, or not?" Form A (N=488, MoE ± 5)

>>>

>>> Yes, Involved 88% (3/03) 86% (8/02)

>>> No, Not Involved 9% (3/03) 8% (8/02)

>>> No Opinion 3% (3/03) 6% (8/02)

>>>

>>>

>>> "Do you think Saddam Hussein was personally involved in the September 11th

>>> terrorist attacks, or not?" Form B (N=519, MoE ± 5)

>>>

>>> Yes, Involved 51% (3/03) 53% (8/02)

>>> No, Not Involved 41% (3/03) 41% (8/02)

>>> No Opinion 8% (3/03) 13% (8/02)

>>>

>>> CBS News/New York Times Poll. Latest: March 7-9, 2003. N=1,010 adults nationwide.

>>>

>>> MoE ± 3 (total sample).

>>

>>>

>>> "Do you think Saddam Hussein was personally involved in the September 11th,

>>> 2001, terrorist attacks against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon?"

>>>

>>> Yes 45%

>>> No 40%

>>> Don't 15%

>>> Know

>>>

>>> CBS News/New York Times Poll. Latest: Feb. 10-12, 2003. N=747 adults nationwide.

>>> MoE ± 4.

>>

>>>

>>> "Do you think Saddam Hussein was personally involved in the September 11th, 2001,

>>>

>>> terrorist attacks against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, or not?"

>>>

>>> Was 42% (2/03) 51% (9/02)

>>> Was Not 42% (2/03) 33% (9/02)

>>> Don't 16% (2/03) 16% (9/02)

>>> Know

>>>

>>>

>>> The Los Angeles Times Poll. Latest: Jan. 30-Feb. 2, 2003. N=1,385 adults nationwide. MoE ± 3 (total sample).

>>

>>> "President Bush has claimed that there is a link between Saddam Hussein and the

>>> Al

>>> Qaeda terrorist organization. Has President Bush provided enough evidence to

>>> convince you of that link, or not?"

>>>

>>> Has 34%

>>> Has Not 56%

>>> No Opinion 10%

>>>

>>>

>>> FOX News/Opinion Dynamics Poll. Latest: Jan. 29-30, 2003. N=900 registered voters

>>>

>>> nationwide. MoE ± 3.

>>

>>> "Do you believe Iraqi President Saddam Hussein has ties to the terrorist group

>>> Al Qaeda?"

>>>

>>> Yes 81%

>>> No 6%

>>> Not 13%

>>> Sure

>>

>>> The polls show that
>>> most people find the Bush administration's argument on these links to be fairly
>>> credible. And given the nature of the evidence, I think you'd have to go a long
>>> way to make the case that these are "false beliefs" or an "erroneous piece of
>>> knowledge."
>>>
>>> Ed Freeland
>>>
>>> Allen Barton wrote:
>>>
>>>> Someone asked whether anyone had cross-tabulated the belief that Saddam
>>>> Hussein was responsible for the September 11 attack on the US with support
>>>> of our attack on Iraq.. I never saw an answer to that. Since several polls
>>>> show 40% to 50% holding this false belief (as much as 70% in some wordings),
>>>> and since the President has used fear of another September 11 as his prime
>>>> justification for attacking Iraq, and has done nothing to dispel the
>>>> convenient false belief that Saddam was responsible for September 11, it is
>>>> possible that public support for the war is at least partly based on this
>>>> erroneous piece of "knowledge." Who has the crosstab?
>>>> Allen Barton
>>>>
>>>> -----
>>>> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
>>>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>>> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>>>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>>>>
>>>> -----
>>>> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
>>>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>>> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>>>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>>>>
>>>> -----
>>>> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
>>>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>>> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>>>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>>>>
>>>> -----
>>>> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
>>>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 21 Mar 2003 12:35:35 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Re: Are false beliefs the basis for public support of the war?
In-Reply-To: <3E7B4888.55E4337F@ttu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

For the public's evaluation of different reasons for and against the war
see Gallup's recent press release at:

<http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr030319.asp>

Unfortunately (or not) they did not use a question that would tap into
the beliefs we have been discussing.

" Reasons to Favor Military Action=20
More than eight in 10 Americans, 85%, say preventing Iraq from using
weapons of mass destruction or providing them to terrorists is a good
reason to take military action, including 52% who say it is a very good
reason. Roughly the same percentage, 84%, say freeing the Iraqi people
from the rule of Saddam Hussein is a good reason. A majority of
Americans rate all other arguments as good reasons to go to war, except
for the idea that military action should be used to lower fuel prices in
the United States in the long run. A majority, 56%, says this is a bad
reason to pursue war with Iraq."

--=20
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax
=20

> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Brian Cannon
> Sent: Friday, March 21, 2003 12:15 PM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Re: Are false beliefs the basis for public support of the
war?
>=20

> With all due respect, no conclusion was drawn with regard to manipulation
> of public
> opinion, I simply posed the question. While President Bush purportedly
> does not rely on
> public opinion polls in making decisions to the degree that other
> presidents have, he
> certainly is aware of these results. And yes, there is a laundry list of
> beliefs by
> Americans who support the war, but I think it is legitimate to raise the
> question of
> whether remaining silent about an issue on which so many people are
> misinformed
> constitutes manipulation or not. I know aapornet is not a political forum
> (I raised the
> question with that in mind) and did not give my personal answer to the
> question. I'll
> leave it alone now ;-).
>=20
> Brian Cannon
>=20
> Nick Panagakis wrote:
>=20
>> A caution.
>>
>> There is probably a laundry list of beliefs by Americans who support the
> war.
>>
>> Not all are false. Don't conclude "manipulation of public opinion" based
>> on one belief.
>>
>> Nick
>>
>> Brian Cannon wrote:
>>>
>>> I don't have the crosstabs originally requested by Allen Barton, but
> the poll
>>> results below (following Ed Freeland's comments) show that a
> substantial proportion
>>>
>>> of the American public do believe that Hussein was involved in the
> 9/11 attacks and
>>>
>>> that he has ties to Al Qaeda (81% in the Fox poll). Allen was also
> correct in
>>> noting that President Bush has allowed people to continue to

believe
> that Hussein
>>> was directly involved in 9/11, as this seems to be the one solid
> foundation on
>>> which his justification for the war rests with the American
public.
> Could this be
>>> considered manipulation of public opinion? I suppose you could
argue
> either way.
>>>
>>> --
>>> Brian Cannon, Director
>>> Earl Survey Research Laboratory
>>> Texas Tech University
>>> Ph: 806-742-4851 Fax: 806-742-4329
>>> www.ttu.edu/~esrl
>>> Ed Freeland wrote:
>>>
>>>> There is a fairly wide range of phrasing on this question. I
think
> the 40-50%
>>>> you mention refers to respondents who believe there is a link
> between Hussein
>>>> and Al Q'aeda or that Hussein has given aid to Al Q'aeda.
>>>
>>>> CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll. Latest: March 14-15, 2003. N=3D1,007
adults
> nationwide.
>>>> MoE =B1 3 (total sample).
>>>
>>>> "Do you think Saddam Hussein is involved in supporting terrorist
> groups that have
>>>>
>>>> plans to attack the United States, or not?" Form A (N=3D488, MoE =
=B1
5)
>>>>
>>>> Yes, Involved 88% (3/03) 86% (8/02)
>>>> No, Not Involved 9% (3/03) 8% (8/02)
>>>> No Opinion 3% (3/03) 6% (8/02)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Do you think Saddam Hussein was personally involved in the
> September 11th
>>>> terrorist attacks, or not?" Form B (N=3D519, MoE =B1 5)
>>>>
>>>> Yes, Involved 51% (3/03) 53% (8/02)
>>>> No, Not Involved 41% (3/03) 41% (8/02)
>>>> No Opinion 8% (3/03) 13% (8/02)
>>>>
>>>> CBS News/New York Times Poll. Latest: March 7-9, 2003. N=3D1,010
> adults nationwide.
>>>>

>>>> MoE =B1 3 (total sample).
>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Do you think Saddam Hussein was personally involved in the
> September 11th,
>>>> 2001, terrorist attacks against the World Trade Center and the
> Pentagon?"
>>>>
>>>> Yes 45%
>>>> No 40%
>>>> Don't 15%
>>>> Know
>>>>
>>>> CBS News/New York Times Poll. Latest: Feb. 10-12, 2003. N=3D747
adults
> nationwide.
>>>> MoE =B1 4.
>>>
>>>>
>>>> "Do you think Saddam Hussein was personally involved in the
> September 11th, 2001,
>>>>
>>>> terrorist attacks against the World Trade Center and the
Pentagon,
> or not?"
>>>>
>>>> Was 42% (2/03) 51% (9/02)
>>>> Was Not 42% (2/03) 33% (9/02)
>>>> Don't 16% (2/03) 16% (9/02)
>>>> Know
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> The Los Angeles Times Poll. Latest: Jan. 30-Feb. 2, 2003.
N=3D1,385
> adults
>>>> nationwide. MoE =B1 3 (total sample).
>>>
>>>> "President Bush has claimed that there is a link between Saddam
> Hussein and the
>>>> Al
>>>> Qaeda terrorist organization. Has President Bush provided enough
> evidence to
>>>> convince you of that link, or not?"
>>>>
>>>> Has 34%
>>>> Has Not 56%
>>>> No Opinion 10%
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> FOX News/Opinion Dynamics Poll. Latest: Jan. 29-30, 2003. =
N=3D900
> registered voters
>>>>
>>>> nationwide. MoE =B1 3.

>>>
>>>> "Do you believe Iraqi President Saddam Hussein has ties to the
> terrorist group
>>>> Al Qaeda?"
>>>>
>>>> Yes 81%
>>>> No 6%
>>>> Not 13%
>>>> Sure
>>>
>>>> The polls show that
>>>> most people find the Bush administration's argument on these
links
> to be fairly
>>>> credible. And given the nature of the evidence, I think you'd
have
> to go a long
>>>> way to make the case that these are "false beliefs" or an
"erroneous
> piece of
>>>> knowledge."
>>>>
>>>> Ed Freeland
>>>>
>>>> Allen Barton wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> Someone asked whether anyone had cross-tabulated the belief
that
> Saddam
>>>>> Hussein was responsible for the September 11 attack on the US
with
> support
>>>>> of our attack on Iraq.. I never saw an answer to that. Since
> several polls
>>>>> show 40% to 50% holding this false belief (as much as 70% in
some
> wordings),
>>>>> and since the President has used fear of another September 11
as
> his prime
>>>>> justification for attacking Iraq, and has done nothing to
dispel
> the
>>>>> convenient false belief that Saddam was responsible for
September
> 11, it is
>>>>> possible that public support for the war is at least partly
based
> on this
>>>>> erroneous piece of "knowledge." Who has the crosstab?
>>>>> Allen Barton
>>>>>
>>>>> -----
>>>>> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

>>>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>>> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>>>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-
> request@asu.edu
>>>>

>>>> -----
>>>> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
>>>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>>> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>>>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-
> request@asu.edu
>>>>

>>>> -----
>>>> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
>>>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>>> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>>>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-
> request@asu.edu
>>>>

>>>> -----
>>>> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
>>>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>>> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>>>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-
> request@asu.edu
>>>>=20

>>>> -----
>>>> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
>>>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>>> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>>>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 21 Mar 2003 13:55:42 -0500
Reply-To: Steven Kull <skull@PIPA.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Steven Kull <skull@PIPA.ORG>
Subject: Support for war and beliefs about Iraq-9/11 linkage
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Yes, there is indeed a strong relationship between attitudes on going to war with Iraq and beliefs about the link between Iraq and Al Queda. In a February PIPA/Knowledge Networks poll we asked a more fine grained question about the

relationship--shown below. Below that are roughly made cross tabs (AAPORnet does not allow attachments) showing the level of support for war in a number of questions according to the four positions on the linkage.

Please select what you think is the best description of the relationship between the Iraqi government and the terrorist group al-Qaeda:

There is no connection at all
7%

A few al-Qaeda individuals have visited
Iraq or had contact with Iraqi officials 29

Iraq has given substantial support to al-Qaeda, but
Was not involved in the September 11th attacks 36

Iraq was directly involved in carrying out the
September 11th attacks
20

Q4 Favor invading with allied support but no UN approval 20% 52%
67% 74%

Q5 Favor invading (over continuing inspections) with
allied support but no UN approval
29% 37% 51% 52%

Q2 Invade Iraq even if we have to go it alone
15% 25% 37% 45%

Q3 Would agree if Bush proceeds without UN approval 13% 30% 41%
55%

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Fri, 21 Mar 2003 17:12:02 -0500

Reply-To: John Hall <JHall@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: John Hall <JHall@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM>

Subject: Position Announcement

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (MPR) has these openings in its Washington, DC and Princeton, NJ offices for statisticians to support its survey sampling and statistical analysis activities:

Senior Sampling Statistician: requires a Ph.D. degree in statistics and at least five years of experience or an equivalent combination of education and experience.

Sampling Statistician: requires a Ph.D. degree in statistics or an equivalent combination of education and experience.

Survey Sampling Specialist: requires a Masters degree in statistics or an equivalent combination of education and experience.

These positions involve sample design, frame construction, sample selection, weight calculation, missing data imputation, methodological and statistical analyses, and report and proposal preparation. Strong communication skills, familiarity with statistical software, and knowledge of sampling methodologies are desirable. Qualified candidates should submit a letter of interest, resume, salary requirements, DC or NJ location preference, and references to:

Michael Beary-Human Resources Dept.
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
600 Maryland Avenue, SW, Suite 550
Washington, DC 20024-2512
Fax: (202) 484-4510
e-mail: HRDC@mathematica-mpr.com
An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer
www.mathematica-mpr.com

Posted by John Hall

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Fri, 21 Mar 2003 15:27:23 -0800
Reply-To: Hank Zucker <hank@surveysystem.com>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Hank Zucker <hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM>
Subject: The crosstabs Re: Are false beliefs the basis for public support
of the war?
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I was the one who originally posed the question. Here a couple of crosstabs, with many thanks to CBS and Pew for providing them.

Both polls asked about whether people approve of military action to remove Saddam Hussein from power and whether they thought he was involved with 9/11. They differ in the percentage thinking SH was involved with 9/11, but are otherwise generally consistent. I do not have the exact wording of the CBS questions, so they may have been somewhat different.

The crosstabs show that people who correctly believe SH was not involved in 9/11 are evenly split on military action, while those who think SH was involved are 4:1 or more in favor of military action. Everyone on this list knows that correlation does not prove causality, but I think these are highly suggestive. It seems that at least before March 19, the two to one margin of the public's support for an attack was based in significant part on misinformation - misinformation the White House clearly new about and, at

best, did nothing to dispel. Unfortunately, as far as I know, no one asked the people who both thought SH was involved and supported action whether they would still support action, if they knew he wasn't involved. That would have given us a definitive answer.

From the CBS poll released March 10:

Action	Total	Military	
		Approve	
Disapprove		66%	
30%			
Think SH involved in 9/11	45%	84%	14%
Not Think SH involved in 9/11	40%	49%	47%

Pew Poll released Feb. 20:

Action	Total	Military	
		Approve	
Disapprove		66%	
26%			
Think SH involved in 9/11	59%	76%	17%
Not Think SH involved in 9/11	25%	48%	48%

Hank Zucker
Creative Research Systems
www.surveysystem.com
(707) 765-1001

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

From: "Allen Barton" <allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM>
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2003 6:28 AM
Subject: Are false beliefs the basis for public support of the war?

> Someone asked whether anyone had cross-tabulated the belief that Saddam
> Hussein was responsible for the September 11 attack on the US with support
> of our attack on Iraq.. I never saw an answer to that. Since several
polls
> show 40% to 50% holding this false belief (as much as 70% in some
wordings),
> and since the President has used fear of another September 11 as his prime

> justification for attacking Iraq, and has done nothing to dispel the
> convenient false belief that Saddam was responsible for September 11, it
is
> possible that public support for the war is at least partly based on this
> erroneous piece of "knowledge." Who has the crosstab?
> Allen Barton

>
> -----
> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Fri, 21 Mar 2003 21:23:09 -0500
Reply-To: ande271@attglobal.net
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jeanne Anderson Research <ande271@ATTGLOBAL.NET>
Subject: Re: Are false beliefs the basis for public support of the war?
Comments: To: allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I don't understand the apparent inability to address Allen's question. Was a question on Hussein's role in 9/11 asked in so few surveys that no one can report on whether it correlates with support for a war in Iraq?

We have heard so many reports on the distribution of responses to questions on support for an attack on Iraq (absolutely no support, support only if the UN agrees (or authorizes), support regardless of the UN, to paraphrase inaccurately) that surely the question was asked at several points in time during the past few months.

Would it be inappropriate for a researcher to do the indicated cross-tab for colleagues?

I fear that the deep divisions in the American public regarding recent events are affecting AAPOR members to the extent that a rational answer to Allen's question cannot be produced.

Jeanne Anderson
(formerly) Principal
Jeanne Anderson Research

Allen Barton wrote:

> Someone asked whether anyone had cross-tabulated the belief that Saddam Hussein was responsible for the September 11 attack on the US with support of our attack on Iraq.. I never saw an answer to that. Since several polls show 40% to 50% holding this false belief (as much as 70% in some wordings), and since the President has used fear of another September 11 as his prime justification for attacking Iraq, and has done nothing to dispel the convenient false belief that Saddam was responsible for September 11, it is possible that public support for the war is at least partly based on this erroneous piece of "knowledge." Who has the crosstab?

> Allen Barton

> -----
> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 21 Mar 2003 21:56:37 -0500
Reply-To: "Langer, Gary E" <Gary.E.Langer@ABC.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Langer, Gary E" <Gary.E.Langer@ABC.COM>
Subject: Re: Are false beliefs the basis for public support of the war?
Comments: To: ande271@attglobal.net
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

This except from our 1/28/03 ABC News poll analysis may help.

AL QAEDA - Bush's assertion in his speech that Saddam Hussein "aids and protects terrorists, including members of Al Qaeda" is one that confirms a perception already held by many Americans. Any number of polls since Sept. 11, 2001, have shown that most do think Iraq supports those terrorists; in this survey, 68 percent say so.

This perception is an important one in fueling support for military action, in that such support is premised to a large extent on the sense of threat Americans feel from Iraq. Among those who think Iraq directly supports Al Qaeda, 73 percent favor taking military action to oust Saddam. Among those who don't think he supports Al Qaeda, support for military action drops to 45 percent.

9. Do you think Iraq has or has not provided direct support to the Al Qaeda terrorist group?

	Provided support	Not provided support	No opinion	=20
1/28/03	68	17	15	

Xtab:	Military action vs Iraq	Support	Oppose	=20
Provided support to Al Qaeda (68%)	73%	24		
Not provided support (17%)	45	51		

Note, our question does not specify 9/11 involvement. Beyond this Al Qaeda question, we also have measured whether people think the Bush administration has provided strong evidence that Iraq supports terrorism; whether they see Iraq as threat to the United States, whether they think U.S. vital interests are at stake in the situation. All such views fuel support for war.

Gary Langer
 Director of Polling
 ABC News

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

From: Jeanne Anderson Research [mailto:ande271@ATTGLOBAL.NET]
 Sent: Friday, March 21, 2003 9:23 PM
 To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
 Subject: Re: Are false beliefs the basis for public support of the war?

I don't understand the apparent inability to address Allen's question. Was a question on Hussein's role in 9/11 asked in so few surveys that no one can report on whether it correlates with support for a war in Iraq?

We have heard so many reports on the distribution of responses to questions on support for an attack on Iraq (absolutely no support, support only if the UN agrees (or authorizes), support regardless of the UN, to paraphrase inaccurately) that surely the question was asked at several points in time during the past few months.

Would it be inappropriate for a researcher to do the indicated cross-tab for colleagues?

I fear that the deep divisions in the American public regarding recent events are affecting AAPOR members to the extent that a rational answer to Allen's question cannot be produced.

Jeanne Anderson
(formerly) Principal
Jeanne Anderson Research

Allen Barton wrote:

> Someone asked whether anyone had cross-tabulated the belief that =
Saddam
> Hussein was responsible for the September 11 attack on the US with =
support
> of our attack on Iraq.. I never saw an answer to that. Since several =
polls
> show 40% to 50% holding this false belief (as much as 70% in some =
wordings),
> and since the President has used fear of another September 11 as his =
prime
> justification for attacking Iraq, and has done nothing to dispel the
> convenient false belief that Saddam was responsible for September 11, =
it is
> possible that public support for the war is at least partly based on =
this
> erroneous piece of "knowledge." Who has the crosstab?

> Allen Barton

>
> -----

> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: =
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: =
aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Sat, 22 Mar 2003 22:33:05 -0500
Reply-To: ande271@attglobal.net
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jeanne Anderson Research <ande271@ATTGLOBAL.NET>
Subject: Re: Are false beliefs the basis for public support of the war?
Comments: To: "Langer, Gary E" <Gary.E.Langer@abc.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I stand corrected. I had not read Steve Kull's reply or, of course, this one, when I wrote with such exasperation.

Jeanne Anderson

"Langer, Gary E" wrote:

> This excerpt from our 1/28/03 ABC News poll analysis may help.

>

> AL QAEDA - Bush's assertion in his speech that Saddam Hussein "aids
> and protects terrorists, including members of Al Qaeda" is one that
> confirms a perception already held by many Americans. Any number of
> polls since Sept. 11, 2001, have shown that most do think Iraq
> supports those terrorists; in this survey, 68 percent say so.

>

>

> This perception is an important one in fueling support for military
> action, in that such support is premised to a large extent on the
> sense of threat Americans feel from Iraq. Among those who think Iraq
> directly supports Al Qaeda, 73 percent favor taking military action to
> oust Saddam. Among those who don't think he supports Al Qaeda, support
> for military action drops to 45 percent.

>

> 9. Do you think Iraq has or has not provided direct support to the Al
> Qaeda terrorist group?

	Provided support	Not provided support	No opinion
> 1/28/03	68	17	15

>

Xtab:	Military action vs Iraq		
	Support	Oppose	
> Provided support to Al Qaeda (68%)	73%	24	
> Not provided support (17%)	45	51	

>

> Note, our question does not specify 9/11 involvement. Beyond this Al
> Qaeda question, we also have measured whether people think the Bush
> administration has provided strong evidence that Iraq supports
> terrorism; whether they see Iraq as threat to the United States,
> whether they think U.S. vital interests are at stake in the situation.
> All such views fuel support for war.

>

> Gary Langer
> Director of Polling
> ABC News

>

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

> From: Jeanne Anderson Research [mailto:ande271@ATTGLOBAL.NET]

> Sent: Friday, March 21, 2003 9:23 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Are false beliefs the basis for public support of the
> war?

>

> I don't understand the apparent inability to address Allen's

> question. Was a
> question on Hussein's role in 9/11 asked in so few surveys that no one
> can
> report on whether it correlates with support for a war in Iraq?
>
> We have heard so many reports on the distribution of responses to
> questions on
> support for an attack on Iraq (absolutely no support, support only if
> the UN
> agrees (or authorizes), support regardless of the UN, to paraphrase
> inaccurately) that surely the question was asked at several points in
> time
> during the past few months.
>
> Would it be inappropriate for a researcher to do the indicated
> cross-tab for
> colleagues?
>
> I fear that the deep divisions in the American public regarding recent
> events
> are affecting AAPOR members to the extent that a rational answer to
> Allen's
> question cannot be produced.
>
> Jeanne Anderson
> (formerly) Principal
> Jeanne Anderson Research
>
> Allen Barton wrote:
>
>> Someone asked whether anyone had cross-tabulated the belief that
>> Saddam
>> Hussein was responsible for the September 11 attack on the US with
>> support
>> of our attack on Iraq.. I never saw an answer to that. Since
>> several polls
>> show 40% to 50% holding this false belief (as much as 70% in some
>> wordings),
>> and since the President has used fear of another September 11 as his
>> prime
>> justification for attacking Iraq, and has done nothing to dispel the
>> convenient false belief that Saddam was responsible for September
>> 11, it is
>> possible that public support for the war is at least partly based on
>> this
>> erroneous piece of "knowledge." Who has the crosstab?
>> Allen Barton
>>
>> -----
>> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:

> aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
> -----
> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Sat, 22 Mar 2003 22:54:19 -0500
Reply-To: allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Allen Barton <allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: False beliefs and the war
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Thanks to all those who provided crosstabulations of the belief that Saddam Hussein was involved in 9/11 and support of President Bush's war policy. This includes Hank Zucker who originally posed the question. The figures all show 20 to 35% higher support of the war among those who believe Saddam Hussein was involved in the 9/11 terror attack, which is clearly a false belief, and 15 to 25% higher support among those who believe he gave "direct" or "substantial" support to Al Qaeda, which is a belief for which evidence is almost entirely lacking.

As to whether there is a causal relation between these beliefs and the decision to support war on Iraq, given the public's acceptance of some additional of reasons for going to war with Saddam Hussein, is a legitimate question. One approach would be to ask directly "which is the most important reason?" (How many would say "freeing the people of Iraq" is the most important?) In the tradition of Lazarsfeld's "Art of Asking Why," it would be necessary to ask those who say "because there is a danger that Saddam Hussein might aid future terror attacks on the U.S." why they think there is such a danger, and see if they use the false belief about the past as a reason for that belief in a future danger. This could still be done even now when we are at war.

Another approach would be to ask the "believers" a hypothetical: "If it were proved that Saddam Hussein had no part in the 9/11 attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, would you still have been in favor going to war with Iraq?"

Ideally, of course, we should have had a Lazarsfeldian panel of the public being asked these questions at intervals of a couple of months, and try to tease out "quasi-experimentally" which beliefs came first and which followed, and how they were related to exposure to the Bush administration

and its supporters "campaign" to sell war on Iraq. But as far as I know there is no such ongoing panel. Another possibility would be to emulate the Carl Hovland "Experiments on Mass Communication" of World War II vintage, trying to assess the effects of various arguments and "facts" on samples of the public in controlled experiments -- difficult to do given that most people probably have well-crystallized opinions. (Try high school students? Make it part of civics classes -- if those still exist?)

If we had panel data, we might find that support of the war comes mainly from fear of Iraq as a source of terror attacks on the U.S., a fear which comes from George W. Bush having convinced almost all of his faithful followers, and the less educated segment of the majority who did not vote for him, of this danger. And perhaps the belief that Saddam was involved in 9/11 is a result, not a cause, of their accepting Bush's arguments about a future threat and the tendency to cognitive consistency. The false belief about the past could then be a result, not the cause of the belief about the future threat and the need to go to war now to eliminate it -- a belief about the future which is of course neither true nor false but a matter of judgment, bolstered by the "bully pulpit" of the presidency and the chorus of Bush supporters in the "non-elite" right-wing media.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Sat, 22 Mar 2003 23:00:41 -0500
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Organization: Rider University
Subject: Re: Are false beliefs the basis for public support of the war?
Comments: To: ande271@ATTGLOBAL.NET
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

It appears there are several issues here that perhaps require separate consideration. First, it seems there is no doubt that those who believe that Saddam Hussein was either responsible for the 9/11 attacks or somehow related to Al Qaeda are also more likely to support the war than those who do not. However, I would guess that there are a number of attitudes or beliefs that correlate with support for the war, including the desire to bring democracy to the Iraqi people, the desire to topple a potential dictator, etc. I would imagine further that if one did a factor analysis on all of these questions, one would discover that one factor probably combined concerns about the people of Iraq, another combined beliefs that Saddam Hussein was responsible for terrorism, and so on. It would probably be impossible to discern which of these factors was the most important in determining support for the war, since I would guess they are intercorrelated.

All of that having been said, one has to look beyond a mere statistical

analysis, as Gary Langer has pointed out. The fact is that President Bush did, in fact, go out of his way in claiming a link between Saddam Hussein and terrorism; indeed, that was his main reason for going to war, since he said that as Commander-in-Chief, he had to deal with dangers to the security of the United States, and that regime change in Iraq was a necessary part of those duties. Combine that with his reliance on references to 9/11 in his justification for military action and it is no accident that those who support the war also believe that Hussein was somehow linked to those attacks. Is this manipulation of opinion? Part of the answer depends upon whether one trusts the version that the president is giving the public; I suspect Bush believes there is a connection, despite evidence to the contrary (although I have no way of knowing). The question therefore becomes whether it is manipulation to convince others of a belief when you accept it, even if it is false.

Jeanne Anderson Research wrote:

> I stand corrected. I had not read Steve Kull's reply or, of course,
> this one, when I wrote with such exasperation.

>
> Jeanne Anderson

>
> "Langer, Gary E" wrote:

>
>> This except from our 1/28/03 ABC News poll analysis may help.

>>
>> AL QAEDA - Bush's assertion in his speech that Saddam Hussein "aids
>> and protects terrorists, including members of Al Qaeda" is one that
>> confirms a perception already held by many Americans. Any number of
>> polls since Sept. 11, 2001, have shown that most do think Iraq
>> supports those terrorists; in this survey, 68 percent say so.

>>
>>
>> This perception is an important one in fueling support for military
>> action, in that such support is premised to a large extent on the
>> sense of threat Americans feel from Iraq. Among those who think Iraq
>> directly supports Al Qaeda, 73 percent favor taking military action to
>> oust Saddam. Among those who don't think he supports Al Qaeda, support
>> for military action drops to 45 percent.

>>
>> 9. Do you think Iraq has or has not provided direct support to the Al
>> Qaeda terrorist group?

>> Provided Not provided No
>> support support opinion
>> 1/28/03 68 17 15

>>
>> Xtab: Military action vs Iraq
>> Support Oppose
>> Provided support to Al Qaeda (68%) 73% 24
>> Not provided support (17%) 45 51

>>
>> Note, our question does not specify 9/11 involvement. Beyond this Al
>> Qaeda question, we also have measured whether people think the Bush
>> administration has provided strong evidence that Iraq supports

>> terrorism; whether they see Iraq as threat to the United States,
>> whether they think U.S. vital interests are at stake in the situation.
>> All such views fuel support for war.
>>
>> Gary Langer
>> Director of Polling
>> ABC News
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Jeanne Anderson Research [mailto:ande271@ATTGLOBAL.NET]
>> Sent: Friday, March 21, 2003 9:23 PM
>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>> Subject: Re: Are false beliefs the basis for public support of the
>> war?
>>
>> I don't understand the apparent inability to address Allen's
>> question. Was a
>> question on Hussein's role in 9/11 asked in so few surveys that no one
>> can
>> report on whether it correlates with support for a war in Iraq?
>>
>> We have heard so many reports on the distribution of responses to
>> questions on
>> support for an attack on Iraq (absolutely no support, support only if
>> the UN
>> agrees (or authorizes), support regardless of the UN, to paraphrase
>> inaccurately) that surely the question was asked at several points in
>> time
>> during the past few months.
>>
>> Would it be inappropriate for a researcher to do the indicated
>> cross-tab for
>> colleagues?
>>
>> I fear that the deep divisions in the American public regarding recent
>> events
>> are affecting AAPOR members to the extent that a rational answer to
>> Allen's
>> question cannot be produced.
>>
>> Jeanne Anderson
>> (formerly) Principal
>> Jeanne Anderson Research
>>
>> Allen Barton wrote:
>>
>>> Someone asked whether anyone had cross-tabulated the belief that
>>> Saddam
>>> Hussein was responsible for the September 11 attack on the US with
>>> support
>>> of our attack on Iraq.. I never saw an answer to that. Since
>>> several polls
>>> show 40% to 50% holding this false belief (as much as 70% in some
>>> wordings),

>>> and since the President has used fear of another September 11 as his
>> prime
>>> justification for attacking Iraq, and has done nothing to dispel the
>>
>>> convenient false belief that Saddam was responsible for September
>> 11, it is
>>> possible that public support for the war is at least partly based on
>> this
>>> erroneous piece of "knowledge." Who has the crosstab?
>>> Allen Barton
>>>
>>> -----
>>> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
>>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
>> aapornet-request@asu.edu
>>
>> -----
>> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
>> aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
> the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Sun, 23 Mar 2003 11:20:43 -0800
Reply-To: a-t-r <a-t-r@QWEST.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: a-t-r <a-t-r@QWEST.NET>
Subject: False beliefs
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I'd like to see what happens when the cross tabs for war support and beliefs about Iraq's involvement are further broken down by party affiliation -- partisan's following the lead of their party?

Don Cundy
ATR - Audience and Talent Research

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Sun, 23 Mar 2003 16:59:25 -0500

Reply-To: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>

Subject: Re: False beliefs and the war

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Since this is a methodological discussion and not a political one, we would also want to ask the "non-believers" "If it were proved that Saddam Hussein had a part in the 9/11 attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, would you now be in favor of going to war with Iraq?".

Nothing presented on this list or elsewhere has yet presented sufficient evidence to definitively validate either belief. Proving the negative is also going to be an exceedingly difficult task.

Ed Ratledge
University of Delaware

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

From: Allen Barton [<mailto:allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM>]

Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2003 10:54 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: False beliefs and the war

Thanks to all those who provided crosstabulations of the belief that Saddam Hussein was involved in 9/11 and support of President Bush's war policy. This includes Hank Zucker who originally posed the question. The figures all show 20 to 35% higher support of the war among those who believe Saddam Hussein was involved in the 9/11 terror attack, which is clearly a false belief, and 15 to 25% higher support among those who believe he gave "direct" or "substantial" support to Al Qaeda, which is a belief for which evidence is almost entirely lacking.

As to whether there is a causal relation between these beliefs and the decision to support war on Iraq, given the public's acceptance of some additional of reasons for going to war with Saddam Hussein, is a legitimate question. One approach would be to ask directly "which is the most important reason?" (How many would say "freeing the people of Iraq" is the most important?) In the tradition of Lazarsfeld's "Art of Asking Why," it would be necessary to ask those who say "because there is a danger that Saddam Hussein might aid future terror attacks on the U.S." why they think there is such a danger, and see if they use the false belief about the past as a

reason for that belief in a future danger. This could still be done even now when we are at war.

Another approach would be to ask the "believers" a hypothetical: "If it were proved that Saddam Hussein had no part in the 9/11 attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, would you still have been in favor going to war with Iraq?"

Ideally, of course, we should have had a Lazarsfeldian panel of the public being asked these questions at intervals of a couple of months, and try to tease out "quasi-experimentally" which beliefs came first and which followed, and how they were related to exposure to the Bush administration and its supporters "campaign" to sell war on Iraq. But as far as I know there is no such ongoing panel. Another possibility would be to emulate the Carl Hovland "Experiments on Mass Communication" of World War II vintage, trying to assess the effects of various arguments and "facts" on samples of the public in controlled experiments -- difficult to do given that most people probably have well-crystallized opinions. (Try high school students? Make it part of civics classes -- if those still exist?)

If we had panel data, we might find that support of the war comes mainly from fear of Iraq as a source of terror attacks on the U.S., a fear which comes from George W. Bush having convinced almost all of his faithful followers, and the less educated segment of the majority who did not vote for him, of this danger. And perhaps the belief that Saddam was involved in 9/11 is a result, not a cause, of their accepting Bush's arguments about a future threat and the tendency to cognitive consistency. The false belief about the past could then be a result, not the cause of the belief about the future threat and the need to go to war now to eliminate it -- a belief about the future which is of course neither true nor false but a matter of judgment, bolstered by the "bully pulpit" of the presidency and the chorus of Bush supporters in the "non-elite" right-wing media.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Mon, 24 Mar 2003 10:35:54 -0500

Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>

Subject: Some more demographic splits on war support: The young back the war

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

The young back the war
Vicki Haddock, Insight Staff Writer
Sunday, March 23, 2003
C2003 San Francisco Chronicle | Feedback

URL:

<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2003/03/23/IN92660.DTL>

SNIP

A closer demographic analysis of several recent national polls shows that Menk and his fellow American adults under age 30 are actually the most supportive of Bush's Iraq policy of any age group. Conversely, the greatest opposition to Bush's approach can be found among those aged 65 and older.

"Is that right?" said Menk. "I'm really surprised. I guess that shows how misleading our stereotypes often are. . . . I would imagine a lot of older people worry as my grandmother does, because all her grandkids are college age, and she's concerned about how war will affect us."

The finding also took some pollsters aback.

"It was a shocker," said Carroll Doherty, editor of the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. The Pew Center first picked up on the difference in its October survey, which found young Americans backing military action against Baghdad by 3-to-1 (69 percent to 23 percent), the widest margin of any age group. Elder voters indicated much greater skepticism, with barely half supporting military action to overthrow Saddam Hussein.

More recent Pew surveys show the generation gap narrowing a bit on Iraq but still revealing striking differences, even allowing for the statistical margin of error.

Similar findings were echoed this month by a Washington Post-ABC News poll, which found the greatest opposition to an Iraq war among older Americans. While 60 percent of 18- to 34-year-olds favored military action to oust Hussein -- even without the OK of the United Nations -- just 49 percent of those 65 or older did.

"This younger generation has never really had to worry about a war going awry. War seems to many of them rather like a video game -- you push a button, and things happen far away, and you've won, and that's that," said Henry Brady, professor of political science and survey director at UC Berkeley. "Casualties in the Persian Gulf War were in the hundreds . . . so almost nobody knows anybody who died in that war.

"Among Americans over 65, some of them experienced World War II on bloody battlefields, all of them lived through the Korean and Vietnam wars, and their memories are that war was either horrific, and we won,

or prolonged and we arguably didn't win. That life experience was searing. It makes them take the prospect of war very seriously."

SNIP

"We have seen war -- to us, Sept. 11 was like war. I stood in front of the TV with my mouth open in shock . . . it was very, very scary," said Rachael Wasilchin, a 24-year-old workers' compensation claims adjuster in Fairfield. "I can't argue that young people are desensitized to violence, but that doesn't mean we can't have informed opinions or make up our minds. I'm for going into Iraq because we've been waiting 12 years, treaty after treaty, and nothing has been done. Yes, people will die, but more will die if Saddam Hussein gets nuclear weapons."

Details culled from past polling data demonstrate similar generational splits in history: Several polls taken in the months preceding the 1991 Persian Gulf war found older Americans were more reluctant than younger ones to want to invade Iraq.

Even more amazing, old Gallup Poll data from the years 1969 and 1970 -- when U.S. public opinion turned sharply against the Vietnam War -- reveals that older Americans at that point were more opposed to that military endeavor than the "give peace a chance" generation.

In May 1970, Gallup asked Americans whether the United States had made a mistake getting involved in Vietnam. While voters under the age of 30 split evenly on the question, only 1 out of 4 voters over age 50 was still insisting U.S. policy was right in Vietnam.

"It's been assumed that young people were the true base of opposition to Vietnam, but that apparently was a misperception," said Doherty. "I think people saw college kids demonstrating because they were so visible on campuses and on the evening news. But they didn't take into account that they didn't necessarily speak for their generation -- or that older Americans might be opposed in greater numbers but weren't likely to take to the streets."

A close look at current poll results exposes other surprises as well.

Just days ago, House Democratic leader Nancy Pelosi forced Virginia Democratic Rep. Jim Moran out of his party's leadership post after he made the public comment that "if it were not for the strong support of the Jewish community for this war in Iraq, we would not be (planning an attack)."

But the numbers show that Jewish Americans express significantly less support for military action against Iraq than other groups. Analyzing eight surveys over the past seven months, the Pew Center found that just 52 percent of American Jews favored war on Hussein, compared with 62 percent of whites with no religion and 66 percent of white Catholics and mainline Protestants.

The biggest pro-war contingent can be found among white evangelical Christians, with 73 percent in favor and only 18 percent opposed.

Other anti-war population pockets are perhaps more predictable. Surveys by Gallup, Pew, Zogby and several media outlets confirm the re-emergence of a gender gap that had vanished after the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, when women were about as likely as men to approve of American action in Afghanistan to neutralize the attackers. The Sept. 11 experience appears to have made American women more willing to support military spending and homeland defense, but they remain less willing to extend that support to Iraq than their male counterparts.

The polling data also confirm a huge partisan influence, with Republicans strongly supportive of Bush's approach to Iraq and Democrats deeply divided.

Those more wary of Iraq engagement include urban dwellers, Latinos and those with college degrees.

But no surveyed group has demonstrated greater opposition than African Americans, who gave Bush only 9 percent of their votes in the 2000 election. Unlike most other demographic groups, black men and women across the spectrum continue to resist the notion of a U.S. war against Baghdad.

"What some communities might feel as a mild cold during war time will really be pneumonia in black and brown communities economically," warned NAACP President Kweisi Mfume. Others have said that a history of racial oppression made blacks particularly reluctant to back American intervention in a distant Third World country.

Political analysts expect to see a traditional surge in support for Bush as a U.S. invasion gets under way -- but also warn that support could erode like quicksand if casualties are high or terrorists retaliate inside U.S. borders.

"Afghanistan (in 2001) was a very simple call for a lot of people -- the world was with us, and the polls demonstrated we were broadly united as Americans in agreement that we needed to go get the bad guys," said Brady. "The problem with Iraq is that it isn't such an easy call."

E-mail Vicki Haddock at vhaddock@sfchronicle.com.

C2003 San Francisco Chronicle | Feedback

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 24 Mar 2003 12:54:27 -0500

Reply-To: Michael Bocian <michael_bocian@HOTMAIL.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Michael Bocian <michael_bocian@HOTMAIL.COM>

Subject: Research Director opening

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; format=flowed

Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research has an opening for Research Director. Info about the position below:

Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research, an international polling firm based in Washington, D.C., has an opening for RESEARCH DIRECTOR to direct and manage all aspects of qualitative and quantitative research services.

Responsibilities include: design of sampling frames and survey methodology. Monitor the quality of data collection and focus group recruitment. Oversee scheduling and execution of all research. Point of contact for all research vendors, obtain cost estimates and handle contract negotiations. Manage a staff of 1-2.

Candidate profile: Candidates should have knowledge of statistical sampling theory with 3 to 5 years plus experience in data collection techniques including phone, mail and web based studies. Must have excellent communication skills, and be detail oriented. Ability to work fast, accurately and creatively under tight timelines and high pressure is essential. MS Office knowledge needed, Masters degree preferred, and language skills a plus. To learn more about the firm visit our website at www.greenbergresearch.com.

Salary commensurate with experience. Submit cover letter, resume and salary requirements to jobs@greenbergresearch.com or fax to 202-289-8648.

Help STOP SPAM with the new MSN 8 and get 2 months FREE*

<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 24 Mar 2003 14:58:31 -0800

Reply-To: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>
Subject: Surveying during wartime
Comments: To: por@vance.irss.unc.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Does anyone have any thoughts about fielding telephone surveys on non-war and non-political topics now that the war has begun? I have some surveys that were to start later this week with alumni from two universities, dealing with issues relating to alumni programs and communications. I'm concerned that respondents might find it inappropriate or insensitive to be calling now. And I'm also concerned that those who do cooperate might offer more favorable opinions than they would at another time (thinking, perhaps, that it's petty to be critical about things relating to their alma mater when life and death are at stake on the battlefield and on the TVs).

Any thoughts are appreciated. Thanks.

Jerold Pearson, '75
Director of Market Research
Stanford Alumni Association
650-723-9186
jpearson@stanford.edu
<http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 24 Mar 2003 20:03:15 -0500
Reply-To: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>
Subject: Re: Surveying during wartime
Comments: To: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

We have 4 non-war surveys in the field right now and have higher than usual completion rates.

Ed Ratledge
University of Delaware

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

From: Jerold Pearson [mailto:jpearson@STANFORD.EDU]
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2003 5:59 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Surveying during wartime

Does anyone have any thoughts about fielding telephone surveys on non-war and non-political topics now that the war has begun? I have some surveys that were to start later this week with alumni from two universities, dealing with issues relating to alumni programs and communications. I'm concerned that respondents might find it inappropriate or insensitive to be calling now. And I'm also concerned that those who do cooperate might offer more favorable opinions than they would at another time (thinking, perhaps, that it's petty to be critical about things relating to their alma mater when life and death are at stake on the battlefield and on the TVs).

Any thoughts are appreciated. Thanks.

Jerold Pearson, '75
Director of Market Research
Stanford Alumni Association
650-723-9186
jpearson@stanford.edu
<http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Tue, 25 Mar 2003 07:10:07 -0500
Reply-To: SallyDaniels@worldnet.att.net
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Sally Daniels <SallyDaniels@WORLDNET.ATT.NET>
Subject: Re: Surveying during wartime
Comments: To: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <FCDC58EC0F22D4119F0800A0C9E58995D247DC@exchange.chep.udel.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The same is true at RoperASW. We have a large number of surveys in the field and are seeing better than normal completion rates. Interviewers have been instructed to be sensitive to people who may feel that it is inappropriate for us to be calling and have been given scripts for responding to such people. But they are reporting no problems at all.

Sally Daniels
RoperASW

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of Ratledge, Edward
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2003 8:03 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Surveying during wartime

We have 4 non-war surveys in the field right now and have higher than usual completion rates.

Ed Ratledge
University of Delaware

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

From: Jerold Pearson [mailto:jpearson@STANFORD.EDU]
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2003 5:59 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Surveying during wartime

Does anyone have any thoughts about fielding telephone surveys on non-war and non-political topics now that the war has begun? I have some surveys that were to start later this week with alumni from two universities, dealing with issues relating to alumni programs and communications. I'm concerned that respondents might find it inappropriate or insensitive to be calling now. And I'm also concerned that those who do cooperate might offer more favorable opinions than they would at another time (thinking, perhaps, that it's petty to be critical about things relating to their alma mater when life and death are at stake on the battlefield and on the TVs).

Any thoughts are appreciated. Thanks.

Jerold Pearson, '75
Director of Market Research
Stanford Alumni Association
650-723-9186
jpearson@stanford.edu
<http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.
=====

Date: Tue, 25 Mar 2003 08:56:28 -0600
Reply-To: Don Ferree <gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Don Ferree <gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU>
Subject: Re: Surveying during wartime
Comments: To: SallyDaniels@WORLDNET.ATT.NET
In-Reply-To: <000801c2f2c7\$e73ddcc0\$09285a0c@SallyDaniels>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I believe I recall a similar phenomenon (and AAPORNET thread) from the days after 9/11, when a number of contributors were noticing increased completion, at least after the initial shock. What I do not immediately recall, and what might be worth some systematic investigation of both mid to late September 2001 and the present period, is how much seemed to be (net) increased willingness to participate and how much seemed to be greater ease of making contact.

Don

At 07:10 AM 03/25/2003 -0500, you wrote:

>The same is true at RoperASW. We have a large number of surveys in the
>field and are seeing better than normal completion rates. Interviewers have
>been instructed to be sensitive to people who may feel that it is
>inappropriate for us to be calling and have been given scripts for
>responding to such people. But they are reporting no problems at all.

>
>Sally Daniels
>RoperASW

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of Ratledge, Edward
>Sent: Monday, March 24, 2003 8:03 PM
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>Subject: Re: Surveying during wartime

>
>
>We have 4 non-war surveys in the field right now and have higher than usual
>completion rates.

>
>Ed Ratledge
>University of Delaware

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

>From: Jerold Pearson [mailto:jpearson@STANFORD.EDU]
>Sent: Monday, March 24, 2003 5:59 PM
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>Subject: Surveying during wartime

>
>
>Does anyone have any thoughts about fielding telephone surveys on non-war
>and non-political topics now that the war has begun? I have some surveys

>that were to start later this week with alumni from two universities,
>dealing with issues relating to alumni programs and communications. I'm
>concerned that respondents might find it inappropriate or insensitive to be
>calling now. And I'm also concerned that those who do cooperate might
>offer more favorable opinions than they would at another time (thinking,
>perhaps, that it's petty to be critical about things relating to their alma
>mater when life and death are at stake on the battlefield and on the TVs).

>
>Any thoughts are appreciated. Thanks.

>
>Jerold Pearson, '75
>Director of Market Research
>Stanford Alumni Association
>650-723-9186
>jpearson@stanford.edu
><http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/>

>-----
>Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>then click on 'Join or leave the list'
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

>-----
>View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
>the messages from the web page above, for instance.

>-----
>View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
>the messages from the web page above, for instance.

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

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Tue, 25 Mar 2003 11:43:11 -0600
Reply-To: alisu@email.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: =?iso-8859-1?Q?Alis=FA_Schoua-Glusberg?= <Alisu@EMAIL.COM>
Subject: Data collecton on palm pilots

MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

A colleague is exploring doing data collection in Africa on CAPI with Palm Pilots. Can anyone point me in the direction of recent papers about others' experiences with handhelds. Their survey is a 45 minute instrument virtually without skips, so papers on similar applications would be best.

=20

Thanks to all in advance!

=20

Alis=FA

=20

Alis=FA Schoua-Glusberg, Ph.D.
General Partner
Research Support Services
906 Ridge Ave. Evanston, IL 60202
847.971.9068 - fax: 208.728.3064
Alisu@email.com

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====

Date: Tue, 25 Mar 2003 10:46:27 -0800
Reply-To: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>
Subject: Re: Data collecton on palm pilots
In-Reply-To: <007401c2f2f6\$01ab5f00\$6501a8c0@GATECELERON>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

A search of PubMed for "hand-held computer" yields 347 references so you=20 will need to refine the search strategy.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?CMD=3Dsearch&DB=3DPubMed>

At 3/25/2003 09:43 AM, you wrote:

>A colleague is exploring doing data collection in Africa on CAPI with
>Palm Pilots. Can anyone point me in the direction of recent papers
>about others' experiences with handhelds. Their survey is a 45 minute
>instrument virtually without skips, so papers on similar applications
>would be best.

>

>Thanks to all in advance!

>

>Alis=FA

>

>*****

>Alis=FA Schoua-Glusberg, Ph.D.
>General Partner
>Research Support Services
>906 Ridge Ave. Evanston, IL 60202
>847.971.9068 - fax: 208.728.3064
>Alisu@email.com

>

>-----

>View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
>the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Tue, 25 Mar 2003 18:19:50 -0300
Reply-To: leleba@USP.BR
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leandro Batista <leleba@USP.BR>
Subject: survey in Russia
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

A doctoral student in our department is looking for information about what is used in Russia to determine the social-economic status of survey respondents.

In Brazil we use a serie of questions about owned goods plus the educational level of the head of the household.

You can respond directly to me. If anyone is also interested on this subject I'll forward the answers I get.

TIA.

Leandro Batista

University of São Paulo - Brazil

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Tue, 25 Mar 2003 16:57:40 -0600

Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: FW: greetings from Poland, internship...
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

=20

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

From: magdalena wojcieszak [mailto:magfish2@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2003 9:53 AM
To: AAPOR-INFO
Subject: greetings from Poland, internship...

To whom it may concern,=20

First I will present the purpose of my e-mail and than provide some =
"explaining" information.=20

So, I would be extremely interested in any possibility of receiving an =
internship in the American Association of Public Opinion Research. =
Preferably this summer, however any date convenient for you, would be =
acceptable for me as well.=20

I have just received a Master Degree in Sociology from the =
well-established Insitute of Applied Social Studies at the Warsaw =
University in Poland. Because of my academic background, I'm very =
familiar with the methodology of both quantitative and qualitative =
research, had many courses and practical trainings on the matter, have =
constructed and conducted several public opinion surveys, and know basis =
of SPSS. Threfore the field of my research and interests is perfectly =
combined with the excellent job you perform in the market.=20

Alltogether I spent 3 years of my life in America. I lived in San =
Francisco for half a year before, during and after September 11th =
disasters and then became interested in the television coverage of the =
events and their aftermath. In fact, my master thesis treats about =
public opinion on the TV coverage. For the thesis, with a help of dr =
Patterson from the University of San Francisco, I constructed and =
conducted a survey in both San Francisco and Mid-West, to capture "two =
Americas". As a matter of fact, I noticed some methodological mistakes =
in some of American national surveys constructed to capture the public =
opinion on the TV coverage, and the attitudes towards the events of =
2001. When analyzing my surveys, and statistically interpreting the =
data, I cooperated with the largest Public Opinion Research Agency in =
Poland, CBOS.=20

I'm thinking seriously about pursuing my academic career in the United States, and widening my knowledge and experience connected with public opinion, polls, methodology, etc. Especially that from the Warsaw University I received a MA degree with distinction, had 5.0 grade average and had been receiving a stipend of the Polish Ministry of Education for "outstanding academic achievements".=20

Therefore I have been thinking of working/cooperating/volunteering for the American Association of Public Opinion Research, and would be extremely grateful if you could provide some detailed information on the matter.=20

I'm looking forward to your response.=20

Thank you, and have a beautiful day,=20

Sincerely,=20

Magdalena Wojcieszak

_____ =20

Do you Yahoo!?

Yahoo! =

<http://rd.yahoo.com/platinum/evt=3D8162/*http://platinum.yahoo.com/splash.html> Platinum - Watch CBS' NCAA March Madness, live =
<http://rd.yahoo.com/platinum/evt=3D8162/*http://platinum.yahoo.com/splash.html> on your desktop!

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Tue, 25 Mar 2003 15:30:38 -0800
Reply-To: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>
Subject: Wartime surveying - Comments
Comments: To: por@vance.irss.unc.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Thanks to everyone who responded to my question about the appropriateness

of calling now, during the opening stages of the mess in Iraq. Others of you asked me to post to the list the replies I received, so here goes.

In short, everyone on the list who responded said they have noticed either no drop-off in response rates or a slight improvement. And no one mentioned any complaints or problems with respondents.

I also asked John Wulff, the VP at Telepoll Canada, the interviewing firm I use. Here's what he said:

"We are conducting surveys in the US at the moment and are plugging along. We haven't had a respondent make a direct comment about being inappropriate or insensitive to interview at the moment. On studies that are on a subject not very important, i.e. Pizza (which we are doing right now), we are noticing a slight decrease in production.

The MRA has suggested that this statement be used by interviewers if a respondent is upset at being called at this time. We'd suggest that you incorporate the upcoming scripts as an objection or a disclaimer...

"In consideration of the government's wishes that Americans continue with their daily lives during this time of war, many businesses have decided to proceed with the activities that keep our economy moving toward recovery. However, we understand your concerns, and if you do not want to participate in an interview at this time, we respect your wishes".

Thanks again to all who responded to me. I will monitor very closely when I begin my next survey with alumni in the next few days. If I hear anything noteworthy, I'll pass it on to the list.

Jerold Pearson, '75
Director of Market Research
Stanford Alumni Association
650-723-9186
jpearson@stanford.edu
<http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Wed, 26 Mar 2003 11:21:05 -0500
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Subject: Wash. Post--Survey Finds Federal Workers Are Restless
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

washingtonpost.com
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A28623-2003Mar25.html>

Survey Finds Federal Workers Are Restless At Least a Third Are Considering Leaving Jobs

By Christopher Lee
Washington Post Staff Writer
Wednesday, March 26, 2003; Page A15

More than one-third of federal employees who took part in a government-wide survey released yesterday said they were considering leaving their jobs, a finding that Bush administration officials call troubling.

A little less than half of the 34.6 percent who are considering leaving said they were planning to retire within three years, according to the Federal Human Capital Survey. That means the much-reported impending wave of federal retirements is only part of the challenge officials face in attracting and keeping talented workers.

"Now we've had our attention drawn to a whole other set of people -- not an insignificant proportion -- who are saying, 'I'm getting out of Dodge,' " said Doris Hausser, assistant director of the Office of Personnel Management. "And we've got to be concerned about that. . . . Retention is something we have to pay attention to."

Hausser said the survey could not discern whether employees were seeking other federal jobs or planning to leave government service. But the fact that so many are looking to leave their current posts suggests they do not feel "connected" to their jobs, which can hurt productivity, she said.

OPM conducted the study of more than 100,000 government workers from May to August last year, then spent the next six months analyzing the results. The survey, which will be repeated every other year, is part of the administration's effort to improve management of the federal workforce.

The 100-question survey went to a representative sample of federal employees across the country, and asked for their opinions on matters ranging from job satisfaction to pay and benefits and recognition of good performance.

It did not directly ask about the Bush administration's effort to allow private companies to compete for more work currently done by government employees, an initiative that could affect jobs and worker morale at every federal agency. However, almost 66 percent of those surveyed said they believed their organization could do its job as effectively as any company.

The current questionnaire is the first public survey of its kind since the early 1990s, officials said.

OPM officials said they were heartened by the findings that 68 percent of workers are satisfied with their jobs, 64 percent are satisfied with

their pay, nearly two-thirds are happy with their retirement benefits, and 91 percent believe they do important work.

Other results were less encouraging, officials said. For instance, fewer than half of all employees said they are satisfied with the recognition they get for doing a good job, with only 30 percent saying awards programs provide real incentives for workers to do their best. Only 27 percent said steps have been taken to deal with poor performers. And only 36 percent said their leaders generate high levels of motivation among workers.

The survey findings "indicate that most employees understand the importance of their work and are satisfied with their jobs and compensation. They also indicate where the government can do better," OPM Director Kay Coles James wrote in an introduction to the report.

Hausser said the survey suggests that agencies could do better in developing leaders and getting the most out of workers' talents. She acknowledged that some of the results appear contradictory, such as the findings that workers believe they are not being recognized for good work and yet are satisfied with their pay.

The survey results are to be made available online today at www.fhcs.opm.gov. "It is at the agency level that much of the heavy lifting needs to be done," James said yesterday. "Senior managers can use the survey to answer the question, 'What can I do to make my agency work better?'"

© 2003 The Washington Post Company

Mark David Richards

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 26 Mar 2003 13:06:33 -0500

Reply-To: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>

Subject: The Second Seminar on the Funding Opportunity In Survey

Research: June 9, 2003

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Topic: The Second Seminar on the Funding Opportunity In Survey Research

Organizer: Research Subcommittee of the Federal Committee On Statistical Methodology (Robert Fay; robert.e.fay.iii@census.gov ; Monroe Sirken; mgs2@CDC.gov)

Sponsors: Washington Statistical Society and Washington DC / Baltimore Chapter of AAPOR

Date/Time: Monday, June 9, 2003, 9:00 AM - 4:00PM (NOTE SPECIAL = TIME)

Location: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Conference and Training Center, Rooms 1, 2, and 3, Postal Square Building (PSB), 2 Massachusetts Avenue, NE, Washington, DC. Please use First St., NE entrance (across from Union Station).

Abstract: In 1998, a consortium of 12 Federal statistical agencies in collaboration with the Methodology, Measurement and Statistics Program, National Science Foundation, and with the support of the Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology initiated a grants program to fund basic survey and statistical research oriented to the needs of Federal agencies. =

Reports of the principal investigators of the 4 research projects funded during cycle 1 of the Program in 1999 were featured at a first Funding Opportunity=

Seminar held in Washington during June 2001. The Second Funding Opportunity Seminar will feature the reports of principal investigators of the 4 projects that were funded in 2001, cycle 2 of the program:

1. "Bayesian Methodology for Disclosure Limitation and Statistical = Analysis of Large Government Surveys" by Rod Little and Trivellore Raghunathan;
2. "Visual and Interactive Issues in the Design of Web Surveys" by Roger Tourangeau, Mick Cooper, Reginald Baker, and Fred Conrad;
3. "Robust Small Area Estimation Based on a Survey Weighted MCMC Solution for the Generalized Linear Mixed Model" by Ralph Folsom and Avinash Singh; and
4. "Small Area and Longitudinal Estimation Using Information from = Multiple Surveys" by Sharon Lohr.

Federal agency statisticians and survey methodologists will be discussants at each session.

If planning to attend, contact:

Pat Drummond by May 15,2003:<Pdrummond@CDC.gov> or 301-458-4193. Also, by noon June 8 either e-mail wss_seminar@bls.gov or call 202-691-7524 and = give your name, affiliation, and name of seminar attending. Finally, bring a photo ID.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Wed, 26 Mar 2003 13:20:14 -0500

Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>

Subject: Social status question--servers/waiters

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Can someone direct me to recent survey data showing public perception/ranking of achieved social status as measured by job function, specifically including restaurant servers/waiters (compared to doctors, lawyers, elected officials, pollsters...).

Thanks, mark

Mark David Richards

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Wed, 26 Mar 2003 14:51:52 -0500

Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>

Subject: Re: False beliefs and the war

In-Reply-To: <[001a01c2f0ef\\$e4501a20\\$718af7a5@default](mailto:001a01c2f0ef$e4501a20$718af7a5@default)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

This video presentation is circulating on the net:

"Dedicated to the men, women and children who lost their lives; all those who sacrificed their lives; And to all the Heroes that responded to the emergency 11 September 2001

<http://www.politicsandprotest.org/>

THIS is what our Nation is responding to. Please remember that in the difficult times ahead."

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Allen Barton

Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2003 10:54 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: False beliefs and the war

Thanks to all those who provided crosstabulations of the belief that Saddam Hussein was involved in 9/11 and support of President Bush's war policy. This includes Hank Zucker who originally posed the question. The figures all show 20 to 35% higher support of the war among those who believe Saddam Hussein was involved in the 9/11 terror attack, which is clearly a false belief, and 15 to 25% higher support among those who believe he gave "direct" or "substantial" support to Al Qaeda, which is a belief for which evidence is almost entirely lacking.

As to whether there is a causal relation between these beliefs and the decision to support war on Iraq, given the public's acceptance of some additional of reasons for going to war with Saddam Hussein, is a legitimate question. One approach would be to ask directly "which is the most important reason?" (How many would say "freeing the people of Iraq" is the most important?) In the tradition of Lazarsfeld's "Art of Asking Why," it would be necessary to ask those who say "because there is a danger that Saddam Hussein might aid future terror attacks on the U.S." why they think there is such a danger, and see if they use the false belief about the past as a reason for that belief in a future danger. This could still be done even now when we are at war.

Another approach would be to ask the "believers" a hypothetical: "If it were proved that Saddam Hussein had no part in the 9/11 attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, would you still have been in favor going to war with Iraq?"

Ideally, of course, we should have had a Lazarsfeldian panel of the public being asked these questions at intervals of a couple of months, and try to tease out "quasi-experimentally" which beliefs came first and which followed, and how they were related to exposure to the Bush administration and its supporters "campaign" to sell war on Iraq. But as far as I know there is no such ongoing panel. Another possibility would be to emulate the

Carl Hovland "Experiments on Mass Communication" of World War II vintage, trying to assess the effects of various arguments and "facts" on samples of the public in controlled experiments -- difficult to do given that most people probably have well-crystallized opinions. (Try high school students? Make it part of civics classes -- if those still exist?)

If we had panel data, we might find that support of the war comes mainly from fear of Iraq as a source of terror attacks on the U.S., a fear which comes from George W. Bush having convinced almost all of his faithful followers, and the less educated segment of the majority who did not vote for him, of this danger. And perhaps the belief that Saddam was involved in 9/11 is a result, not a cause, of their accepting Bush's arguments about a future threat and the tendency to cognitive consistency. The false belief about the past could then be a result, not the cause of the belief about the future threat and the need to go to war now to eliminate it -- a belief about the future which is of course neither true nor false but a matter of judgment, bolstered by the "bully pulpit" of the presidency and the chorus of Bush supporters in the "non-elite" right-wing media.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Thu, 27 Mar 2003 09:23:04 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Believe your eyes, not opinion polls
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

From yesterday's Baltimore Sun.

I plan on writing a letter to the editor and I suggest others do too.

Believe your eyes,
not opinion polls

[http://www.sunspot.net/news/opinion/oped/bal-op.polls26mar26,0,1222405.s
tory](http://www.sunspot.net/news/opinion/oped/bal-op.polls26mar26,0,1222405.story)

By Daniel Meltzer
Originally published March 26, 2003

SNIP

Backing from the Poles for the war against Iraq is credible, if of questionable value. The polls are another matter. Americans would do well to doubt the degree of citizen support for the war being reported here. These numbers are printed and broadcast regularly and accepted as something resembling fact when they are anything but.

SNIP

The results of periodic public opinion polls are routinely regarded as reliable by most news organizations and are disseminated widely. Recently published polls on the subject of Iraq, examined more closely, can be revealed, however (as have been many in the past), as being of dubious credibility and/or accuracy.

A New York Times/CBS News public opinion poll published Saturday in The Times reported that about 70 percent of the American public strongly supports the U.S. invasion of Iraq.

The poll was quoted widely in other papers and on broadcast news programs, often positioned to contrast with, or to "balance," well-attended anti-war protests that were taking place across the country and around the world. San Francisco police had arrested more than 1,000 protesters over two consecutive days of street action, and the generally conservative New York Police Department estimated there were more than 125,000 demonstrators Saturday, perhaps an all-time record for anti-war activism in the city.

Not mentioned at all during broadcast reports of the poll, however, and buried inside The Times that day was that its survey's conclusion was based on interviews with no more than 463 American adults, randomly chosen by computer from various households across the country. Pollsters consistently claim that their samplings, regardless of how minuscule, represent, within a negligible margin of error, the opinions of all Americans.

To put this into proper perspective, bear in mind that the 463 "adults" reportedly contacted by telephone represent an infinitesimal fraction of our population of about 280 million. And yet the clear conclusion suggested in virtually all reports of the poll was that Americans overwhelmingly support the war on Iraq.

Few of us need to be reminded that these same pollsters, who conduct random opinion "sampling" from tiny percentages of willing or compliant Americans, have already botched more than a few pre-election estimates and Election Day exit polls in recent years.

Nor do the published or broadcast survey reports provide the actual wording of the questions that had been posed during the interviews. Pollsters readily acknowledge that the language and nuances of the questions themselves can influence responses.

Perhaps this is just part of the continued numbing, if not dumbing, of America -- a concession by the media to the notion that Americans can and should be told what to think.

As a veteran of national news coverage, I can tell you that from a business standpoint, it has long been valued as a cheap story for the organization breaking the story, in this case The Times and CBS News -- no travel or per diem expenses and virtually cost-free for all of the other papers or broadcasters who will quote it. Bang-per-buck ratio is consistently high.

How should you react to the next random-sample opinion poll thrown at you? To paraphrase the motto of one of our least objective news media outlets: I am reporting this to you, now you decide.

Daniel Meltzer teaches journalism at New York University.

Copyright C 2003, The Baltimore Sun

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Thu, 27 Mar 2003 13:28:34 -0600
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: random samples
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Dear Sir or Madam,=20

I am in the process of applying for a small research grant from the =
Economic and Social Research Council in the United Kingdom in order to =
conduct mail-out surveys in the U.S. and UK, and am currently trying to =
locate a company or organization that can provide a random sample of =
adults (along with their addresses) in the U.S. I have written to the =
Survey Research Center, and they have suggested I contact AAPOR for help =
with this. Can you recommend any companies or agencies that provide =
such a service? =20

=20

=20

Sincerely yours,=20

Lauren McLaren=20

=20

Lauren McLaren
Lecturer
Department of Politics and International Relations
Associate Member, Nuffield College
University of Oxford=20
3 George Street Mews, #5
Oxford OX1 2AA
+44 01865 278835 (office)
+44 01865 278725 (fax)
lauren.mclaren@politics.ox.ac.uk

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 28 Mar 2003 08:44:04 -0500
Reply-To: Ed Freeland <efreelan@PRINCETON.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ed Freeland <efreelan@PRINCETON.EDU>
Subject: Re: Believe your eyes, not opinion polls
Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Perhaps a better title for Meltzer's editorial would be "Believe (what news editors choose to put in front of) your eyes, not opinion polls"

"Leo G. Simonetta" wrote:

> >From yesterday's Baltimore Sun.

>

> I plan on writing a letter to the editor and I suggest others do too.

>
> Believe your eyes,
> not opinion polls
> <http://www.sunspot.net/news/opinion/oped/bal-op.polls26mar26,0,1222405.s>
> tory
>
> By Daniel Meltzer
> Originally published March 26, 2003
>
> SNIP
>
> Backing from the Poles for the war against Iraq is credible, if of
> questionable value. The polls are another matter. Americans would do
> well to doubt the degree of citizen support for the war being reported
> here. These numbers are printed and broadcast regularly and accepted as
> something resembling fact when they are anything but.
>
> SNIP
>
> The results of periodic public opinion polls are routinely regarded as
> reliable by most news organizations and are disseminated widely.
> Recently published polls on the subject of Iraq, examined more closely,
> can be revealed, however (as have been many in the past), as being of
> dubious credibility and/or accuracy.
>
> A New York Times/CBS News public opinion poll published Saturday in The
> Times reported that about 70 percent of the American public strongly
> supports the U.S. invasion of Iraq.
>
> The poll was quoted widely in other papers and on broadcast news
> programs, often positioned to contrast with, or to "balance,"
> well-attended anti-war protests that were taking place across the
> country and around the world. San Francisco police had arrested more
> than 1,000 protesters over two consecutive days of street action, and
> the generally conservative New York Police Department estimated there
> were more than 125,000 demonstrators Saturday, perhaps an all-time
> record for anti-war activism in the city.
>
> Not mentioned at all during broadcast reports of the poll, however, and
> buried inside The Times that day was that its survey's conclusion was
> based on interviews with no more than 463 American adults, randomly
> chosen by computer from various households across the country. Pollsters
> consistently claim that their samplings, regardless of how minuscule,
> represent, within a negligible margin of error, the opinions of all
> Americans.
>
> To put this into proper perspective, bear in mind that the 463 "adults"
> reportedly contacted by telephone represent an infinitesimal fraction of
> our population of about 280 million. And yet the clear conclusion
> suggested in virtually all reports of the poll was that Americans
> overwhelmingly support the war on Iraq.
>
> Few of us need to be reminded that these same pollsters, who conduct
> random opinion "sampling" from tiny percentages of willing or compliant

> Americans, have already botched more than a few pre-election estimates
> and Election Day exit polls in recent years.
>
> Nor do the published or broadcast survey reports provide the actual
> wording of the questions that had been posed during the interviews.
> Pollsters readily acknowledge that the language and nuances of the
> questions themselves can influence responses.
>
> Perhaps this is just part of the continued numbing, if not dumbing, of
> America -- a concession by the media to the notion that Americans can
> and should be told what to think.
>
> As a veteran of national news coverage, I can tell you that from a
> business standpoint, it has long been valued as a cheap story for the
> organization breaking the story, in this case The Times and CBS News --
> no travel or per diem expenses and virtually cost-free for all of the
> other papers or broadcasters who will quote it. Bang-per-buck ratio is
> consistently high.
>
> How should you react to the next random-sample opinion poll thrown at
> you? To paraphrase the motto of one of our least objective news media
> outlets: I am reporting this to you, now you decide.
>
> Daniel Meltzer teaches journalism at New York University.
>
> Copyright C 2003, The Baltimore Sun
>
> --
> Leo G. Simonetta
> Art & Science Group, LLC
> 6115 Falls Road Suite 101
> Baltimore, MD 21209
> 410-377-7880 ext. 14
> 410-377-7955 fax
>
> -----
> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> then click on 'Join or leave the list'
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Fri, 28 Mar 2003 13:52:52 -0600
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Position Opening at JPSM
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Please respond to the e-mail address listed below only. =20

=20

I am posting this at the request of Pam Ainsworth, Assistant to =
Director, JPSM

Please direct all communications to her at: =

<mailto:painswor@survey.umd.edu> painswor@survey.umd.edu=20

Thanks,

Jim Caplan

=20

Social Scientist/Survey Methodologist

=20

The Joint Program in Survey Methodology (JPSM) seeks applications for a =
full-time, tenure - track Assistant Professor appointment from persons =
with research interests in survey methodology ideally beginning Fall =
2003. We will also consider appointments at the Associate level for =
qualified candidates. The JPSM is a consortium of the University of =
Maryland, the University of Michigan, and Westat, sponsored by the U.S. =
Federal statistical agencies. Responsibilities include graduate teaching =
and research. Research interest should include areas such as =
questionnaire design, computer-assisted data collection, cognition and =
survey measurement, interviewer effects, survey management, and the =
measurement and reduction of nonsampling errors. Doctorate in a =
relevant field is required. Send letter of application, curriculum =
vitae (with list of references, including phone numbers and e-mail =
addresses), copies of graduate transcripts, and if available, evidence =
of teaching effectiveness (sample syllabi and student evaluations) to =
Dr. R. Valliant, Search Committee Chair, 1218 Lefrak Hall, College Park, =
Maryland 20742. Reviews begin April 1, 2003, and will continue until =
the position is filled. For more information send e-mail to =
Rvalliant@survey.umd.edu. The University of Maryland is an EEO/AA =
Employer. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply.

=20

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Fri, 28 Mar 2003 15:48:02 -0500

Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>

Subject: Most Palestinians say they want to stop the violence - poll
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Jerusalem Post
Mar. 28, 2003

Most Palestinians say they want to stop the violence - poll

By KHALED ABU TOAMEH

<http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?pagename=JPost/A/JParticle/ShowFull&cid=1048758133066>

More than 60 percent of Palestinians support Iraq in its present confrontation with the US, according to a poll published Thursday by the Palestinian Center for Public Opinion.

The results of the poll show that an increasing percentage of Palestinians support ending the violence and terrorist attacks. Asked about suicide bombings in Israel, 43.0% of respondents said they want these attacks to stop, while 51.6% said they would like the intifada to end.

In the January poll, only 25.7% said they are opposed to the suicide attacks, and only 40.9% called for halting the intifada.

The poll shows that Palestinian Authority Chairman Yasser Arafat's popularity has risen approximately 10% since his decision to appoint a prime minister to run the day-to-day affairs of Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

PCPO director Dr. Nabil Kukali said the poll was based on a random sampling of 619 adults from the West Bank and Jerusalem's Arab neighborhoods.

The poll was conducted between March 14-20, and the margin of error was 3.9% points, he said.

According to the poll, Arafat's popularity increased from 44% in January 2003 to 53.3%.

Kukali attributed this to Arafat's decision to appoint Mahmoud Abbas as prime minister of the PA, a move many Palestinians regard as a serious step toward implementing reforms in the PA.

Some 42.2% of respondents said they support Abbas, while another 35.9% said the new prime minister should replace all the present cabinet ministers.

More than 50% said appointing a Palestinian premier now is "suitable."

The poll also showed that 53.8% don't expect the US and its partners in the Quartet Russia, the EU, and the UN to implement the road map plan for peace in the Middle East, even after Abbas assumes the duties of

prime minister.

In response to a question regarding the possibility of resuming security coordination between Israel and the PA, 54% said they are opposed.

Only 32% said they support, to different degrees, its resumption.

Mark David Richards

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Sat, 29 Mar 2003 14:15:58 -0500
Reply-To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Subject: When Prophecy Fails
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

"In fact, [argued William Schneider] all of our polls have found that morale is holding up and reporting that has given the people a voice."

The findings thus far that support for the war has remained steady is reminiscent of the classic finding from Festinger, Riecken, and Schachter's "When Prophecy Fails:" believers can persist despite despite an overwhelming disconfirmation. But the public has relatively few really committed believers in the case of this war, and given the still vivid history of Vietnam and the way the war was promoted, change can occur with some rapidity. It is well for us to keep in mind that attitudes are important as dependent variables, perhaps more so than as independent variables. H.S.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Sat, 29 Mar 2003 14:10:47 -0500
Reply-To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Subject: Re: Most Palestinians say they want to stop the violence - poll
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

With respect to Toameh's article stating that "Most Palestinians say they

want to stop the violence", the same author published another article in Jerusalem Post which seems to contradict the first one.

>Poll says 70% of Palestinians support suicide bombings
>Jerusalem Post; Jerusalem; Mar 25, 2003; KHALED ABU TOAMEH;

Since we can't access the basis for either conclusion, it's hard to know what to think. I've written to the Post asking for an explanation but as Mark says, it does make one a bit leery.

Dick Halpern

>Jerusalem Post
>Mar. 28, 2003

>
>Most Palestinians say they want to stop the violence - poll

>
>By KHALED ABU TOAMEH

>
>[http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?pagename=JPost/A/JParticle/ShowFu](http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?pagename=JPost/A/JParticle/ShowFu&ll&cid=1048758133066)
>[ll&cid=1048758133066](http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?pagename=JPost/A/JParticle/ShowFu&ll&cid=1048758133066)

>
>More than 60 percent of Palestinians support Iraq in its present
>confrontation with the US, according to a poll published Thursday by the
>Palestinian Center for Public Opinion.

>
>The results of the poll show that an increasing percentage of
>Palestinians support ending the violence and terrorist attacks. Asked
>about suicide bombings in Israel, 43.0% of respondents said they want
>these attacks to stop, while 51.6% said they would like the intifada to
>end.

>
>In the January poll, only 25.7% said they are opposed to the suicide
>attacks, and only 40.9% called for halting the intifada.

>
>The poll shows that Palestinian Authority Chairman Yasser Arafat's
>popularity has risen approximately 10% since his decision to appoint a
>prime minister to run the day-to-day affairs of Palestinians in the West
>Bank and Gaza Strip.

>
>PCPO director Dr. Nabil Kukali said the poll was based on a random
>sampling of 619 adults from the West Bank and Jerusalem's Arab
>neighborhoods.
>The poll was conducted between March 14-20, and the margin of error was
>3.9% points, he said.

>
>According to the poll, Arafat's popularity increased from 44% in January
>2003 to 53.3%.

>
>Kukali attributed this to Arafat's decision to appoint Mahmoud Abbas as
>prime minister of the PA, a move many Palestinians regard as a serious
>step toward implementing reforms in the PA.

>

>Some 42.2% of respondents said they support Abbas, while another 35.9%
>said the new prime minister should replace all the present cabinet
>ministers.
>More than 50% said appointing a Palestinian premier now is "suitable."
>
>The poll also showed that 53.8% don't expect the US and its partners in
>the Quartet Russia, the EU, and the UN to implement the road map plan
>for peace in the Middle East, even after Abbas assumes the duties of
>prime minister.
>
>In response to a question regarding the possibility of resuming security
>coordination between Israel and the PA, 54% said they are opposed.
>
>Only 32% said they support, to different degrees, its resumption.
>
>-----
>Mark David Richards

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Sat, 29 Mar 2003 17:25:20 -0500
Reply-To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Subject: Is Diversity Overrated?
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

This was initially reported in the Spring issue of the International=20
Journal of Public Opinion Research.

NY Times, March 29, 2003

Is Diversity Overrated?

By STANLEY ROTHMAN

NORTHAMPTON, Mass.

The Supreme Court hears arguments next week in the cases that may determine=
=20
whether racial and ethnic preferences in higher education admissions and=20

hiring are preserved or discarded. Whatever it decides, the court should be=20
=20
skeptical of one of the most popular justifications for preferential=20
treatment of minority applicants: that a diverse student body necessarily=20
improves the quality of education for everyone.

One of the most comprehensive studies ever undertaken of diversity in=20
higher education indicates that this contention is at least questionable.=20
The study's findings show that college diversity programs fail to raise=20
standards, and that a majority of faculty members and administrators=20
recognize this when speaking anonymously.

With my colleagues, Seymour Martin Lipset and Neil Nevitte, I measured=20
views of the educational benefit of diversity as it is now incorporated in=
=20
higher education policy. We wanted to know this: Is diversity truly seen,=20
as the former president of the University of Michigan has said, "as=20
essential as the study of the Middle Ages, of international politics and of=
=20
Shakespeare" to a well-rounded education?

To find out, in 1999 we surveyed a random sample of more than 1,600=20
students and 2,400 faculty members and administrators at 140 American=20
colleges and universities, asking them to evaluate the quality of education=
=20
at their institution, the academic preparation and work habits of the=20
student body, the state of race relations on campus and their own=20
experiences of discrimination. Then we correlated their responses with the=
=20
proportion of black students attending each institution, based on=20
government statistics.

If diversity works as advertised, we surmised, then those at institutions=20
with higher proportions of black enrollment should rate their educational=20
and racial milieus more favorably than their peers at institutions with=20
lower proportions.

The results contradict almost every benefit claimed for campus diversity.=20
Students, faculty members and administrators all responded to increasing=20
racial diversity by registering increased dissatisfaction with the quality=
=20
of education and the work ethic of their peers. Students also increasingly=
=20
complained about discrimination.

Moreover, diversity fails to deliver even when all else is equal. When we=20
controlled for other demographic and institutional factors like the=20
respondent's race, gender, economic background and religion, or an=20
institution's public or private status, selectivity and whether it offers=20
an ethnic or racial studies program, the results were surprising. A higher=
=20
level of diversity is associated with somewhat less educational=20
satisfaction and worse race relations among students.

We also tested for the effects of higher Hispanic and Asian enrollment. Hispanic enrollment has little effect on any group's ratings of the educational or racial climate. As the proportion of Asian students increased, however, faculty members and administrators perceived an improvement in the academic quality of their students. Thus support for the diversity argument comes with respect to a minority often excluded from preferential admissions programs.

We also asked students about policies used to increase diversity. Three out of four oppose "relaxing academic standards" to increase minority representation, as do a majority of faculty members. And an overwhelming 85 percent of students specifically reject the use of racial or ethnic "preferences" along with a majority of faculty members. More telling, 62 percent of minority students oppose relaxing standards, and 71 percent oppose preferences.

Among the most striking findings is the silent opposition of so many who administer these programs yet must publicly support them. Although a small majority of administrators support admissions preferences, 47.7 percent oppose them. In addition, when asked to estimate the impact of preferential admissions on university academic standards, about two-thirds say there is none. Most dismaying, of those who think that preferences have some impact on academic standards, those believing it negative exceed those believing it positive by 15 to 1.

One cannot help but wonder why the public and private views of higher education's leadership differ so greatly. It would be useful to have some good studies of that question.

Stanley Rothman, professor emeritus of government at Smith College, is director of the Center for the Study of Social and Political Change.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Sat, 29 Mar 2003 19:55:08 -0500

Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>

Subject: Re: Is Diversity Overrated?

Comments: To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
In-Reply-To: <5.2.0.9.2.20030329172454.0113d838@pop3.norton.antivirus>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I haven't read this study, but I was struck by this statement that also appears in the Chronicle of Higher Ed account:

>
> To find out, in 1999 we surveyed a random sample of more than 1,600
> students and 2,400 faculty members and administrators at 140 American
> colleges and universities, asking them to evaluate the quality of
> education
> at their institution, the academic preparation and work habits of the
> student body, the state of race relations on campus and their own
> experiences of discrimination. Then we CORRELATED their responses
> with the
> proportion of black students attending each institution, based on
> government statistics.
>
> If diversity works as advertised, we surmised, then those at institutions
> with higher proportions of black enrollment should rate their educational
> and racial milieus more favorably than their peers at institutions with
> lower proportions.

Apparently Lipset, et al, do not understand that correlation is not cause. If one did this study of public schools, it would rate the lily white suburban districts ahead of the suburban districts with some blacks and ahead of districts which are essentially segregated.

How ever you slice it, this sounds like support for segregated higher ed, based upon correlation.

Very strange!!!

Andrew A. Beveridge
Professor of Sociology
Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY
209 Kissena Hall
64-19 Kissena Blvd
Flushing, NY 11367
Phone: 718-997-2837
FAX: 718-997-2820
email: andrew_beveridge@qc.edu
web: www.socialexplorer.com

>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Sat, 29 Mar 2003 20:33:23 -0500
Reply-To: ande271@attglobal.net
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jeanne Anderson Research <ande271@ATTGLOBAL.NET>
Subject: Re: Is Diversity Overrated?
Comments: To: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I'm surprised to learn that Marty Lipset does not understand that "correlation is not cause." (!) How much of the report was written by Lipset?

Andrew A Beveridge wrote:

> I haven't read this study, but I was struck by this statement that
> also appears in the Chronicle of Higher Ed account:
>
>>
>> To find out, in 1999 we surveyed a random sample of more than 1,600
>> students and 2,400 faculty members and administrators at 140 American
>> colleges and universities, asking them to evaluate the quality of
>> education
>> at their institution, the academic preparation and work habits of the
>> student body, the state of race relations on campus and their own
>> experiences of discrimination. Then we CORRELATED their responses
>> with the
>> proportion of black students attending each institution, based on
>> government statistics.
>>
>> If diversity works as advertised, we surmised, then those at institutions
>> with higher proportions of black enrollment should rate their educational
>> and racial milieus more favorably than their peers at institutions with
>> lower proportions.
>
> Apparently Lipset, et al, do not understand that correlation is not cause.
> If one did this study of public schools, it would rate the lily white
> suburban districts ahead of the suburban districts with some blacks and
> ahead of districts which are essentially segregated.
>
> How ever you slice it, this sounds like support for segregated higher ed,
> based upon correlation.
>
> Very strange!!!
>
> Andrew A. Beveridge
> Professor of Sociology
> Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY
> 209 Kissena Hall
> 64-19 Kissena Blvd

> Flushing, NY 11367
> Phone: 718-997-2837
> FAX: 718-997-2820
> email: andrew_beveridge@qc.edu
> web: www.socialexplorer.com
>
>>
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Sat, 29 Mar 2003 20:17:20 -0500
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Organization: Rider University
Subject: Re: Is Diversity Overrated?
Comments: To: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I haven't read the study either, so perhaps I'm misunderstanding the methodology. However, if I read it correctly, I am not sure of the validity of correlating results of a public opinion survey within an institution with characteristics of the institution like the percentage of a given group on campus. The former is based on individual-level data and the second is based on aggregate-level data that can relate to any number of features of the institution.

Also, even if the finding is valid, it may find nothing more than there is likely to be a higher degree of racial tension and prejudgement where there are more diverse populations. Finally, note that the surveys measure perceptions of academic quality, etc. There don't seem to be any objective measures of these factors, which again only implies that some people perceive educational standards are lowered in institutions with more diverse populations. I could argue, for instance, that highly ranked academic institutions where something like two-thirds of its students grade are A- or higher, suffer from lowered educational standards, but I don't know that many there would perceive that to be the case.

Andrew A Beveridge wrote:

> I haven't read this study, but I was struck by this statement that
> also appears in the Chronicle of Higher Ed account:
>
>>
>> To find out, in 1999 we surveyed a random sample of more than 1,600
>> students and 2,400 faculty members and administrators at 140 American
>> colleges and universities, asking them to evaluate the quality of
>> education
>> at their institution, the academic preparation and work habits of the
>> student body, the state of race relations on campus and their own
>> experiences of discrimination. Then we CORRELATED their responses
>> with the
>> proportion of black students attending each institution, based on
>> government statistics.

>> If diversity works as advertised, we surmised, then those at institutions
>> with higher proportions of black enrollment should rate their educational
>> and racial milieus more favorably than their peers at institutions with
>> lower proportions.
>
> Apparently Lipset, et al, do not understand that correlation is not cause.
> If one did this study of public schools, it would rate the lily white
> suburban districts ahead of the suburban districts with some blacks and
> ahead of districts which are essentially segregated.

> How ever you slice it, this sounds like support for segregated higher ed,
> based upon correlation.
>
> Very strange!!!

> Andrew A. Beveridge
> Professor of Sociology
> Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY
> 209 Kissena Hall
> 64-19 Kissena Blvd
> Flushing, NY 11367
> Phone: 718-997-2837
> FAX: 718-997-2820
> email: andrew_beveridge@qc.edu
> web: www.socialexplorer.com

> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your main email address.

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Sat, 29 Mar 2003 22:18:13 -0500
Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
Subject: Here is the Chronicle Article
Comments: To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <3E8645A0.CDB03C9@rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear All:

I remember when I read the account in the Chronicle, I was glad that it was not being published in POQ. As a person who has been doing research related to educational topics, it seems to me that this correlational study should probably not have been published in its form, since many other hypotheses should be also explored to account for the the attitudinal findings. Also as Rusciano points out this really is done at an aggregate level. So you have aggregated attitude measures correlated with school composition.

Most arguments for diversity benefits are based upon longitudinal studies not on stuff like this. The idea, of course, being that if white students (for instance) are only educated with other whites, they will reinforce attitudes with other groups that are perhaps not positive. While black and other minorities are denied opportunities.

Given some of the other research that has been done by Lipset, et al on faculty attitudes, I was somewhat surprised by this finding. It certainly does not look at the long term benefits of diversity or segregation on those in such institutions. Nothing like the SHAPE OF THE RIVER, which is the "big book" on this topic, nor the recent work by Massey on stereotyping of black students entitled THE SOURCE OF THE RIVER.

As you all must know, the oral arguments on the affirmative action case are on Tuesday, and they arguments will be available on the web immediately, ala Bush v. Gore.

Andy Beveridge
Queens College and Graduate Center -- CUNY

New Study Questions Educational Benefits of Diversity
By JEFFREY SELINGO

In a direct challenge to academic research that asserts the educational benefits of diversity, a new study by a team of prominent scholars suggests

that students of all ethnic backgrounds feel that as minority enrollment grows, the quality of their education diminishes and incidents of discrimination increase.

The findings, published in the spring issues of the *International Journal of Public Opinion Research and The Public Interest*, are likely to generate intense debate as the U.S. Supreme Court prepares to hear two lawsuits challenging race-conscious admissions policies at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor's chief undergraduate college and law school. In defending the use of affirmative action, the university and its supporters cite volumes of data that they say show that a diverse student body enriches the educational experience of all students.

But the authors of the new study contend that such evidence "suffers from the subjective nature of survey responses," in which questions are worded in a way so that everyone agrees.

"In a sense, diversity is like free speech -- almost everyone approves of it in the abstract, but its application in concrete situations can produce great controversy," write the authors, Stanley Rothman, director of the Center for the Study of Social and Political Change and a professor of government at Smith College; Seymour Martin Lipset, a professor of public policy at George Mason University; and Neil Nevitte, a political-science professor at the University of Toronto.

A Broader Approach

The three scholars therefore sought to undertake a broader approach in their survey. They not only asked administrators, professors, and students at 140 colleges how they felt about campus diversity, but also inquired about the institutions' general educational environment, making no references to diversity.

Following the survey, the responses were correlated to the number of black students at each institution, since the authors argue that the debate over affirmative action has primarily centered on black students at predominantly white colleges.

In the survey, conducted in the spring of 1999, participants were asked how well their institution educated its students and how hard students worked at their studies. Faculty members and administrators were asked how academically well prepared students were upon enrolling. Participants were also asked several questions about diversity, including whether minority students were treated better or worse than white students were and to what extent racial discrimination was a problem at their college.

The results were the opposite of what the researchers say they expected. As the number of black students increased, student satisfaction with their educational experience dropped, as did their favorable impression of the quality of education and the work ethic of their peers. In addition, the more diverse the institution, the more likely students were to respond that they had experienced discrimination. The survey did not distinguish minority respondents from nonminority respondents.

The responses were similar among students, professors, and administrators. For instance, as the number of black students on a campus increased, the more likely it was that faculty members criticized the work habits of students.

The findings, Mr. Rothman said in an interview, show that "studies done by the academic community, which is overtly in favor of diversity, are predisposed to the goal of diversity."

Questioning Other Studies

Opponents of affirmative action who support the plaintiffs in the Michigan cases said that the new study raises serious questions about previous studies that back the educational benefits of diversity.

The new survey "shows the shakiness of the Gurin study that is being relied on so heavily by the University of Michigan," said Roger B. Clegg, general counsel for the Center for Equal Opportunity, which opposes affirmative action.

The Gurin study was conducted by Patricia Y. Gurin, a professor of psychology and women's studies at Michigan. It concluded that white students reap long-term benefits from diversity. Tapping into a database with information from many colleges, she found that students who most interacted with diverse peers in college were most likely to be living or working in integrated settings five years after graduation.

The Rothman study, Mr. Clegg said, "shows how dangerous it would be for the Supreme Court to allow racial discrimination simply because a social scientist purports to find a correlation between racial discrimination and some desirable educational outcome."

But Gary A. Orfield, a professor of education and social policy at Harvard University, criticized the findings as being "inconsistent" with a "vast literature of research on desegregation."

Mr. Orfield said that in his own surveys of law and medical schools, he has found "very positive and powerful impacts of diversity on what students believe they are learning, development of their views on key issues in their professions, changes in attitudes about how they will practice, and very strong support for affirmative action, with many students saying that more should be done."

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Frank Rusciano

> Sent: Saturday, March 29, 2003 8:17 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Is Diversity Overrated?

>

>

> I haven't read the study either, so perhaps I'm misunderstanding the

> methodology. However, if I read it correctly, I am not sure of

> the validity of

> correlating results of a public opinion survey within an institution with

> characteristics of the institution like the percentage of a given group on
> campus. The former is based on individual-level data and the
> second is based
> on aggregate-level data that can relate to any number of features of the
> institution.
>
> Also, even if the finding is valid, it may find nothing more than there is
> likely to be a higher degree of racial tension and prejudgement
> where there are
> more diverse populations. Finally, note that the surveys measure
> perceptions
> of academic quality, etc. There don't seem to be any objective
> measures of
> these factors, which again only implies that some people perceive
> educational
> standards are lowered in institutions with more diverse
> populations. I could
> argue, for instance, that highly ranked academic institutions
> where something
> like two-thirds of its students grade are A- or higher, suffer
> from lowered
> educational standards, but I don't know that many there would
> perceive that to
> be the case.
>
> Andrew A Beveridge wrote:
>
>> I haven't read this study, but I was struck by this statement that
>> also appears in the Chronicle of Higher Ed account:
>>
>>>
>>> To find out, in 1999 we surveyed a random sample of more than 1,600
>>> students and 2,400 faculty members and administrators at 140 American
>>> colleges and universities, asking them to evaluate the quality of
>>> education
>>> at their institution, the academic preparation and work habits of the
>>> student body, the state of race relations on campus and their own
>>> experiences of discrimination. Then we CORRELATED their responses
>>> with the
>>> proportion of black students attending each institution, based on
>>> government statistics.
>>>
>>> If diversity works as advertised, we surmised, then those at
> institutions
>>> with higher proportions of black enrollment should rate their
> educational
>>> and racial milieus more favorably than their peers at
> institutions with
>>> lower proportions.
>>
>> Apparently Lipset, et al, do not understand that correlation is
> not cause.
>> If one did this study of public schools, it would rate the lily white
>> suburban districts ahead of the suburban districts with some blacks and

>> ahead of districts which are essentially segregated.
>>
>> How ever you slice it, this sounds like support for segregated
> higher ed,
>> based upon correlation.

>> Very strange!!!

>> Andrew A. Beveridge
>> Professor of Sociology
>> Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY
>> 209 Kissena Hall
>> 64-19 Kissena Blvd
>> Flushing, NY 11367
>> Phone: 718-997-2837
>> FAX: 718-997-2820
>> email: andrew_beveridge@qc.edu
>> web: www.socialexplorer.com

>> -----
>> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
>> main email address.
>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu

> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Sat, 29 Mar 2003 23:34:55 -0500
Reply-To: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Susan Carol Losh <slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Here is the Chronicle Article
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain
Content-transfer-encoding: binary

Here's the major crux of the matter, and it's an old classic called the

ecological fallacy. Note the quote about the "Gurin Study:"

Tapping into a database with information from many colleges, she found that students who most interacted with diverse peers in college were most likely to be living or working in integrated settings five years after graduation.

In the current work, we have aggregate attitude measures correlated with statistics on organizations.

Are the faculty who complain about student effort THE SAME ONES who interact with Black (or Hispanic or whomever) students?

Are the White students who complain about academic quality THE SAME ONES who interact with Black students?

etc.

We don't know. These aren't the correlations that were reported to us.

I can envision a scenario where stereotypes come into play...the more Black faces seen on campus, the more whites decide the campus is low quality.

Nearly 30 years ago, JPSP published two separate classic articles by John Touhey.

In one, a randomized group of college students were told certain occupations would see a rise in the number of women workers in the next 10 years, the other group was told the sex ratios would remain the same.

In the second set of studies, one randomized group of students was told that certain occupations would see an influx of male workers over the next 10 years, the other group was told the sex ratios would remain the same.

Students who were told an occupation would have an influx of males rated its future prestige higher, those told an occupation would have an influx of females rated the future prestige of that occupation lower, than those told sex ratios would remain constant.

From a different angle, our Provost has finally decided that student evaluations of faculty are student PERCEPTIONS of faculty teaching effectiveness.

Long-term benefits (if existing) of being a student in a diverse environment are a totally different set of variables than the ones referenced in this article.

Cheers!
Susan

On Sat, 29 Mar 2003 22:18:13 -0500 Andrew A Beveridge wrote:

> Dear All:

>
> I remember when I read the account in the Chronicle, I was glad that
> it was
> not being published in POQ. As a person who has been doing research
> related
> to educational topics, it seems to me that this correlational study should
> probably not have been published in its form, since many other hypotheses
> should be also explored to account for the the attitudinal findings. Also
> as Rusciano points out this really is done at an aggregate level. So you
> have aggregated attitude measures correlated with school composition.
>
> Most arguments for diversity benefits are based upon longitudinal studies
> not on stuff like this. The idea, of course, being that if white students
> (for instance) are only educated with other whites, they will reinforce
> attitudes with other groups that are perhaps not positive. While
> black and
> other minorities are denied opportunities.
>
> Given some of the other research that has been done by Lipset, et al on
> faculty attitudes, I was somewhat surprised by this finding. It certainly
> does not look at the long term benefits of diversity or segregation
> on those
> in such institutions. Nothing like the SHAPE OF THE RIVER, which is the
> "big book" on this topic, nor the recent work by Massey on stereotyping of
> black students entitled THE SOURCE OF THE RIVER.
>
> As you all must know, the oral arguments on the affirmative action
> case are
> on Tuesday, and they arguments will be available on the web
> immediately, ala
> Bush v. Gore.
>
> Andy Beveridge
> Queens College and Graduate Center -- CUNY
>
>
>
>
> New Study Questions Educational Benefits of Diversity
> By JEFFREY SELINGO
>
> In a direct challenge to academic research that asserts the educational
> benefits of diversity, a new study by a team of prominent scholars
> suggests
> that students of all ethnic backgrounds feel that as minority enrollment
> grows, the quality of their education diminishes and incidents of
> discrimination increase.
>
> The findings, published in the spring issues of the International
> Journal of

> Public Opinion Research and The Public Interest, are likely to generate
> intense debate as the U.S. Supreme Court prepares to hear two lawsuits
> challenging race-conscious admissions policies at the University of
> Michigan
> at Ann Arbor's chief undergraduate college and law school. In
> defending the
> use of affirmative action, the university and its supporters cite
> volumes of
> data that they say show that a diverse student body enriches the
> educational
> experience of all students.
>
> But the authors of the new study contend that such evidence "suffers from
> the subjective nature of survey responses," in which questions are
> worded in
> a way so that everyone agrees.
>
> "In a sense, diversity is like free speech -- almost everyone
> approves of it
> in the abstract, but its application in concrete situations can produce
> great controversy," write the authors, Stanley Rothman, director of the
> Center for the Study of Social and Political Change and a professor of
> government at Smith College; Seymour Martin Lipset, a professor of public
> policy at George Mason University; and Neil Nevitte, a political-science
> professor at the University of Toronto.
>
> A Broader Approach
>
> The three scholars therefore sought to undertake a broader approach
> in their
> survey. They not only asked administrators, professors, and students
> at 140
> colleges how they felt about campus diversity, but also inquired about the
> institutions' general educational environment, making no references to
> diversity.
>
> Following the survey, the responses were correlated to the number of black
> students at each institution, since the authors argue that the debate over
> affirmative action has primarily centered on black students at
> predominantly
> white colleges.
>
> In the survey, conducted in the spring of 1999, participants were
> asked how
> well their institution educated its students and how hard students
> worked at
> their studies. Faculty members and administrators were asked how
> academically well prepared students were upon enrolling. Participants were
> also asked several questions about diversity, including whether minority
> students were treated better or worse than white students were and to what
> extent racial discrimination was a problem at their college.
>
> The results were the opposite of what the researchers say they
> expected. As

> the number of black students increased, student satisfaction with their
> educational experience dropped, as did their favorable impression of the
> quality of education and the work ethic of their peers. In addition, the
> more diverse the institution, the more likely students were to
> respond that
> they had experienced discrimination. The survey did not distinguish
> minority
> respondents from nonminority respondents.
>
> The responses were similar among students, professors, and administrators.
> For instance, as the number of black students on a campus increased, the
> more likely it was that faculty members criticized the work habits of
> students.
>
> The findings, Mr. Rothman said in an interview, show that "studies done by
> the academic community, which is overtly in favor of diversity, are
> predisposed to the goal of diversity."
>
> Questioning Other Studies
>
> Opponents of affirmative action who support the plaintiffs in the Michigan
> cases said that the new study raises serious questions about previous
> studies that back the educational benefits of diversity.
>
> The new survey "shows the shakiness of the Gurin study that is being
> relied
> on so heavily by the University of Michigan," said Roger B. Clegg, general
> counsel for the Center for Equal Opportunity, which opposes affirmative
> action.
>
> The Gurin study was conducted by Patricia Y. Gurin, a professor of
> psychology and women's studies at Michigan. It concluded that white
> students
> reap long-term benefits from diversity. Tapping into a database with
> information from many colleges, she found that students who most
> interacted
> with diverse peers in college were most likely to be living or working in
> integrated settings five years after graduation.
>
> The Rothman study, Mr. Clegg said, "shows how dangerous it would be
> for the
> Supreme Court to allow racial discrimination simply because a social
> scientist purports to find a correlation between racial discrimination and
> some desirable educational outcome."
>
> But Gary A. Orfield, a professor of education and social policy at Harvard
> University, criticized the findings as being "inconsistent" with a "vast
> literature of research on desegregation."
>
> Mr. Orfield said that in his own surveys of law and medical schools,
> he has
> found "very positive and powerful impacts of diversity on what students
> believe they are learning, development of their views on key issues
> in their

> professions, changes in attitudes about how they will practice, and very
> strong support for affirmative action, with many students saying that more
> should be done."

>

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

>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of Frank Rusciano

>> Sent: Saturday, March 29, 2003 8:17 PM

>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>> Subject: Re: Is Diversity Overrated?

>>

>>

>> I haven't read the study either, so perhaps I'm misunderstanding the

>> methodology. However, if I read it correctly, I am not sure of

>> the validity of

>> correlating results of a public opinion survey within an

> institution with

>> characteristics of the institution like the percentage of a given

> group on

>> campus. The former is based on individual-level data and the

>> second is based

>> on aggregate-level data that can relate to any number of features of the

>> institution.

>>

>> Also, even if the finding is valid, it may find nothing more than

> there is

>> likely to be a higher degree of racial tension and prejudgement

>> where there are

>> more diverse populations. Finally, note that the surveys measure

>> perceptions

>> of academic quality, etc. There don't seem to be any objective

>> measures of

>> these factors, which again only implies that some people perceive

>> educational

>> standards are lowered in institutions with more diverse

>> populations. I could

>> argue, for instance, that highly ranked academic institutions

>> where something

>> like two-thirds of its students grade are A- or higher, suffer

>> from lowered

>> educational standards, but I don't know that many there would

>> perceive that to

>> be the case.

>>

>> Andrew A Beveridge wrote:

>>

>>> I haven't read this study, but I was struck by this statement that

>>> also appears in the Chronicle of Higher Ed account:

>>>

>>>>

>>>> To find out, in 1999 we surveyed a random sample of more than 1,600

>>>> students and 2,400 faculty members and administrators at 140

> American

>>>> colleges and universities, asking them to evaluate the quality of

>>>> education

>>>> at their institution, the academic preparation and work habits
> of the
>>>> student body, the state of race relations on campus and their own
>>>> experiences of discrimination. Then we CORRELATED their responses
>>>> with the
>>>> proportion of black students attending each institution, based on
>>>> government statistics.

>>>>
>>>> If diversity works as advertised, we surmised, then those at
>> institutions
>>>> with higher proportions of black enrollment should rate their
>> educational
>>>> and racial milieus more favorably than their peers at
>> institutions with
>>>> lower proportions.

>>>
>>> Apparently Lipset, et al, do not understand that correlation is
>> not cause.
>>> If one did this study of public schools, it would rate the lily white
>>> suburban districts ahead of the suburban districts with some
> blacks and
>>> ahead of districts which are essentially segregated.

>>>
>>> How ever you slice it, this sounds like support for segregated
>> higher ed,
>>> based upon correlation.

>>>
>>> Very strange!!!

>>>
>>> Andrew A. Beveridge
>>> Professor of Sociology
>>> Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY
>>> 209 Kissena Hall
>>> 64-19 Kissena Blvd
>>> Flushing, NY 11367
>>> Phone: 718-997-2837
>>> FAX: 718-997-2820
>>> email: andrew_beveridge@qc.edu
>>> web: www.socialexplorer.com

>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>> -----
>>> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
>>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not
> at your
>>> main email address.
>>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>
>> -----
>> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
>> main email address.
>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
>>
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.
Program Leader, Learning & Cognition
Department of Educational Psychology & Learning Systems
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

VOICE (850) 644-8778
FAX (850) 644-8776

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

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Sun, 30 Mar 2003 06:47:32 -0500
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re: Here is the Chronicle Article
Comments: To: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

It is intriguing that you cite "The Shape of the River" which asserts that the presumed gains of a race-sensitive admissions policy are achieved at a "tolerable cost". The case before the Supreme Court is, in essence, about the issue of cost. Simply put [and we in academia are loathe to put any proposition simply] the case will turn on the issue of denial of benefit to an individual because of an accident of birth. Because an applicant to the University of Michigan is non-Black and non-Hispanic, he or she will be denied admission in favor of a Black or Hispanic applicant with absolutely identical qualifications. She may be the daughter of a Vietnamese woman who came to this country after the Vietnam war and was taught that the United States is the land of opportunity for all; she may be living in Ann Arbor, and unable to attend any other University because her family lacks the funds

to send her away to school, and she was planning to go to the University of Michigan, but because she has the wrong information on her birth certificate, she will be denied admission in favor of a Hispanic or Black applicant.

We tend to think that the costs, which are not denied in "The Shape of the River" are paid by an affluent, white, privileged monolith. Not true.

As to the criticism that "correlation is not causation", there is no denying the truth to that. However, the statement made in the Op-ed piece in the New York Times, that you quote correctly, is "If diversity works as advertised, we surmised, then, those at institutions with higher proportions of black enrollment should rate their educational and racial milieus more favorably than their peers at institutions with lower proportions." If this had been the case, I'm sure you would not be raising any methodological objections, and if there had been no significant differences, there would have been no article. But instead the null hypothesis was rejected in a way that seems to offend you. But again, the supposed/debated benefits of race-sensitive admission policies are not the issue: discrimination on the basis of an accident of birth is the issue.

But what truly amazes me is your concluding statement that "How ever you slice it, this sounds like support for segregated higher ed." Segregation is the practice of denying a benefit [like, sitting in the front of the bus] to a class of individuals because of an accident of birth.

Nathaniel Ehrlich, Ph.D.
Senior Research Associate
University of Michigan Institute for Social Research
426 Thompson Street, P.O. Box 1248, EP 427
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248
Phone: 734-222-8660
Fax: 734-222-1542

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

From: Andrew A Beveridge [mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU]
Sent: Saturday, March 29, 2003 10:18 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Here is the Chronicle Article

Dear All:

I remember when I read the account in the Chronicle, I was glad that it was not being published in POQ. As a person who has been doing research related to educational topics, it seems to me that this correlational study should probably not have been published in its form, since many other hypotheses should be also explored to account for the the attitudinal findings. Also as Rusciano points out this really is done at an aggregate level. So you have aggregated attitude measures correlated with school composition.

Most arguments for diversity benefits are based upon longitudinal studies not on stuff like this. The idea, of course, being that if white students (for instance) are only educated with other whites, they will reinforce attitudes with other groups that are perhaps not positive. While black and

other minorities are denied opportunities.

Given some of the other research that has been done by Lipset, et al on faculty attitudes, I was somewhat surprised by this finding. It certainly does not look at the long term benefits of diversity or segregation on those in such institutions. Nothing like the SHAPE OF THE RIVER, which is the "big book" on this topic, nor the recent work by Massey on stereotyping of black students entitled THE SOURCE OF THE RIVER.

As you all must know, the oral arguments on the affirmative action case are on Tuesday, and they arguments will be available on the web immediately, ala Bush v. Gore.

Andy Beveridge
Queens College and Graduate Center -- CUNY

New Study Questions Educational Benefits of Diversity
By JEFFREY SELINGO

In a direct challenge to academic research that asserts the educational benefits of diversity, a new study by a team of prominent scholars suggests that students of all ethnic backgrounds feel that as minority enrollment grows, the quality of their education diminishes and incidents of discrimination increase.

The findings, published in the spring issues of the International Journal of Public Opinion Research and The Public Interest, are likely to generate intense debate as the U.S. Supreme Court prepares to hear two lawsuits challenging race-conscious admissions policies at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor's chief undergraduate college and law school. In defending the use of affirmative action, the university and its supporters cite volumes of data that they say show that a diverse student body enriches the educational experience of all students.

But the authors of the new study contend that such evidence "suffers from the subjective nature of survey responses," in which questions are worded in a way so that everyone agrees.

"In a sense, diversity is like free speech -- almost everyone approves of it in the abstract, but its application in concrete situations can produce great controversy," write the authors, Stanley Rothman, director of the Center for the Study of Social and Political Change and a professor of government at Smith College; Seymour Martin Lipset, a professor of public policy at George Mason University; and Neil Nevitte, a political-science professor at the University of Toronto.

A Broader Approach

The three scholars therefore sought to undertake a broader approach in their survey. They not only asked administrators, professors, and students at 140 colleges how they felt about campus diversity, but also inquired about the

institutions' general educational environment, making no references to diversity.

Following the survey, the responses were correlated to the number of black students at each institution, since the authors argue that the debate over affirmative action has primarily centered on black students at predominantly white colleges.

In the survey, conducted in the spring of 1999, participants were asked how well their institution educated its students and how hard students worked at their studies. Faculty members and administrators were asked how academically well prepared students were upon enrolling. Participants were also asked several questions about diversity, including whether minority students were treated better or worse than white students were and to what extent racial discrimination was a problem at their college.

The results were the opposite of what the researchers say they expected. As the number of black students increased, student satisfaction with their educational experience dropped, as did their favorable impression of the quality of education and the work ethic of their peers. In addition, the more diverse the institution, the more likely students were to respond that they had experienced discrimination. The survey did not distinguish minority respondents from nonminority respondents.

The responses were similar among students, professors, and administrators. For instance, as the number of black students on a campus increased, the more likely it was that faculty members criticized the work habits of students.

The findings, Mr. Rothman said in an interview, show that "studies done by the academic community, which is overtly in favor of diversity, are predisposed to the goal of diversity."

Questioning Other Studies

Opponents of affirmative action who support the plaintiffs in the Michigan cases said that the new study raises serious questions about previous studies that back the educational benefits of diversity.

The new survey "shows the shakiness of the Gurin study that is being relied on so heavily by the University of Michigan," said Roger B. Clegg, general counsel for the Center for Equal Opportunity, which opposes affirmative action.

The Gurin study was conducted by Patricia Y. Gurin, a professor of psychology and women's studies at Michigan. It concluded that white students reap long-term benefits from diversity. Tapping into a database with information from many colleges, she found that students who most interacted with diverse peers in college were most likely to be living or working in integrated settings five years after graduation.

The Rothman study, Mr. Clegg said, "shows how dangerous it would be for the Supreme Court to allow racial discrimination simply because a social scientist purports to find a correlation between racial discrimination and

some desirable educational outcome."

But Gary A. Orfield, a professor of education and social policy at Harvard University, criticized the findings as being "inconsistent" with a "vast literature of research on desegregation."

Mr. Orfield said that in his own surveys of law and medical schools, he has found "very positive and powerful impacts of diversity on what students believe they are learning, development of their views on key issues in their professions, changes in attitudes about how they will practice, and very strong support for affirmative action, with many students saying that more should be done."

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of Frank Rusciano

> Sent: Saturday, March 29, 2003 8:17 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Is Diversity Overrated?

>

>

> I haven't read the study either, so perhaps I'm misunderstanding the
> methodology. However, if I read it correctly, I am not sure of
> the validity of
> correlating results of a public opinion survey within an institution with
> characteristics of the institution like the percentage of a given group on
> campus. The former is based on individual-level data and the
> second is based
> on aggregate-level data that can relate to any number of features of the
> institution.

>

> Also, even if the finding is valid, it may find nothing more than there is
> likely to be a higher degree of racial tension and prejudgement
> where there are
> more diverse populations. Finally, note that the surveys measure
> perceptions
> of academic quality, etc. There don't seem to be any objective
> measures of
> these factors, which again only implies that some people perceive
> educational
> standards are lowered in institutions with more diverse
> populations. I could
> argue, for instance, that highly ranked academic institutions
> where something
> like two-thirds of its students grade are A- or higher, suffer
> from lowered
> educational standards, but I don't know that many there would
> perceive that to
> be the case.

>

> Andrew A Beveridge wrote:

>

>> I haven't read this study, but I was struck by this statement that
>> also appears in the Chronicle of Higher Ed account:

>>

>>>
>>> To find out, in 1999 we surveyed a random sample of more than 1,600
>>> students and 2,400 faculty members and administrators at 140 American
>>> colleges and universities, asking them to evaluate the quality of
>>> education
>>> at their institution, the academic preparation and work habits of the
>>> student body, the state of race relations on campus and their own
>>> experiences of discrimination. Then we CORRELATED their responses
>>> with the
>>> proportion of black students attending each institution, based on
>>> government statistics.

>>>
>>> If diversity works as advertised, we surmised, then those at
> institutions
>>> with higher proportions of black enrollment should rate their
> educational
>>> and racial milieus more favorably than their peers at
> institutions with
>>> lower proportions.

>>
>> Apparently Lipset, et al, do not understand that correlation is
> not cause.
>> If one did this study of public schools, it would rate the lily white
>> suburban districts ahead of the suburban districts with some blacks and
>> ahead of districts which are essentially segregated.

>>
>> How ever you slice it, this sounds like support for segregated
> higher ed,
>> based upon correlation.

>>
>> Very strange!!!

>>
>> Andrew A. Beveridge
>> Professor of Sociology
>> Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY
>> 209 Kissena Hall
>> 64-19 Kissena Blvd
>> Flushing, NY 11367
>> Phone: 718-997-2837
>> FAX: 718-997-2820
>> email: andrew_beveridge@qc.edu
>> web: www.socialexplorer.com

>>
>>>
>>
>> -----
>> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
>> main email address.
>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>
> -----

> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Sun, 30 Mar 2003 08:09:43 -0500
Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
Subject: Here something on Charles and Massey Work on Stereotypes.
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear All:

I think it comes down to stereotyping and here is brief summary of the Charles and Massey work on this topic.

How Stereotypes Sabotage Minority Students By CAMILLE Z. CHARLES and DOUGLAS S. MASSEY

The perceptions that individuals have about members of various racial and ethnic groups -- racial stereotypes -- are thought by many people to be an essential element of intergroup relations. Those attitudes play an important role in shaping the overall environment in which students attend college and, as such, are important to understanding academic outcomes.

For example, according to Stanford University professor of psychology Claude Steele's hypothesis of "stereotype vulnerability," minority students are afraid of living up to the myth of intellectual inferiority. As a result, they reduce their efforts to protect themselves from the psychologically painful prospect of trying hard and still doing poorly (thus proving themselves intellectually inferior).

We developed the National Longitudinal Survey of Freshmen to provide comprehensive data that would enable researchers like Steele to test such

theoretical explanations for minority underachievement in higher education. Specifically, the survey sought to measure the academic and social progress of college students at regular intervals and to capture emergent psychological processes hypothesized by researchers -- while controlling for differences in students' social, economic, and demographic backgrounds.

In the end, we surveyed 3,924 students -- 959 Asian-American, 998 white, 1,051 African-American, and 916 Latino students -- at 28 selective colleges and universities in the fall and winter of 1999. The survey consisted of face-to-face interviews that compiled detailed information about the neighborhood, family, and educational environments that the students experienced before entering college. It also assessed students' attitudes, aspirations, and motivations at the time of entry.

We followed that baseline survey with a shorter telephone survey conducted during the spring term to gather information from the same students about their social, psychological, and academic experiences since arriving on campus. We plan to follow the first-year surveys with additional telephone interviews conducted during the spring of each of the next four years. By combining retrospective data captured in the baseline survey with prospective information compiled in years one through five, we are seeking to create a longitudinal database stretching from childhood through college graduation, and beyond.

To gain insight into the stereotypes they hold, we asked the students in the baseline survey to rate people of different races according to various traits. The scores went from 1 to 7, with higher scores reflecting increasingly negative stereotypes. The trait dimensions were: hard-working/lazy, peaceful/violence-prone, intelligent/unintelligent, prefer to be self-supporting/prefer to live off welfare, easy to get along with/hard to get along with, stick with tasks/give up easily, tend to treat members of other groups equally/tend to discriminate against members of other groups, and rich/poor.

We found that black, Latino, Asian, and white people see themselves and each other as tending to discriminate against members of other groups; this could have ramifications for intergroup relations on campuses by stifling interracial contact and increasing racial tensions. In an interesting turn of American racial ideology, black, Latino, and Asian students all perceive themselves as more hard-working than white people. Otherwise minority-group members have generally favorable stereotypes of white people, and white people have favorable stereotypes of themselves.

Stereotypes of black people aren't as negative as we expected; however, it is clear that black people are rated most negatively on traits that are consistent with American racial ideology. White, Latino, and Asian students are all likely to perceive blacks as violence-prone and poor. They also rate black people more negatively than themselves in traits like lazy, unintelligent, and preferring welfare dependence.

Stereotypes of Latino people follow a similar pattern. They receive their most negative ratings in relation to tendencies to be violence-prone and poor, and both white and Asian students perceive Latinos as more likely than their own groups to be lazy, unintelligent, and to prefer welfare

dependence. As expected, Asian people are typically stereotyped as hard-working, intelligent, preferring to be self-sufficient, and tending to stick to tasks.

We also asked the students, "What do you think should be more important to blacks in the United States: being black, being American, or should both identities be equally important?" Similarly, we asked whether it was more important for Latinos to be Latino, American, or for both identities to be equally important. And we found that American-identified black and Latino students are more likely than their counterparts with the strongest racial identities to stereotype their groups as tending to be lazy, unintelligent, hard to get along with; to give up easily; and to discriminate against others. Many of these traits are the ones most closely associated with achievement, and the pattern of results outlined are consistent with earlier results that suggest that American-identified blacks and Latinos may be more concerned with confirming negative group stereotypes and, therefore, their poor academic performance is the result of stereotype threat.

Our research therefore suggests that black and Latino students must overcome the stereotypes that others have of them, in addition to those that they have internalized about their own group. Many of these stereotypes reflect traits that are inconsistent with academic success and are, therefore, potentially influential in producing stereotype threat, particularly for those who identify themselves as American. For those who identify most strongly as members of a racial group, the concern is more likely to be with not "acting white" and, therefore, adopting an oppositional cultural orientation.

When considered in light of racial identity, then, the persistence of negative stereotypes has the potential to sabotage academic achievement of a large segment of both the black and Latino student populations.

Camille Z. Charles is an assistant professor of sociology and Douglas S. Massey is chairman of the sociology department at the University of Pennsylvania. This article is adapted from *The Source of the River: The Social Origin of Freshmen at America's Selective Colleges and Universities*, published this month by Princeton University Press.

Andrew A. Beveridge
Professor of Sociology
Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY
209 Kissena Hall
64-19 Kissena Blvd
Flushing, NY 11367
Phone: 718-997-2837
FAX: 718-997-2820
email: andrew_beveridge@qc.edu
web: www.socialexplorer.com

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Sun, 30 Mar 2003 08:12:20 -0500
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: Is Diversity Overrated?
In-Reply-To: <5.2.0.9.2.20030329172454.0113d838@pop3.norton.antivirus>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

The flaw in this study is revealed in the following statement:

If diversity works as advertised, we surmised, then those at institutions with higher proportions of black enrollment should rate their educational and racial milieus more favorably than their peers at institutions with lower proportions.

Even if this study were rigorously designed and executed, the results obtained would be meaningless, because what was actually measured is irrelevant to the topic.

Only someone isolated in an ivory tower could postulate that the benefits of diversity might best be measured by how people in academic institutions rate their environment.

The very purpose of promoting diversity in institutions, academic and otherwise, is to expose and overcome prejudice, and if some people find this unsettling, it is most likely succeeding.

I find it sad that some distinguished elder scholars seem to have forgotten that the goal of academia should be to challenge students and teachers alike to improve society, not to provide them with a comfortable cocoon within which they can escape its problems

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

dick halpern wrote:

- > This was initially reported in the Spring issue of the International
- > Journal of Public Opinion Research.
- >
- >
- >
- > NY Times, March 29, 2003
- >
- >
- >
- >
- > Is Diversity Overrated?
- >

> By STANLEY ROTHMAN

>

> NORTHAMPTON, Mass.

> The Supreme Court hears arguments next week in the cases that may
> determine whether racial and ethnic preferences in higher education
> admissions and hiring are preserved or discarded. Whatever it decides,
> the court should be skeptical of one of the most popular justifications
> for preferential treatment of minority applicants: that a diverse
> student body necessarily improves the quality of education for everyone.

>

> One of the most comprehensive studies ever undertaken of diversity in
> higher education indicates that this contention is at least
> questionable. The study's findings show that college diversity programs
> fail to raise standards, and that a majority of faculty members and
> administrators recognize this when speaking anonymously.

>

> With my colleagues, Seymour Martin Lipset and Neil Nevitte, I measured
> views of the educational benefit of diversity as it is now incorporated
> in higher education policy. We wanted to know this: Is diversity truly
> seen, as the former president of the University of Michigan has said,
> "as essential as the study of the Middle Ages, of international politics
> and of Shakespeare" to a well-rounded education?

>

> To find out, in 1999 we surveyed a random sample of more than 1,600
> students and 2,400 faculty members and administrators at 140 American
> colleges and universities, asking them to evaluate the quality of
> education at their institution, the academic preparation and work habits
> of the student body, the state of race relations on campus and their own
> experiences of discrimination. Then we correlated their responses with
> the proportion of black students attending each institution, based on
> government statistics.

>

> If diversity works as advertised, we surmised, then those at
> institutions with higher proportions of black enrollment should rate
> their educational and racial milieus more favorably than their peers at
> institutions with lower proportions.

>

> The results contradict almost every benefit claimed for campus
> diversity. Students, faculty members and administrators all responded to
> increasing racial diversity by registering increased dissatisfaction
> with the quality of education and the work ethic of their peers.
> Students also increasingly complained about discrimination.

>

> Moreover, diversity fails to deliver even when all else is equal. When
> we controlled for other demographic and institutional factors like the
> respondent's race, gender, economic background and religion, or an
> institution's public or private status, selectivity and whether it
> offers an ethnic or racial studies program, the results were surprising.
> A higher level of diversity is associated with somewhat less educational
> satisfaction and worse race relations among students.

>

> We also tested for the effects of higher Hispanic and Asian enrollment.
> Hispanic enrollment has little effect on any group's ratings of the
> educational or racial climate. As the proportion of Asian students

> increased, however, faculty members and administrators perceived an
> improvement in the academic quality of their students. Thus support for
> the diversity argument comes with respect to a minority often excluded
> from preferential admissions programs.
>
> We also asked students about policies used to increase diversity. Three
> out of four oppose "relaxing academic standards" to increase minority
> representation, as do a majority of faculty members. And an overwhelming
> 85 percent of students specifically reject the use of racial or ethnic
> "preferences"— along with a majority of faculty members. More telling,
> 62 percent of minority students oppose relaxing standards, and 71
> percent oppose preferences.
>
> Among the most striking findings is the silent opposition of so many who
> administer these programs — yet must publicly support them. Although a
> small majority of administrators support admissions preferences, 47.7
> percent oppose them. In addition, when asked to estimate the impact of
> preferential admissions on university academic standards, about
> two-thirds say there is none. Most dismaying, of those who think that
> preferences have some impact on academic standards, those believing it
> negative exceed those believing it positive by 15 to 1.
>
> One cannot help but wonder why the public and private views of higher
> education's leadership differ so greatly. It would be useful to have
> some good studies of that question.
>
> Stanley Rothman, professor emeritus of government at Smith College, is
> director of the Center for the Study of Social and Political Change.
>
>
> *****
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Sun, 30 Mar 2003 10:31:02 -0500
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re: Here is the Chronicle Article
Comments: To: "Scheuren@aol.com" <Scheuren@aol.com>
MIME-version: 1.0

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

Thanks, Fritz, for your insights.

Thanks, also, for reminding me of Dr. King's speech, and values. I would be very surprised if he would be endorsing race-sensitive admissions policies. By the way, I'm not a professor [anymore-I was an associate professor of psychology at Michigan for 17 years, though].

Nathaniel Ehrlich, Ph.D.
Senior Research Associate
University of Michigan Institute for Social Research
426 Thompson Street, P.O. Box 1248, EP 427
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248
Phone: 734-222-8660
Fax: 734-222-1542

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

From: Scheuren@aol.com [mailto:Scheuren@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2003 9:55 AM
To: nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU
Subject: Fwd: Here is the Chronicle Article

Dear Professor Ehrlich:

Well reasoned. Thank you. What is crucial here is that, as scholars, we remain open to all sides of this issue, if we are trying to be objective -- reasoning not rationalizing. There are no simple options that will not have adverse (hopefully unintended?) consequences.

To be fair, as a white male who grew up in a public housing project, I am not entirely objective either. I might not have "made it" if current admission practices were operating when I was young. Nor is my wife objective. She comes from China and worries about our children being denied the fruits of her adopted country. As do I.

There is irony here too. We humans are complicated. It turns out that I have spent my life helping African-American achieve equality of opportunity. As a student, I was even on the Mall August 28, 1963, to hear the "I have a Dream" speech. As you know, the Reverent King's words are not consistent with racial preferences. I wonder what he would say to the Supreme Court? I now work mainly on Native American rights issues, by the way.

How does it go? "The mark of a mature mind is the ability to hold, as true, two or more conflicting ideas at the same time." Partly true perhaps would be a better way of putting it. And maybe it should be "patient," not "mature." Pray God we have the patience to sort out which parts of the imperfect truths we "know" are the real truths.

Thanks again for moving us along in this journey, Fritz

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Sun, 30 Mar 2003 11:12:30 -0500
Reply-To: Ken Sherrill <ken@KENSHERILL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ken Sherrill <ken@KENSHERILL.COM>
Subject: Re: Is Diversity Overrated?
Comments: To: jwerner@jwdp.com
In-Reply-To: <3E86ED34.4010604@jwdp.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=Windows-1252
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

As far as I can tell, Rothman and his colleagues do not control for objective budgetary conditions at the colleges and universities that they study. Certainly, one might expect that budgets will be the tightest at the public institutions that have the greatest minority enrollment. If so, faculty dissatisfaction with academic standards might reflect teaching load, class size, the quality of library holdings, and research support far more than it reflects the racial composition of the student body.

Ken Sherrill

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>]On Behalf Of Jan Werner
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2003 8:12 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Is Diversity Overrated?

The flaw in this study is revealed in the following statement:

If diversity works as advertised, we surmised, then those at institutions with higher proportions of black enrollment should rate their educational and racial milieus more favorably than their peers at institutions with lower proportions.

Even if this study were rigorously designed and executed, the results obtained would be meaningless, because what was actually measured is irrelevant to the topic.

Only someone isolated in an ivory tower could postulate that the benefits of diversity might best be measured by how people in academic institutions rate their environment.

The very purpose of promoting diversity in institutions, academic and otherwise, is to expose and overcome prejudice, and if some people find this unsettling, it is most likely succeeding.

I find it sad that some distinguished elder scholars seem to have forgotten that the goal of academia should be to challenge students and teachers alike to improve society, not to provide them with a

comfortable cocoon within which they can escape its problems

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

dick halpern wrote:

- > This was initially reported in the Spring issue of the International
- > Journal of Public Opinion Research.
- >
- >
- >
- > NY Times, March 29, 2003
- >
- >
- >
- >
- > Is Diversity Overrated?
- >
- > By STANLEY ROTHMAN
- >
- > NORTHAMPTON, Mass.
- > The Supreme Court hears arguments next week in the cases that may
- > determine whether racial and ethnic preferences in higher education
- > admissions and hiring are preserved or discarded. Whatever it decides,
- > the court should be skeptical of one of the most popular justifications
- > for preferential treatment of minority applicants: that a diverse
- > student body necessarily improves the quality of education for everyone.
- >
- > One of the most comprehensive studies ever undertaken of diversity in
- > higher education indicates that this contention is at least
- > questionable. The study's findings show that college diversity programs
- > fail to raise standards, and that a majority of faculty members and
- > administrators recognize this when speaking anonymously.
- >
- > With my colleagues, Seymour Martin Lipset and Neil Nevitte, I measured
- > views of the educational benefit of diversity as it is now incorporated
- > in higher education policy. We wanted to know this: Is diversity truly
- > seen, as the former president of the University of Michigan has said,
- > "as essential as the study of the Middle Ages, of international politics
- > and of Shakespeare" to a well-rounded education?
- >
- > To find out, in 1999 we surveyed a random sample of more than 1,600
- > students and 2,400 faculty members and administrators at 140 American
- > colleges and universities, asking them to evaluate the quality of
- > education at their institution, the academic preparation and work habits
- > of the student body, the state of race relations on campus and their own
- > experiences of discrimination. Then we correlated their responses with
- > the proportion of black students attending each institution, based on
- > government statistics.
- >
- > If diversity works as advertised, we surmised, then those at
- > institutions with higher proportions of black enrollment should rate

> their educational and racial milieus more favorably than their peers at
> institutions with lower proportions.
>
> The results contradict almost every benefit claimed for campus
> diversity. Students, faculty members and administrators all responded to
> increasing racial diversity by registering increased dissatisfaction
> with the quality of education and the work ethic of their peers.
> Students also increasingly complained about discrimination.
>
> Moreover, diversity fails to deliver even when all else is equal. When
> we controlled for other demographic and institutional factors like the
> respondent's race, gender, economic background and religion, or an
> institution's public or private status, selectivity and whether it
> offers an ethnic or racial studies program, the results were surprising.
> A higher level of diversity is associated with somewhat less educational
> satisfaction and worse race relations among students.
>
> We also tested for the effects of higher Hispanic and Asian enrollment.
> Hispanic enrollment has little effect on any group's ratings of the
> educational or racial climate. As the proportion of Asian students
> increased, however, faculty members and administrators perceived an
> improvement in the academic quality of their students. Thus support for
> the diversity argument comes with respect to a minority often excluded
> from preferential admissions programs.
>
> We also asked students about policies used to increase diversity. Three
> out of four oppose "relaxing academic standards" to increase minority
> representation, as do a majority of faculty members. And an overwhelming
> 85 percent of students specifically reject the use of racial or ethnic
> "preferences"— along with a majority of faculty members. More telling,
> 62 percent of minority students oppose relaxing standards, and 71
> percent oppose preferences.
>
> Among the most striking findings is the silent opposition of so many who
> administer these programs — yet must publicly support them. Although a
> small majority of administrators support admissions preferences, 47.7
> percent oppose them. In addition, when asked to estimate the impact of
> preferential admissions on university academic standards, about
> two-thirds say there is none. Most dismaying, of those who think that
> preferences have some impact on academic standards, those believing it
> negative exceed those believing it positive by 15 to 1.
>
> One cannot help but wonder why the public and private views of higher
> education's leadership differ so greatly. It would be useful to have
> some good studies of that question.
>
> Stanley Rothman, professor emeritus of government at Smith College, is
> director of the Center for the Study of Social and Political Change.
>
>
> *****
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
>

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Sun, 30 Mar 2003 13:43:04 -0500
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Subject: Re: Is Diversity Overrated?
In-Reply-To: <NFBKGDIMDAGNLHBFKIIKEJCJIAA.ken@kensherrill.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Affirmative Action
'Percent Plans' Come Up Short, Says Harvard Study
By civilrights.org
February 20, 2003

The Harvard University Civil Rights Project has issued two reports that conclude that percent plans are not effective replacements for traditional affirmative action.

"Appearance and Reality in the Sunshine State: The Talented 20 Program in Florida" and "Percent Plans in College Admissions: A Comparative Analysis of Three States' Experiences" compare the strategies and ultimate shortcomings of the Texas, California, and Florida alternatives to traditional affirmative action.

<http://www.civilrights.org/issues/affirmative/index.html>
<http://www.civilrights.org/issues/affirmative/details.cfm?id=11349>
<http://www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu/>

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A49278-2003Mar29.html>

washingtonpost.com
At Boston U., 'Holistic' Admissions Venture Beyond Black and White

Struggle With Race Brings Scrutiny in U-Mich. Court Case

By Michael A. Fletcher
Washington Post Staff Writer
Sunday, March 30, 2003; Page A06

BOSTON -- The Boston University admissions committee was set to offer a coveted slot in next fall's freshman class to an applicant from Newark, N.J., though his SAT scores were far below the school's standard and despite a few troubling syntax errors in his application. But their deliberations were stopped cold by a perplexing recommendation from the applicant's high school counselor.

"He is a star," it began. But then it described the high school senior as distant and selfish. "Some people don't like him," the recommendation continued, ". . . for good reason."

"Anybody else nervous about that?" Associate Director of Admissions Daniel Warner asked, looking up at four other committee members clustered around a small conference table in his office. Surely, everyone was.

"Does anybody care that he's a black male?" offered Russell Dover, an assistant admissions director, who advocated acceptance of the applicant.

The question hung over the committee, which decided to dig deeper into the teenager's application.

With 29,312 applicants competing for 3,935 seats in next fall's freshman class, Boston University is typical of the small number of colleges and universities that reject more applicants than they accept. Students admitted for the 2003-2004 school year have an average SAT score of 1334, a 3.66 grade-point average and rank in the top 8 percent of their high school classes. Many have taken an impressive array of advanced placement and honors classes in high school. Others can point to unique extracurricular pursuits, from summers at Oxford University to work on a sheep ranch in the Australian outback.

But in one of the murkiest aspects of its admissions process, Boston University also admits large numbers of students, including many black and Hispanic applicants, who fall far short of those lofty standards. It is a policy exercised and defended by most selective colleges but, at the same time, a practice most of them are reluctant to spell out.

Now, in a Supreme Court case that could alter three decades of college admissions practice across the country, lawyers for the University of Michigan will be forced to defend the fairness and societal value of race-conscious admissions. Oral arguments are scheduled for Tuesday. The high court's decision is likely to affect admissions at universities across the nation, public and private.

Earlier this month, Boston University allowed The Washington Post to observe two of its admissions committees as they debated and voted on

dozens of applications.

The look inside the process revealed a school struggling to admit the most academically accomplished students possible, while identifying those who have special talents or characteristics that frequently prove even more crucial to success in college and beyond: drive, perseverance, personal initiative and the ability to work with others.

At the same time, they strove to diversify the school in a variety of ways -- socioeconomically, by gender, by geography and, most controversially, by race.

For the applicant from Newark, admissions officials say race was never the critical factor, even if it framed the discussion about him. It was his essay that sold the committee. In it, he described spending many hungry nights at home while his parents scoured the streets for drugs. Once the committee heard that, the student was in.

Admissions officials said the applicant's story of overcoming obstacles, coupled with his academic record, earned him a spot at the school. Being black certainly helped, they added, but a white student could well have been admitted under similar circumstances.

"I want to make it clear: We do not have a point system of any kind at BU," Director of Admissions Kelly A. Walter said in a reference to the University of Michigan's undergraduate admissions system. That system grants extra points for a wide range of factors, including underrepresented minority status. But she added: "Clearly, race is not a neutral factor in the process."

School officials call their consideration of race part of a "holistic" review that seeks to determine whether applicants have made the most of the opportunities available to them as high school students and whether they will contribute to student life at the university.

Still, the harsh truth hanging over the deliberations is that for every applicant with a questionable counselor's recommendation, a transcript with no advanced placement courses and an 1150 SAT score admitted to the university, it means the rejection of another, often one with more impressive academic credentials. Usually, that applicant is white or Asian.

"The decisions we make are often not straightforward," Walter said. "Our process is not formulaic. We are looking at each and every individual student and what makes them unique and whether they can enrich our community."

Most selective schools not only conduct a "whole file" review of students, but also grant admissions preferences to underrepresented racial minorities as well as to children of alumni, athletes and applicants whose families make significant financial donations.

"A holistic review is generally what you see at most private institutions," said Donald E. Heller, a researcher at Penn State

University's Center for the Study of Higher Education. "In public institutions like Michigan, you generally see more formulaic approaches to admissions. The fact of the matter is, no matter how the court rules, public institutions will have no choice but to take a more holistic approach."

Even so, if the Supreme Court rules against the University of Michigan, selective schools such as Boston University could be legally barred from using race as an admissions factor, even in the largely undefined way they do now. With race-conscious affirmative action in place, black and Hispanic students account for 8.3 percent of the school's undergraduate enrollment.

If selective schools chose students based solely on grades and test scores, they would almost certainly enroll many fewer blacks and Hispanics. Among the nation's high school graduates last year, 1,400 black students and 2,436 Hispanics scored at least 1320 out of a possible 1600 on the SAT, a mark just below this year's average for students admitted to Boston University. Nearly 65,000 whites and 16,030 Asians achieved that score or better, according to the College Board.

Critics of standardized tests note there is a weak correlation between students' SAT scores and their first-year performance in college -- a link they say is even more tenuous for blacks and Hispanics. It is an argument that admissions officials bear in mind.

Take, for example, the student from an elite private school in the mid-Atlantic region, the daughter of Iranian parents, an engineer and a doctor. The committee was impressed by her ambitious high school curriculum, which included four advanced placement classes in her senior year. They also noted that she spoke Farsi and was the only female member and a co-captain of her school's "It's Academic" team.

But her 3.3 grade-point average and 1190 SAT score put her, as one member said, "on the low end," particularly for a student whose parents are highly educated professionals.

Sara Libby, the senior assistant admissions director who served as the student's advocate, said her essay was fine. She also made it clear that she liked the applicant's style. "She has a little spunk," she said.

Still, Walter was skeptical. "She's 150 points below where we are running as an average," she said. "Is that a concern?" It was, but the school admitted her, convinced that she was an overachiever.

There was no debate about another applicant from the same school. Not only did the Asian male score a 1460 on the SAT, but he also had a 3.5 grade-point average, interned at the National Institutes of Health and formed a ska band.

"[He] sounds very strong," Walter said. The committee unanimously agreed to admit him.

Admissions officials acknowledge that their work is highly subjective

and can be inconsistent. It is also guided by few hard-and-fast rules. They frown on students from elite schools who take few advanced placement courses. But they also admit students from schools where such courses are not offered.

"If as a student they had choices, we expect them to take advantage of them," said Yasmin McGinnis, a senior assistant director of admissions. "I would never penalize a student who didn't have those choices."

Students from places that produce few applicants, such as Arizona, may get in with lesser academic credentials than one from the suburbs of New York City, which send the university hundreds of applicants. It is little wonder that officials call what they do "more art than science."

Boston University does have basic admissions criteria: Applicants must complete a core high school curriculum that includes four years of English, three years of math, three years of laboratory science, three years of history and social studies and two years of foreign language.

There are no fixed entrance requirements regarding grade-point averages or standardized test scores. But about 20 percent of students are presumptively accepted if they have especially strong academic credentials, or rejected if they have particularly weak grades and test scores.

The other cases are laid out before the four- and five-member admissions committees, always identified by their high schools, grades, test scores, gender and race.

A black female applicant from a private school in Washington piqued the committee's interest, despite a lackluster 2.7 grade-point average and 1140 SAT score. Committee members saw her as a leader because she founded a black cultural club and a hip-hop dance group at her school. They also decided she is "an uphill runner," because her grades have improved lately.

But her essay, describing how she met her boyfriend at a concert, struck the committee as curious. "It was all over the place," Libby said, "like a little soap opera."

She was a "lifer," meaning she had attended the private school since kindergarten. Some committee members mumbled that her grades should be better. "I'll give her this," Libby said. "She has no C's; they're all C-pluses."

After a few minutes of debate, the committee sent her application to the university's College of General Studies, a highly structured two-year liberal arts program intended to shore up borderline students in their freshman and sophomore years.

Another applicant from Los Angeles got a long look from the committee. Born in Ethiopia, she had grown up in a rough neighborhood, where she was robbed at gunpoint in her apartment building and witnessed a drive-by shooting. A scholarship program allowed her to leave a poorly

performing public high school to attend a highly regarded private school, where she struggled with a 2.7 grade-point average; she managed just a 900 on the SAT.

"She's been pretty much on her own," said Jennifer Simpson, an assistant admissions director who presented the girl's application. The committee discussed the girl's personal story for several minutes, but her academic record remained a stumbling block.

"I don't know that there is really much to discuss here," Simpson said finally.

Reluctantly, the committee agreed, rejecting the student's application. "The worst thing we could do is take someone and set them up for failure," Deputy Admissions Director Patrick McNally said. "This is a no, a hard no."

© 2003 The Washington Post Company

Mark David Richards

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Sun, 30 Mar 2003 19:32:34 -0500
Reply-To: wilson@ROANOKE.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Harry Wilson <wilson@ROANOKE.EDU>
Subject: Re: False beliefs and the war
Comments: To: mark@bisconti.com
In-Reply-To: <003001c2f3d1\$2a1cf350\$6701a8c0@mark>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

I surprised myself and took the time to watch this video. I did not see a call to arms against Iraq. Maybe I missed something. It's clearly designed to make an emotional impact, and I think it does that, but I did not see an attempt to link the events of September 11 to Iraq or Saddam Hussein. There were a couple of clips of George W. Bush, but there were more of Rudy Giuliani. I did not see Saddam Hussein at all, although there are many images and I may have missed some. I saw one image that appeared to be what I will call a man who appeared to be from the Middle East. It could have been Bin Laden, but I'm not sure.

I'm also not sure how we can make the leap that "THIS is what our Nation is responding to"...whatever THIS is. It's not clear how many people have taken

the time to watch this video or how much it influenced their thinking regarding Iraq.

Beyond that, though, I think this thread raises some interesting questions for us in the polling business. What is our responsibility, if any, in trying to identify false beliefs, be they related to war, racial preferences, elections, etc.? I believe that many conclusions are based on false beliefs. For example, in 1988 George H.W. Bush convinced many New Hampshireites that Bob Dole wanted to raise taxes. In 1992 Bill Clinton convinced many Americans that the economy was in the worst shape since the Depression and that it was still in recession. Both claims were, I think, verifiably false. Do these deceptions call into question the legitimacy of the Bush I and Clinton presidencies? Should pollsters have pointed out that these perceptions may well have been false?

If it is legitimate to ask or concern ourselves with perceived linkages between Saddam Hussein and 9/11 and its impact on support for the war, then are we also obligated to ask if people think that France's opposition is based on moral beliefs, a perceived need to counter the power of the United States or possible protection of economic interests in Iraq? Likewise, should we explore folks' knowledge of Russia's sale of GPS-jamming equipment to Iraq and its possible influence on Russia's opposition to military intervention? What about reports (true or not) that Iraq may be trying to raise the number of civilian casualties (by inflating estimates or putting civilians in danger) to influence opinion on the "Arab street?"

In short, there are a wide variety of reasons to favor or oppose the war. I've heard lots on both sides that I think are ridiculous as well as some good ones on both sides.

What disturbs me is my perception that some on AAPORNET are implying that support for the war is not legitimate because it is based on some fallacious belief(s). I hope that my perception is wrong. Should we be in the business of suggesting which beliefs are true, false, legitimate or not? Is it enough to say that X percent of those who support the war also think that Saddam Hussein was involved in the terrorist attacks of September 11?

Do we have any data on those opposed to the war and their perception of the legitimacy of the 2000 Presidential election? I know it is merely an anecdote, but last week I spoke with one of my colleagues who had signed one of the numerous "letters" from academics opposing the war. In fact, he isn't really opposed to the war for any reason except that he believes it is Bush's war and that Bush is not the legitimate President. He thinks that Saddam is a bona fide menace, if not to the U.S., then to many others in the Middle East and that he should be toppled from power, by force if necessary. Yet, he's on

record as being opposed to the war. Is his opposition to be disregarded because it isn't based on anything to do with Iraq?

In short, I think we need to be very careful when we start talking about false beliefs and any position that the public (or we? I?) hold on the war or a variety of other subjects.

Harry Wilson
Director, Center for Community Research
Roanoke College

Quoting Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>:

- > This video presentation is circulating on the net:
- >
- > "Dedicated to the men, women and children who lost their lives; all
- > those who sacrificed their lives; And to all the Heroes that responded
- > to the emergency 11 September 2001
- >
- > <http://www.politicsandprotest.org/>
- >
- > THIS is what our Nation is responding to. Please remember that in the
- > difficult times ahead."
- >
- >
- > -----Original Message-----
- > From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Allen Barton
- > Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2003 10:54 PM
- > To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
- > Subject: False beliefs and the war
- >
- > Thanks to all those who provided crosstabulations of the belief that
- > Saddam
- > Hussein was involved in 9/11 and support of President Bush's war policy.
- > This includes Hank Zucker who originally posed the question. The figures
- > all
- > show 20 to 35% higher support of the war among those who believe Saddam
- > Hussein was involved in the 9/11 terror attack, which is clearly a false
- > belief, and 15 to 25% higher support among those who believe he gave
- > "direct" or "substantial" support to Al Qaeda, which is a belief for
- > which
- > evidence is almost entirely lacking.
- >
- > As to whether there is a causal relation between these beliefs and the
- > decision to support war on Iraq, given the public's acceptance of some
- > additional of reasons for going to war with Saddam Hussein, is a
- > legitimate
- > question. One approach would be to ask directly "which is the most
- > important
- > reason?" (How many would say "freeing the people of Iraq" is the most
- > important?) In the tradition of Lazarsfeld's "Art of Asking Why," it

> would
> be necessary to ask those who say "because there is a danger that Saddam
> Hussein might aid future terror attacks on the U.S." why they think
> there is
> such a danger, and see if they use the false belief about the past as a
> reason for that belief in a future danger. This could still be done even
> now
> when we are at war.
>
> Another approach would be to ask the "believers" a hypothetical: "If it
> were proved that Saddam Hussein had no part in the 9/11 attack on the
> World
> Trade Center and the Pentagon, would you still have been in favor going
> to
> war with Iraq?"
>
> Ideally, of course, we should have had a Lazarsfeldian panel of the
> public
> being asked these questions at intervals of a couple of months, and try
> to
> tease out "quasi-experimentally" which beliefs came first and which
> followed, and how they were related to exposure to the Bush
> administration
> and its supporters "campaign" to sell war on Iraq. But as far as I know
> there is no such ongoing panel. Another possibility would be to emulate
> the
> Carl Hovland "Experiments on Mass Communication" of World War II
> vintage,
> trying to assess the effects of various arguments and "facts" on samples
> of
> the public in controlled experiments -- difficult to do given that most
> people probably have well-crystallized opinions. (Try high school
> students?
> Make it part of civics classes -- if those still exist?)
>
> If we had panel data, we might find that support of the war comes mainly
> from fear of Iraq as a source of terror attacks on the U.S., a fear
> which
> comes from George W. Bush having convinced almost all of his faithful
> followers, and the less educated segment of the majority who did not
> vote
> for him, of this danger. And perhaps the belief that Saddam was involved
> in
> 9/11 is a result, not a cause, of their accepting Bush's arguments about
> a
> future threat and the tendency to cognitive consistency. The false
> belief
> about the past could then be a result, not the cause of the belief
> about
> the future threat and the need to go to war now to eliminate it -- a
> belief
> about the future which is of course neither true nor false but a matter
> of
> judgment, bolstered by the "bully pulpit" of the presidency and the

> chorus
> of Bush supporters in the "non-elite" right-wing media.
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
> the messages from the web page above, for instance.
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

Director, Center for Community Research
Associate Professor of Political Science
Roanoke College

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Sun, 30 Mar 2003 20:43:43 -0500
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re: False beliefs and the war
Comments: To: "wilson@ROANOKE.EDU" <wilson@ROANOKE.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Bravo, Harry

We are too often guilty of making unwarranted assumptions about the "truth".

Nathaniel Ehrlich, Ph.D.
Senior Research Associate
University of Michigan Institute for Social Research
426 Thompson Street, P.O. Box 1248, EP 427
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248
Phone: 734-222-8660
Fax: 734-222-1542

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

From: Harry Wilson [<mailto:wilson@ROANOKE.EDU>]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2003 7:33 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: False beliefs and the war

I surprised myself and took the time to watch this video. I did not see a call to arms against Iraq. Maybe I missed something. It's clearly designed to make an emotional impact, and I think it does that, but I did not see an attempt to link the events of September 11 to Iraq or Saddam Hussein. There were a couple of clips of George W. Bush, but there were more of Rudy Giuliani. I did not see Saddam Hussein at all, although there are many images and I may have missed some. I saw one image that appeared to be what I will call a man who appeared to be from the Middle East. It could have been Bin Laden, but I'm not sure.

I'm also not sure how we can make the leap that "THIS is what our Nation is responding to."...whatever THIS is. It's not clear how many people have taken the time to watch this video or how much it influenced their thinking regarding Iraq.

Beyond that, though, I think this thread raises some interesting questions for us in the polling business. What is our responsibility, if any, in trying to identify false beliefs, be they related to war, racial preferences, elections, etc.? I believe that many conclusions are based on false beliefs. For example, in 1988 George H.W. Bush convinced many New Hampshireites that Bob Dole wanted to raise taxes. In 1992 Bill Clinton convinced many Americans that the economy was in the worst shape since the Depression and that it was still in recession. Both claims were, I think, verifiably false. Do these deceptions call into question the legitimacy of the Bush I and Clinton presidencies? Should pollsters have pointed out that these perceptions may well have been false?

If it is legitimate to ask or concern ourselves with perceived linkages between Saddam Hussein and 9/11 and its impact on support for the war, then are we also obligated to ask if people think that France's opposition is based on moral beliefs, a perceived need to counter the power of the United States or possible protection of economic interests in Iraq? Likewise, should we explore folks' knowledge of Russia's sale of GPS-jamming equipment to Iraq and its possible influence on Russia's opposition to military intervention? What about

reports
(true or not) that Iraq may be trying to raise the number of civilian
casualties (by inflating estimates or putting civilians in danger) to
influence
opinion on the "Arab street?"

In short, there are a wide variety of reasons to favor or oppose the war.
I've
heard lots on both sides that I think are ridiculous as well as some good
ones
on both sides.

What disturbs me is my perception that some on AAPORNET are implying that
support for the war is not legitimate because it is based on some fallacious
belief(s). I hope that my perception is wrong. Should we be in the business
of
suggesting which beliefs are true, false, legitimate or not? Is it enough
to
say that X percent of those who support the war also think that Saddam
Hussein
was involved in the terrorist attacks of September 11?

Do we have any data on those opposed to the war and their perception of the
legitimacy of the 2000 Presidential election? I know it is merely an
anecdote,
but last week I spoke with one of my colleagues who had signed one of the
numerous "letters" from academics opposing the war. In fact, he isn't
really
opposed to the war for any reason except that he believes it is Bush's war
and
that Bush is not the legitimate President. He thinks that Saddam is a bona
fide menace, if not to the U.S., then to many others in the Middle East and
that he should be toppled from power, by force if necessary. Yet, he's on
record as being opposed to the war. Is his opposition to be disregarded
because it isn't based on anything to do with Iraq?

In short, I think we need to be very careful when we start talking about
false
beliefs and any position that the public (or we? I?) hold on the war or a
variety of other subjects.

Harry Wilson
Director, Center for Community Research
Roanoke College

Quoting Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>:

> This video presentation is circulating on the net:
>
> "Dedicated to the men, women and children who lost their lives; all
> those who sacrificed their lives; And to all the Heroes that responded

> to the emergency 11 September 2001

>

> <http://www.politicsandprotest.org/>

>

> THIS is what our Nation is responding to. Please remember that in the
> difficult times ahead."

>

>

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Allen Barton

> Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2003 10:54 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: False beliefs and the war

>

> Thanks to all those who provided crosstabulations of the belief that

> Saddam

> Hussein was involved in 9/11 and support of President Bush's war policy.

> This includes Hank Zucker who originally posed the question. The figures

> all

> show 20 to 35% higher support of the war among those who believe Saddam

> Hussein was involved in the 9/11 terror attack, which is clearly a false

> belief, and 15 to 25% higher support among those who believe he gave

> "direct" or "substantial" support to Al Qaeda, which is a belief for

> which

> evidence is almost entirely lacking.

>

> As to whether there is a causal relation between these beliefs and the

> decision to support war on Iraq, given the public's acceptance of some

> additional of reasons for going to war with Saddam Hussein, is a

> legitimate

> question. One approach would be to ask directly "which is the most

> important

> reason?" (How many would say "freeing the people of Iraq" is the most

> important?) In the tradition of Lazarsfeld's "Art of Asking Why," it

> would

> be necessary to ask those who say "because there is a danger that Saddam

> Hussein might aid future terror attacks on the U.S." why they think

> there is

> such a danger, and see if they use the false belief about the past as a

> reason for that belief in a future danger. This could still be done even

> now

> when we are at war.

>

> Another approach would be to ask the "believers" a hypothetical: "If it

> were proved that Saddam Hussein had no part in the 9/11 attack on the

> World

> Trade Center and the Pentagon, would you still have been in favor going

> to

> war with Iraq?"

>

> Ideally, of course, we should have had a Lazarsfeldian panel of the

> public

> being asked these questions at intervals of a couple of months, and try

> to

> tease out "quasi-experimentally" which beliefs came first and which
> followed, and how they were related to exposure to the Bush
> administration
> and its supporters "campaign" to sell war on Iraq. But as far as I know
> there is no such ongoing panel. Another possibility would be to emulate
> the
> Carl Hovland "Experiments on Mass Communication" of World War II
> vintage,
> trying to assess the effects of various arguments and "facts" on samples
> of
> the public in controlled experiments -- difficult to do given that most
> people probably have well-crystallized opinions. (Try high school
> students?
> Make it part of civics classes -- if those still exist?)
>
> If we had panel data, we might find that support of the war comes mainly
> from fear of Iraq as a source of terror attacks on the U.S., a fear
> which
> comes from George W. Bush having convinced almost all of his faithful
> followers, and the less educated segment of the majority who did not
> vote
> for him, of this danger. And perhaps the belief that Saddam was involved
> in
> 9/11 is a result, not a cause, of their accepting Bush's arguments about
> a
> future threat and the tendency to cognitive consistency. The false
> belief
> about the past could then be a result, not the cause of the belief
> about
> the future threat and the need to go to war now to eliminate it -- a
> belief
> about the future which is of course neither true nor false but a matter
> of
> judgment, bolstered by the "bully pulpit" of the presidency and the
> chorus
> of Bush supporters in the "non-elite" right-wing media.

>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
> the messages from the web page above, for instance.

>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

Director, Center for Community Research
Associate Professor of Political Science

Roanoke College

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

then click on 'Join or leave the list'

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Sun, 30 Mar 2003 21:01:20 -0500

Reply-To: lindeman@bard.edu

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>

Subject: Re: False beliefs and the war

In-Reply-To: <1049070754.3e878ca2f2f2a@alfred.roanoke.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Quoting Harry Wilson <wilson@ROANOKE.EDU>:

> I'm also not sure how we can make the leap that "THIS is what our Nation is
> responding to."...whatever THIS is. It's not clear how many people have
> taken the time to watch this video or how much it influenced their thinking
> regarding Iraq.

Harry, in case Mark David Richards doesn't get a chance to post for a while,
I'll point out that this sentence ("THIS is what...") is quoted from the
website itself -- <http://www.politicsandprotest.org/> -- and was not his
commentary on the video.

I'm sure your post will trigger interesting discussion; just a few comments.

> Beyond that, though, I think this thread raises some interesting questions
> for us in the polling business. What is our responsibility, if any, in
> trying to identify false beliefs, be they related to war, racial
preferences,
> elections, etc.? [...]

With so many people polling for so many reasons, I wouldn't generalize
about "responsibility." But if I had a polling outfit, I'd certainly be
interested in assessing the impact of false beliefs.

> What disturbs me is my perception that some on AAPORNET are implying that
> support for the war is not legitimate because it is based on some fallacious
> belief(s). I hope that my perception is wrong. Should we be in the business
> of suggesting which beliefs are true, false, legitimate or not? [...]

Let's just suppose, momentarily and counterfactually, that 70% of Americans

express support for the war, and half of these [35% of the public] support the war _solely_ because they believe that Saddam Hussein personally planned the 9/11 attacks. Should we care? I think so. I think we're, collectively, in the business of understanding public opinion, not just reporting mock plebiscites.

But I agree that even that hypothetical belief -- and the related beliefs about Iraq's involvement in the 9/11 attacks that polls have actually examined -- are not clear instances of "false beliefs." A fairly straightforward example is that Americans typically overestimate the foreign aid budget, as a percentage of the total budget, by something like a factor of 10 [my copy of Kull and Destler is in the office!]. We know that correct information alters their opinions about whether the foreign aid budget should be cut. I think that fact is noteworthy -- in fact, honestly, I would think ill of any pollster who reported "widespread support for cutting U.S. foreign aid," without probing the context of widespread false beliefs.

Now, actually, I suspect that people's beliefs about the Iraq-9/11 connection have relatively little overall impact on their support for the war. I'd love to see some direct evidence, and I wouldn't mind being proven wrong.

> In short, I think we need to be very careful when we start talking about false beliefs and any position that the public (or we? I?) hold on the war or a variety of other subjects.

I agree. In particular, the question of "false beliefs and the war" is fascinating, but so far it's much more question than answer.

Mark Lindeman
Bard College

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Sun, 30 Mar 2003 21:05:13 -0800
Reply-To: Ellis Godard <ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ellis Godard <ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU>
Subject: Re: False beliefs and the war
Comments: To: wilson@ROANOKE.EDU
In-Reply-To: <1049070754.3e878ca2f2f2a@alfred.roanoke.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

In "THIS is what we're responding to", "this" (9/11) might be an indicator

rather than an affront, and "responding" might not mean specific retaliation but general reflection, changes in policy and strategy that respond to changes in international behaviors.

- Ellis Godard

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 31 Mar 2003 09:41:13 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Re: Is Diversity Overrated?
In-Reply-To: <5.2.0.9.2.20030329172454.0113d838@pop3.norton.antivirus>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

The Public Interest on-line has what I believe is the entire article:
<http://www.thepublicinterest.com/current/article2.html>

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Mon, 31 Mar 2003 09:47:49 -0500
Reply-To: "Traugott, Michael" <mtrau@UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Traugott, Michael" <mtrau@UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re: Is Diversity Overrated?
Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

If you are interested in a more detailed version of the analysis, take a look at the current issue of the International Journal of Public Opinion Research (vol. 15, no 1.).

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

From: Leo G. Simonetta [mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM]

Sent: Monday, March 31, 2003 9:41 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Is Diversity Overrated?

The Public Interest on-line has what I believe is the entire article:

<http://www.thepublicinterest.com/current/article2.html>

--

Leo G. Simonetta

Art & Science Group, LLC

6115 Falls Road Suite 101

Baltimore, MD 21209

410-377-7880 ext. 14

410-377-7955 fax

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

=====
Date: Mon, 31 Mar 2003 10:05:08 -0500

Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>

Subject: Re: Is Diversity Overrated?

Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Thanks for the reference. It provided an answer on the 'correlation is =
not

causation' argument, and then some.

I would emphasize, though, that most legal decisions are made on the =
basis

of an absolute, rather than a compensatory, model, i.e. it is not =
whether or

not the cost is justified or balanced by the benefit, but rather has a =
wrong

been committed, and the court is likely to see the denial of admission =
to

qualified students on the basis of race as a wrong.

Here is the money quote on methodology from the study:

"Of course, correlation is not causation, and it is possible that these correlations might be masking the effects of other factors. For example, the association of diversity with negative educational experiences might be due to racial discrimination that traps black students in less desirable schools. In order to control for these possible factors, we used the statistical tool of multiple regression, which isolates the separate effect of each potential causal agent from all others. Each evaluation of college life that produced a significant correlation with enrollment diversity was tested by a regression that included a host of background variables taken from the most recently available NCES and U.S. News data. These included: first, individual demographic traits such as race, gender, religion, age, marital status, citizenship, income, and parental education levels; second, academic or institutional factors such as public vs. private schools, selectivity (proportion of applicants admitted), student-faculty ratio, faculty experience and academic success, proportion of full-time vs. part-time faculty, proportions of faculty disciplines and student majors; and third, number of student organizations and proportion of students living on campus. In this way, we were able to tease out the remaining associations of enrollment diversity with educational outcomes and racial relations."=B9=20

The regression analysis showed that, even after controlling for these demographic, academic, and institutional factors, enrollment diversity still contributed significantly to students' evaluations of college life. Once again, the greater the school's diversity, the less students were satisfied with their own educational experience. In addition, greater diversity was associated with perceptions of less academic effort among students and a poorer overall educational experience. Finally, enrollment diversity was positively related to students' experience of unfair treatment, even after the effects of all other variables were controlled. (As the proportion of black students grew, the incidence of these personal grievances increased

among whites. Among blacks, however, there was no significant = correlation.

Thus diversity appears to increase complaints of unfair treatment among white students without reducing them among black students.)=20

The regression analysis of the faculty sample also showed that = enrollment diversity contributed independently to variation in all three measures = of the educational environment. With all other variables controlled, = enrollment diversity was inversely related to faculty satisfaction with the = quality of education, the work effort of the student body, and the academic = readiness of students. The administrators' judgments of student preparation and = the quality of the educational experience were similar. On the other hand, = the association of diversity with more positive faculty perceptions of the treatment of minorities, and with both faculty and administrators' perceptions of less campus discrimination, held true. It is also = notable that the respondent's race contributed independently to evaluations of academic readiness. White faculty members were found to have a more = positive evaluation of students' academic skills. This would seem to preclude an explanation of the findings as the product of negative stereotyping on = the part of whites."

Nathaniel Ehrlich, Ph.D.
Senior Research Associate
University of Michigan Institute for Social Research
426 Thompson Street, P.O. Box 1248, EP 427
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248
Phone: 734-222-8660
Fax: 734-222-1542

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

From: Leo G. Simonetta [mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2003 9:41 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Is Diversity Overrated?

The Public Interest on-line has what I believe is the entire article:
<http://www.thepublicinterest.com/current/article2.html>

--
Leo G. Simonetta

Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Mon, 31 Mar 2003 12:32:35 -0500
Reply-To: "Dumont, Bryan" <BDumont@APCOWORLDWIDE.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Dumont, Bryan" <BDumont@APCOWORLDWIDE.COM>
Subject: Research Associate Position in Washington, DC
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Research Opportunity in Washington, DC

APCO Insight, the research and message development division of APCO =
Worldwide, based in Washington, DC. is adding research professionals. =
APCO is a subsidiary of New York based Grey Global Group. APCO =
maintains offices in 21 cities throughout North America, Europe, and =
Asia. =20

Insight is a fast-growing research organization offering a wide range of =
opinion and market research services. Insight uses research to guide =
reputation management, litigation and crisis communications, and issues =
management. In addition, Insight is on the cutting edge of brand =
research. =20

We provide research and strategic communications consulting for Fortune =
500 companies, trade associations, NGO's and other clients from around =
the world. We are adding research associates to our Washington office, =
with opportunities in London and Brussels planned. =20

We are currently seeking to add a Research Associate to our Washington, =
DC team. Ideal candidates would have the following attributes:

Strong quantitative/methodological background: =20

- Firm grasp of statistics, including multivariate analysis, factor =
analysis (structural equation modeling skills preferred, but not =
required).

- Experience with cleaning, coding and analyzing datasets

-Experience with business software and statistical packages (SAS, =
SPSS, LISREL)
-Strong experience with PowerPoint and charting data =20
Exceptional client communications and presentation skills. =20
Excellent writing skills.
An ability to form cooperative relationships with APCO colleagues around =
the world.
1-3 years of professional experience in a fast-paced research company.

Insight offers an excellent work environment with exciting opportunities =
for motivated research professionals. If this interests you, please =
send a resume to:

Mark Benson
President, APCO Insight
1615 L Street NW =20
Suite 900
Washington, DC 20036
mbenson@apcoinsight.com

Bryan G. Dumont
Vice President, APCO Insight
1615 L Street, NW
Suite 900
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 778-1486 Tel
(202) 466-6002 Fax
(703) 582-9418 Cel
bdumont@apcoinsight.com

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Mon, 31 Mar 2003 10:57:42 -0800
Reply-To: LPollack@PSG.UCSF.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Lance Pollack <LPollack@PSG.UCSF.EDU>
Subject: Re: Here is the Chronicle Article
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Is it really discrimination these people who filed suit against UM have
experienced? Affirmative Action was adopted in order to overcome an
entrenched set of American values (in many places backed up by laws) that
denied access by people of color AND women (especially at the level of
professional programs) to ANY institution of higher learning. That is
discrimination. The inability to gain acceptance to a particular institution
"by accident of birth" for having a particular characteristic that is
present in the MAJORITY of the student body at that institution is not
discrimination. If these individuals had made application to several
comparable institutions in the State of Michigan and had been denied

acceptance in every case, then I would be more sympathetic to their contention. No, what I hear is a "my life is ruined because I couldn't get a (fill in the degree) from (fill in the institution)" argument. No one has the right to attend any particular institution. All institutions make choices. Most people at one time or another don't get the teacher, class, school, award, opportunity, job, etc. they really wanted, many times for reasons not under their own control. But those same people move on, find other ways of accomplishing their goals, and succeeding. If they could not find any such alternatives, then you have a case for discrimination. What I see in this case is disappointment that life isn't fair. This is not the basis for judicial relief.

Entrenched discrimination is a societal ill. A perfect solution would be the transformation of those values to a truly color blind society. We are still working on that, but the track record isn't very good. When my father moved our family to a southern university town in 1969, long after Brown v. Board of Education, we found that the high schools were still segregated. Even a cursory inspection of the white and African American high schools revealed the differences in physical plant, resources, teacher-student ratios, etc. Any number of examples of school busing and magnet school programs can be given that were run in such a way as to maximize resistance to the programs, to try and get people to make them fail. During this past year a southern town was challenged and finally relented on their "tradition" of racially segregated high school proms. Resistance to transformation has been continuing and persistent. I keep asking myself, why is economic hardship now a more palatable "accident of birth" than race/ethnicity?

In the mean time, equal opportunity and affirmative action legislation was undertaken to address the problem in the real world in a real way. They encompass imperfect policies and programs implemented in imperfect ways, characteristics of most public policies and programs. Whether different ways of accomplishing the goals of this legislation (points, preferences, economic hardship, accept a given percent of every high school graduating class) are better or worse is a matter for public discourse and debate, but the goals stand, and "choices" will be made, and someone in the majority will get upset. If no one in the majority got upset, then I would know the programs weren't working.

Lance M. Pollack, Ph.D.
Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)
University of California, San Francisco
lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu

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

From: Nathaniel Ehrlich [mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2003 3:48 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Here is the Chronicle Article

It is intriguing that you cite "The Shape of the River" which asserts that the presumed gains of a race-sensitive admissions policy are achieved at a "tolerable cost". The case before the Supreme Court is, in essence, about the issue of cost. Simply put [and we in academia are loathe to put any proposition simply] the case will turn on the issue of denial of benefit to

an individual because of an accident of birth. Because an applicant to the University of Michigan is non-Black and non-Hispanic, he or she will be denied admission in favor of a Black or Hispanic applicant with absolutely identical qualifications. She may be the daughter of a Vietnamese woman who came to this country after the Vietnam war and was taught that the United States is the land of opportunity for all; she may be living in Ann Arbor, and unable to attend any other University because her family lacks the funds to send her away to school, and she was planning to go to the University of Michigan, but because she has the wrong information on her birth certificate, she will be denied admission in favor of a Hispanic or Black applicant.

We tend to think that the costs, which are not denied in "The Shape of the River" are paid by an affluent, white, privileged monolith. Not true.

As to the criticism that "correlation is not causation", there is no denying the truth to that. However, the statement made in the Op-ed piece in the New York Times, that you quote correctly, is "If diversity works as advertised, we surmised, then, those at institutions with higher proportions of black enrollment should rate their educational and racial milieus more favorably than their peers at institutions with lower proportions." If this had been the case, I'm sure you would not be raising any methodological objections, and if there had been no significant differences, there would have been no article. But instead the null hypothesis was rejected in a way that seems to offend you. But again, the supposed/debated benefits of race-sensitive admission policies are not the issue: discrimination on the basis of an accident of birth is the issue.

But what truly amazes me is your concluding statement that "How ever you slice it, this sounds like support for segregated higher ed." Segregation is the practice of denying a benefit [like, sitting in the front of the bus] to a class of individuals because of an accident of birth.

Nathaniel Ehrlich, Ph.D.
Senior Research Associate
University of Michigan Institute for Social Research
426 Thompson Street, P.O. Box 1248, EP 427
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248
Phone: 734-222-8660
Fax: 734-222-1542

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

From: Andrew A Beveridge [mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU]
Sent: Saturday, March 29, 2003 10:18 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Here is the Chronicle Article

Dear All:

I remember when I read the account in the Chronicle, I was glad that it was not being published in POQ. As a person who has been doing research related to educational topics, it seems to me that this correlational study should probably not have been published in its form, since many other hypotheses should be also explored to account for the the attitudinal findings. Also

as Rusciano points out this really is done at an aggregate level. So you have aggregated attitude measures correlated with school composition.

Most arguments for diversity benefits are based upon longitudinal studies not on stuff like this. The idea, of course, being that if white students (for instance) are only educated with other whites, they will reinforce attitudes with other groups that are perhaps not positive. While black and other minorities are denied opportunities.

Given some of the other research that has been done by Lipset, et al on faculty attitudes, I was somewhat surprised by this finding. It certainly does not look at the long term benefits of diversity or segregation on those in such institutions. Nothing like the SHAPE OF THE RIVER, which is the "big book" on this topic, nor the recent work by Massey on stereotyping of black students entitled THE SOURCE OF THE RIVER.

As you all must know, the oral arguments on the affirmative action case are on Tuesday, and they arguments will be available on the web immediately, ala Bush v. Gore.

Andy Beveridge
Queens College and Graduate Center -- CUNY

New Study Questions Educational Benefits of Diversity
By JEFFREY SELINGO

In a direct challenge to academic research that asserts the educational benefits of diversity, a new study by a team of prominent scholars suggests that students of all ethnic backgrounds feel that as minority enrollment grows, the quality of their education diminishes and incidents of discrimination increase.

The findings, published in the spring issues of the International Journal of Public Opinion Research and The Public Interest, are likely to generate intense debate as the U.S. Supreme Court prepares to hear two lawsuits challenging race-conscious admissions policies at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor's chief undergraduate college and law school. In defending the use of affirmative action, the university and its supporters cite volumes of data that they say show that a diverse student body enriches the educational experience of all students.

But the authors of the new study contend that such evidence "suffers from the subjective nature of survey responses," in which questions are worded in a way so that everyone agrees.

"In a sense, diversity is like free speech -- almost everyone approves of it in the abstract, but its application in concrete situations can produce great controversy," write the authors, Stanley Rothman, director of the Center for the Study of Social and Political Change and a professor of government at Smith College; Seymour Martin Lipset, a professor of public policy at George Mason University; and Neil Nevitte, a political-science

professor at the University of Toronto.

A Broader Approach

The three scholars therefore sought to undertake a broader approach in their survey. They not only asked administrators, professors, and students at 140 colleges how they felt about campus diversity, but also inquired about the institutions' general educational environment, making no references to diversity.

Following the survey, the responses were correlated to the number of black students at each institution, since the authors argue that the debate over affirmative action has primarily centered on black students at predominantly white colleges.

In the survey, conducted in the spring of 1999, participants were asked how well their institution educated its students and how hard students worked at their studies. Faculty members and administrators were asked how academically well prepared students were upon enrolling. Participants were also asked several questions about diversity, including whether minority students were treated better or worse than white students were and to what extent racial discrimination was a problem at their college.

The results were the opposite of what the researchers say they expected. As the number of black students increased, student satisfaction with their educational experience dropped, as did their favorable impression of the quality of education and the work ethic of their peers. In addition, the more diverse the institution, the more likely students were to respond that they had experienced discrimination. The survey did not distinguish minority respondents from nonminority respondents.

The responses were similar among students, professors, and administrators. For instance, as the number of black students on a campus increased, the more likely it was that faculty members criticized the work habits of students.

The findings, Mr. Rothman said in an interview, show that "studies done by the academic community, which is overtly in favor of diversity, are predisposed to the goal of diversity."

Questioning Other Studies

Opponents of affirmative action who support the plaintiffs in the Michigan cases said that the new study raises serious questions about previous studies that back the educational benefits of diversity.

The new survey "shows the shakiness of the Gurin study that is being relied on so heavily by the University of Michigan," said Roger B. Clegg, general counsel for the Center for Equal Opportunity, which opposes affirmative action.

The Gurin study was conducted by Patricia Y. Gurin, a professor of psychology and women's studies at Michigan. It concluded that white students reap long-term benefits from diversity. Tapping into a database with

information from many colleges, she found that students who most interacted with diverse peers in college were most likely to be living or working in integrated settings five years after graduation.

The Rothman study, Mr. Clegg said, "shows how dangerous it would be for the Supreme Court to allow racial discrimination simply because a social scientist purports to find a correlation between racial discrimination and some desirable educational outcome."

But Gary A. Orfield, a professor of education and social policy at Harvard University, criticized the findings as being "inconsistent" with a "vast literature of research on desegregation."

Mr. Orfield said that in his own surveys of law and medical schools, he has found "very positive and powerful impacts of diversity on what students believe they are learning, development of their views on key issues in their professions, changes in attitudes about how they will practice, and very strong support for affirmative action, with many students saying that more should be done."

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Frank Rusciano

> Sent: Saturday, March 29, 2003 8:17 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Is Diversity Overrated?

>

>

> I haven't read the study either, so perhaps I'm misunderstanding the
> methodology. However, if I read it correctly, I am not sure of
> the validity of

> correlating results of a public opinion survey within an institution with
> characteristics of the institution like the percentage of a given group on
> campus. The former is based on individual-level data and the
> second is based
> on aggregate-level data that can relate to any number of features of the
> institution.

>

> Also, even if the finding is valid, it may find nothing more than there is
> likely to be a higher degree of racial tension and prejudgement
> where there are
> more diverse populations. Finally, note that the surveys measure
> perceptions
> of academic quality, etc. There don't seem to be any objective
> measures of
> these factors, which again only implies that some people perceive
> educational
> standards are lowered in institutions with more diverse
> populations. I could
> argue, for instance, that highly ranked academic institutions
> where something
> like two-thirds of its students grade are A- or higher, suffer
> from lowered
> educational standards, but I don't know that many there would
> perceive that to

> be the case.
>
> Andrew A Beveridge wrote:
>
>> I haven't read this study, but I was struck by this statement that
>> also appears in the Chronicle of Higher Ed account:
>>
>>>
>>> To find out, in 1999 we surveyed a random sample of more than 1,600
>>> students and 2,400 faculty members and administrators at 140 American
>>> colleges and universities, asking them to evaluate the quality of
>>> education
>>> at their institution, the academic preparation and work habits of the
>>> student body, the state of race relations on campus and their own
>>> experiences of discrimination. Then we CORRELATED their responses
>>> with the
>>> proportion of black students attending each institution, based on
>>> government statistics.
>>>
>>> If diversity works as advertised, we surmised, then those at
> institutions
>>> with higher proportions of black enrollment should rate their
> educational
>>> and racial milieus more favorably than their peers at
> institutions with
>>> lower proportions.
>>
>> Apparently Lipset, et al, do not understand that correlation is
> not cause.
>> If one did this study of public schools, it would rate the lily white
>> suburban districts ahead of the suburban districts with some blacks and
>> ahead of districts which are essentially segregated.
>>
>> How ever you slice it, this sounds like support for segregated
> higher ed,
>> based upon correlation.
>>
>> Very strange!!!
>>
>> Andrew A. Beveridge
>> Professor of Sociology
>> Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY
>> 209 Kissena Hall
>> 64-19 Kissena Blvd
>> Flushing, NY 11367
>> Phone: 718-997-2837
>> FAX: 718-997-2820
>> email: andrew_beveridge@qc.edu
>> web: www.socialexplorer.com
>>
>>>
>>
>> -----
>> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

>> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
>> main email address.
>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
> <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
> main email address.
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can also post messages from this page--useful if you're not at your
main email address.
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
then click on 'Join or leave the list'
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Mon, 31 Mar 2003 14:17:13 -0500
Reply-To: RFunk787@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "G. Ray Funkhouser" <RFunk787@AOL.COM>
Subject: Is it spam? A virus? Anyone know?
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Would appreciate some advice --

I received today an E-mail with a download. Subject: "Your password" from "DurbanJ@state.gov" Looked suspicious, like one of those junkmails made up to look like a government refund check. But, I downloaded it anyway, and got several files, e.g., "afc.txt" and "afc.winzip". On the face of it, it claims to have something to do with pre-installation of Windows 98. Which seems fishy, to say the least. So far, nothing has showed up affecting the operation of my computer. But that doesn't mean it isn't a virus.

Does anyone know anything about this?

Thanks, Ray Funkhouser

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Mon, 31 Mar 2003 14:52:08 -0500
Reply-To: Jim Wolf <Jim-Wolf@WORLDNET.ATT.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jim Wolf <Jim-Wolf@WORLDNET.ATT.NET>
Subject: Re: Is it spam? A virus? Anyone know?
Comments: To: RFunk787@AOL.COM
In-Reply-To: <d.d4d340c.2bb9ee39@aol.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Ray,

You've been popped by the dreaded Klez worm. For more info and how to clean up, see:

<http://www.symantec.com/avcenter/venc/data/w32.klez.h@mm.html>

If you haven't done so already, DO NOT open those files you downloaded.

Jim

At 02:17 PM 3/31/03 -0500, G. Ray Funkhouser wrote:

>Would appreciate some advice --

>

>I received today an E-mail with a download. Subject: "Your password" from
>"DurbanJ@state.gov" Looked suspicious, like one of those junkmails made up
>to look like a government refund check. But, I downloaded it anyway, and got
>several files, e.g., "afc.txt" and "afc.winzip". On the face of it, it
>claims to have something to do with pre-installation of Windows 98. Which
>seems fishy, to say the least. So far, nothing has showed up affecting the
>operation of my computer. But that doesn't mean it isn't a virus.

>

>Does anyone know anything about this?

>

>Thanks, Ray Funkhouser

>

>-----

>View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:

><http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
>the messages from the web page above, for instance.

>

Jim Wolf

Jim-Wolf@att.net

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Mon, 31 Mar 2003 08:04:37 -0500
Reply-To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Subject: Re: Is Diversity Overrated?
In-Reply-To: <011901c2f793\$944fdbf0\$130a010a@LEO>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Supposing we discarded the notion of diversity and ranked potential students only on merit. What would be the unanticipated social consequences of such an action over the long term? In the same breath, suppose we eliminated all traces of affirmative action, what would be the long term social consequences? These are factors which I think deserve close consideration before taking the author's conclusions as the definitive end all as a guide for future action.

Dick Halpern

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Mon, 31 Mar 2003 17:13:17 -0500
Reply-To: RFunk787@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "G. Ray Funkhouser" <RFunk787@AOL.COM>
Subject: Klez banished (?)
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Thanks, guys --

Should this happen to anyone else, Norton/Symantec has an easy-to-use (and free) tool to obliterate Klez. If that is in fact what I downloaded against my better judgment, "FixKlez" claims it resides in my system no more, with, apparently, no harm done (I didn't open the file).

If that isn't what infected my system, well . . . Norton still claims to have cleared Klez out.

There are devils everywhere. Who understands these matters . . . ?

Ray Funkhouser

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

Date: Mon, 31 Mar 2003 16:24:25 -0600
Reply-To: "Stuefen, Randy" <rstuefen@USD.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Stuefen, Randy" <rstuefen@USD.EDU>
Subject: Re: Is Diversity Overrated?
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

Dick,

Economists would argue that you would get an efficient use of human capital as each of us would adapt to our highest and best use. The end result of greater efficiency would be greater productivity increasing the generation of wealth resulting in a richer nation.

Best,
Randy

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

From: dick halpern [mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET]
Sent: March 31, 2003 7:05 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Is Diversity Overrated?

Supposing we discarded the notion of diversity and ranked potential students only on merit. What would be the unanticipated social consequences of such an action over the long term? In the same breath, suppose we eliminated all traces of affirmative action, what would be the long term social consequences? These are factors which I think deserve close consideration before taking the author's conclusions as the definitive end all as a guide for future action.

Dick Halpern

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.

View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:
<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
You can set 'nomail' to stop getting email, and read
the messages from the web page above, for instance.