

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 LOG0304"

Date: Tue, 1 Apr 2003 10:23:58 -0600
Reply-To: Rick Weil <fweil@COX.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Rick Weil <fweil@COX.NET>
Subject: Abusive respondent; Student access to phone banks
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I'd like feedback about an issue that came up. Please reply off-list, and I'll summarize answers for the list, unless you want to send an on-list comment of general interest.

I teach a sociology methods class, and for the 4th year, we're doing a local survey (see <http://members.cox.net/fweil/s2211guide.html>). The students design, conduct, & analyze the survey with my guidance. The content is GSS/NES-style omnibus; universe is general population in our parish (county); sample is telephone purchased from Genesys; N is 400+ completed; and we've had good reception: several news reports, and the mayor visited the class last year & plans to visit this year. Nice project.

One problem we've had is that the students have no access to university phone banks and have to call from their own phones or make alternative arrangements. I've told the students that their safety has the highest priority, and they can block their outgoing caller ID if they want - even though this can affect the sample representativeness. (Other students have agreed to try numbers that auto-refuse blocked calls.)

This year a student reached an abusive & threatening respondent - sounded like an older man. The student called from his parents' phone, didn't block the outgoing caller ID, and the R called the police, who called the student/parents. The student and parents were very upset, & contacted me and the dept chair. To avoid further complications, I gave the student permission to stop interviewing. This is the first instance of this magnitude in 4 years of the project, ie, out of 8,000+ call attempts.

2 Questions -

1. Has anyone noticed an increase in abusive respondents? If so, any thoughts about reasons? I haven't noticed any major trend in response rate in our short 4 years; and I've thought about the usual possible reasons for R non-cooperation.

2. More importantly, I'd like to argue for access to a university phone bank so as to avoid the problem becoming this big. How do people at different universities handle access to phone banks for instructional purposes. It doesn't have to be a CATI system, as long as it's university phones with a

blocked- or university caller ID. Note: our survey research lab director has denied us access with the argument that all projects have to be self-financing, but our department contributes to the lab's support. Do people think this gives me grounds to argue for access? What's been your experience?

As I said, reply off-list & I'll summarize answers, or on-list if you think it's of general interest.

Thanks much. Rick Weil

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

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, 1 Apr 2003 11:44:38 -0500
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Subject: Wash Post--War Through Rose-Colored Sunglasses
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Marc Fisher writes, "Suddenly, it made sense that poll figures show well more than 70 percent of Americans backing this war. But it is a quiet kind of support, nothing remotely like the explosion of national pride and community that we saw after 9/11."

See Fisher's column:

War Through Rose-Colored Sunglasses

By Marc Fisher

The Washington Post
Tuesday, April 1, 2003; Page B01
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A63416-2003Mar31.html>

Returning to Washington after several days away is like coming home from the TV version of a war to something much closer to the real thing. Not

that life in this city is even remotely akin to what the people of Iraq are living through, but our experiences here and those of other Americans remain almost as far apart as war and peace.

Here and in other big, cosmopolitan cities, the debate about this war continues, with demonstrations and disruptions by antiwar folks. Here, the link between war and terrorism is a daily question kept alive by the newspapers and talk shows, in conversations on the Metro, in school classrooms. Here, we see the war through the prism of process and policy -- the personalities are Rumsfeld and Cheney, the studio generals of TV land, and their omnipresent interlocutors, the cable news anchors.

Far beyond the Beltway, the connection between the nonstop TV show called "War in Iraq" and daily life is less complicated. The local TV newscasts feature blood drives, Air Force wives putting on a perky face, yellow ribbons wrapped around front yard trees, and nary a demonstrator to be seen. The chatter at the convenience store is about kids whose parents have been sent to the desert. And the war is pretty much entirely the president's: He's coming to central Florida to give a pep talk; he's reaching out to military families; his sound bites are a constant on the local news, which pays no mind to the internecine battles of the Washington bureaucracy.

We knew that by spending spring break at spring training and Disney's Magic Kingdom, we had assured ourselves a journey far from the realities of armed conflict. But it is so easy for Disney's dream merchants and the lords of baseball to keep reality at bay because most Americans, even after 9/11, exist very much apart from the turbulent forces that knock around most of this planet's residents.

In Winter Park, at a ballgame between the Cleveland Indians and our future Washington Senators, now commuting between Montreal and Puerto Rico, there was no mention of war, not even during the pregame tribute to the flag. The war's only intrusion into the idyll of meaningless spring baseball came very late in the game, when one somewhat inebriated man lurched along the main aisle of the stadium shouting, "Everyone who's for George, let's hear you holler!"

The crowd promptly roared its approval; not a boo in the place.

That there is not the slightest mention of war inside the theme parks of central Florida should surprise no one. Even at Disney's Hall of Presidents, performers didn't touch the subject. But as an a cappella singing group completed its set of tunes by inviting the audience to join in "God Bless America," the voices of 500 tourists rose with much more than the usual gusto, and a few men who stood at attention won handshakes from strangers. One of the singers said patriotic numbers were resonating in a special way these days.

Suddenly, it made sense that poll figures show well more than 70 percent of Americans backing this war.

But it is a quiet kind of support, nothing remotely like the explosion of national pride and community that we saw after 9/11. Out beyond the

tourist sector, in the sprawling suburbs of Orlando and the small towns that interrupt the orange groves of Florida's lake country, you see the occasional church or used-car lot posting a message of support to the soldiers, but this is a muted rallying around the flag.

It is refreshing but also somewhat strange to visit parts of this country where there is no discernible change in security except at the airport, and where there is no talk of gas masks or duct tape. Living in Washington, it is easy to accept the slogans of politicians who say that the oceans that separated us from the harshness of this world have evaporated, easy to imagine that we are next in line for the suicide bombers and the armies of jihad. But out there, where local crime can displace the war as the lead story on the TV news, it is still possible to pretend that hardly anything has changed.

That is the beauty and grace of being American, and we continue down that path at our common peril.

Join me tomorrow at noon -- instead of the usual Thursday -- for "Potomac Confidential" at www.washingtonpost.com/liveonline.

C 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: Tue, 1 Apr 2003 12:17:49 -0500

Reply-To: Steven Kull <skull@PIPA.ORG>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Steven Kull <skull@PIPA.ORG>

Subject: Survey Research Position Available in DC

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Position Available: Research Associate for Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA), affiliated with the University of Maryland

PIPA is seeking candidates for a research associate with a background in questionnaire design, statistics, and international affairs; as well as computer and writing skills.

The position entails participation in the development of poll questionnaires, background study on public policy issues, statistical analysis of survey data (using SPSS), and participation in the writing of reports of PIPA surveys, as well as analyses of polling data from

diverse sources.

The Program on International Policy Attitudes conducts research on public attitudes on international issues. PIPA actively disseminates its findings to policymakers and the media as well as to the academic community. In addition, it maintains the on-line Americans and the World Digest which offers a comprehensive analyses of polls from all public sources on international issues (see www.pipa.org)

To apply send resume and writing samples to pipa@his.com :

Or

PIPA

1779 Massachusetts Ave. NW Suite 510

Washington DC 20036

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, 1 Apr 2003 12:24:27 -0600

Reply-To: ALLAN L MCCUTCHEON <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: ALLAN L MCCUTCHEON <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU>

Subject: Position: Mayo Clinic Survey Research Center Director

Comments: cc: "Offord, Kenneth P." <offord.kenneth@mayo.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Hello,

The Mayo Clinic's Survey Research Center is seeking applicants for Director. The announcement is attached.

Please respond to the person mentioned in the announcement. Thanks.

Best,

Allan

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, 1 Apr 2003 16:02:57 -0500

Reply-To: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>

Subject: "Do-Not-Email" Lists Emerging

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I just received from Donna Gillin at CMOR some information on "Do-Not- =
Email" lists, which are similar to the growing "Do-Not-Call" list. These =
regulations are directed a sales contacts. Thus far, survey research has =
been exempted from this legislation and regulation. However, we need to =
be diligent in assuring that research remains exempted. CMOR is monitoring =
this legislation. AAPOR is a contributing organization to CMOR.=20

Here's Donna's memo:
-----=

Do-Not-Email: New Trends in State Legislation

by Donna L. Gillin, CMOR, Promoting and Advocating Survey Research,
dgillin@cmor.org=20

Members of the survey research industry are aware of *do-not-call*
registries and their impact on telephone research. But in recent years,
lawmakers have introduced email legislation modeled after telemarketing =
and
do-not-call legislation. Researchers should therefore also be aware of the
scope trends in legislation in this are and the potential impact of these
laws on survey research activities.

Do-not-call laws have come in two forms:

- 1) Internal do-not-call laws - requiring a caller to comply with an
individual*s do-not-call request and keep a company do-not-call registry =
(or
internal do-not-call registry); and
- 2) External do-not-call laws - requiring callers to purchase and abide by =
a compiled list of those who do not wish to be called

The federal internal do-not-call laws impose such restrictions on
sales-related calls (calls for survey research purposes are implicitly
exempt * outside the scope of the laws). Likewise, the state do-not-call
registry laws and the newly modified federal Telemarketing Sales Rule,
establish lists of those who do not wish to receive sales-related =
contacts.

(All of these laws exempt -- either implicitly or explicitly - survey
research calls.)

In recent years, a new trend has begun in restricting sales-related
contacts. States have introduced and enacted legislation directed at
regulating unsolicited emails. For the most part, these laws regulate
sales-related contacts (those that regulate survey research emails are the
most benign in nature * visit the CMOR website at www.cmor.org for more
details) and are analogous to the existing telemarketing laws. Similarities=

to the telemarketing laws exist in the definitions used to define
sales-related contacts (i.e implicitly exempting survey research
activities), as well as the restrictions on such contacts, including

do-not-email mechanisms for sales-related emails. The do-not-email components have followed the trend of the do-not-call statutes, since the first stage of legislative activity in this area required sales-related emails to include an *opt out* * allowing the person contacted to request not to be contacted again by the company/entity. About a dozen states have = thus far included such a requirement for sales-related emails.

In 2003, the legislative trend in do-not-email legislation has mirrored = the progression in do-not-call legislation by now seeking to establish = external do-not-email registries. Such states as Missouri and Colorado have introduced legislation to create a list of those who do not wish to = receive unsolicited sales-related emails (emails for survey research purposes = would be implicitly exempt from the Missouri law and specifically exempt from = the Colorado law). Similar to the do-not-call registry laws, when states enact such a law, they will likely highly publicize its existence and the manner in which email addresses can be added to the list.

The evolution of the do-not-call and do-not-email legislation is identical, = as is the threat to research. The language used in the do-not-call legislation to define sales-related contacts has occasionally been drafted in such a way as to inadvertently include survey research activities. CMOR therefore closely monitors the language used to regulate email activities for the inadvertent inclusion of survey research in the definition of sales-related contacts. Furthermore, the threat to research from the = impact of existing laws also exists. Respondents who are aware of the do-not-email = laws (whether they be laws requiring an *opt out* or laws establishing a do-not-email registry) may not be aware of the true scope of the law or = our exclusion. Therefore, possible refusals or potential irate respondents = that may come into play as a result of the do-not-call laws, may also occur in the context of do-not-email laws.

For further information on current legislation or the current email statutes, please visit the CMOR website at www.cmor.org or contact CMOR's = Director of Government Affairs, Donna Gillin, at dgillin@cmor.org.

- Donna

Donna L. Gillin
Director of Government Affairs
CMOR... Promoting and Advocating Survey Research
5507-10 Nesconset Highway, # 147
Mount Sinai, NY 11766
Phone: 631-696-2544

Fax: 631-696-2372
Email: dgillin@cmor.org=20
Website: www.cmor.org=20

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, 1 Apr 2003 13:21:12 -0800
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
Subject: Do Not Call list protocols
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

We were discussing creating an FAQ statement regarding these don't call =
rules for our CATI interviewers. Here's a possibility...

Respondent: Hey, you guys shouldn't be calling me, I put our phone =
number in the do-not-call registry!

Interviewer: As survey researchers, we are exempt from the 'do not =
call' registry because we are not selling you anything. We are =
conducting research and your answers will remain completely confidential =
and not used for any purpose outside this research. In fact, not only =
are we not selling you anything, but we are also offering <an incentive> =
if you qualify for and complete the study. Would you like to =
participate?=20

Anyhow, it's a start. Perhaps we should, without being too wordy, send =
them to CMOR's website, or does AAPOR have something about it? Or maybe =
suggest they speak to the lab director or project director? Ideas?

Leora

Leora Lawton, Ph.D.
Director of Consumer & Demographic Research
Population Research Systems, LLC
A Member of the FSC Group
100 Spear, Suite 1700
San Francisco, CA 94105
v: 415 777-0707, ex. 117; f: 415 777-2420;
m: 510 928-7572
www.populationresearchsystems.com

This information is intended solely for the individual or entity named =
as
the recipient hereof and may be, or contain privileged (i.e.

attorney-client), confidential and/or proprietary information. If you =
are
not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying,
distribution, or use of the contents of this transmission is prohibited. =
If
you have received this communication in error, please notify us =
immediately
by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and =
destroy
this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

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, 1 Apr 2003 16:24:36 -0500
Reply-To: "Butterworth, Michael" <MXB@CBSNEWS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Butterworth, Michael" <MXB@CBSNEWS.COM>
Subject: Re: "Do-Not-Email" Lists Emerging
Comments: To: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Finally - a non-proprietary email sampling frame!

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

From: Mark Schulman [<mailto:M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2003 4:03 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: "Do-Not-Email" Lists Emerging

I just received from Donna Gillin at CMOR some information on "Do-Not-Email" lists, which are similar to the growing "Do-Not-Call" list. These regulations are directed a sales contacts. Thus far, survey research has been exempted from this legislation and regulation. However, we need to be diligent in assuring that research remains exempted. CMOR is monitoring this legislation. AAPOR is a contributing organization to CMOR.

Here's Donna's memo:

Do-Not-Email: New Trends in State Legislation

by Donna L. Gillin, CMOR, Promoting and Advocating Survey Research,
dgillin@cmor.org

Members of the survey research industry are aware of *do-not-call* registries and their impact on telephone research. But in recent years,

lawmakers have introduced email legislation modeled after telemarketing and do-not-call legislation. Researchers should therefore also be aware of the scope trends in legislation in this area and the potential impact of these laws on survey research activities.

Do-not-call laws have come in two forms:

- 1) Internal do-not-call laws - requiring a caller to comply with an individual's do-not-call request and keep a company do-not-call registry (or *internal do-not-call* registry); and
- 2) External do-not-call laws - requiring callers to purchase and abide by a compiled list of those who do not wish to be called

The federal internal do-not-call laws impose such restrictions on sales-related calls (calls for survey research purposes are implicitly exempt * outside the scope of the laws). Likewise, the state do-not-call registry laws and the newly modified federal Telemarketing Sales Rule, establish lists of those who do not wish to receive sales-related contacts. (All of these laws exempt -- either implicitly or explicitly - survey research calls.)

In recent years, a new trend has begun in restricting sales-related contacts. States have introduced and enacted legislation directed at regulating unsolicited emails. For the most part, these laws regulate sales-related contacts (those that regulate survey research emails are the most benign in nature * visit the CMOR website at www.cmor.org for more details) and are analogous to the existing telemarketing laws. Similarities to the telemarketing laws exist in the definitions used to define sales-related contacts (i.e implicitly exempting survey research activities), as well as the restrictions on such contacts, including *do-not-email* mechanisms for sales-related emails. The do-not-email components have followed the trend of the do-not-call statutes, since the first stage of legislative activity in this area required sales-related emails to include an *opt out* * allowing the person contacted to request not to be contacted again by the company/entity. About a dozen states have thus far included such a requirement for sales-related emails.

In 2003, the legislative trend in do-not-email legislation has mirrored the progression in do-not-call legislation by now seeking to establish external do-not-email registries. Such states as Missouri and Colorado have introduced legislation to create a list of those who do not wish to receive unsolicited sales-related emails (emails for survey research purposes would be implicitly exempt from the Missouri law and specifically exempt from the Colorado law). Similar to the do-not-call registry laws, when states enact such a law, they will likely highly publicize its existence and the manner in which email addresses can be added to the list.

The evolution of the do-not-call and do-not-email legislation is identical, as is the threat to research. The language used in the do-not-call legislation to define sales-related contacts has occasionally been drafted in such a way as to inadvertently include survey research activities. CMOR therefore closely monitors the language used to regulate email activities for the inadvertent inclusion of survey research in the definition of sales-related contacts. Furthermore, the threat to research from the impact of existing laws also exists. Respondents who are aware of the do-not-email

laws (whether they be laws requiring an *opt out* or laws establishing a do-not-email registry) may not be aware of the true scope of the law or our exclusion. Therefore, possible refusals or potential irate respondents that may come into play as a result of the do-not-call laws, may also occur in the context of do-not-email laws.

For further information on current legislation or the current email statutes, please visit the CMOR website at www.cmor.org or contact CMOR's Director of Government Affairs, Donna Gillin, at dgillin@cmor.org.

- Donna

Donna L. Gillin
Director of Government Affairs
CMOR... Promoting and Advocating Survey Research
5507-10 Nesconset Highway, # 147
Mount Sinai, NY 11766
Phone: 631-696-2544
Fax: 631-696-2372
Email: dgillin@cmor.org
Website: www.cmor.org

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: Tue, 1 Apr 2003 16:48:48 -0500
Reply-To: "DeBell, Matthew" <MDeBell@AIR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "DeBell, Matthew" <MDeBell@AIR.ORG>
Subject: Re: Do Not Call list protocols
Comments: To: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

For the 2003 National Household Education Survey, CATI interviewers were provided with the following suggested response to people who protested that they were on a do-not-call list:

"This is not a telemarketing call. I work for a social science research firm. Our aim is to have you participate in our research study, not to sell you anything. The telephone calls we make are not prohibited or regulated by the Federal Trade Commission. The information you give us will be used

exclusively for research purposes. There is no federal law that prohibits telephone calls to conduct social science research."

This is a little verbose to come out all at once. I would stick with just the first three sentences unless the respondent claimed the call was illegal.

--

Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.
Research Analyst
Education Statistics Services Institute
American Institutes for Research
1990 K St., NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20006
tel. 202-654-6503; fax 202-737-4918
mdebell@air.org

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

From: Leora Lawton [mailto:leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2003 4:21 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Do Not Call list protocols

We were discussing creating an FAQ statement regarding these don't call rules for our CATI interviewers. Here's a possibility...

Respondent: Hey, you guys shouldn't be calling me, I put our phone number in the do-not-call registry!

Interviewer: As survey researchers, we are exempt from the 'do not call' registry because we are not selling you anything. We are conducting research and your answers will remain completely confidential and not used for any purpose outside this research. In fact, not only are we not selling you anything, but we are also offering <an incentive> if you qualify for and complete the study. Would you like to participate?

Anyhow, it's a start. Perhaps we should, without being too wordy, send them to CMOR's website, or does AAPOR have something about it? Or maybe suggest they speak to the lab director or project director? Ideas?

Leora

Leora Lawton, Ph.D.
Director of Consumer & Demographic Research
Population Research Systems, LLC
A Member of the FSC Group
100 Spear, Suite 1700
San Francisco, CA 94105
v: 415 777-0707, ex. 117; f: 415 777-2420;
m: 510 928-7572
www.populationresearchsystems.com

This information is intended solely for the individual or entity named as the recipient hereof and may be, or contain privileged (i.e. attorney-client), confidential and/or proprietary information. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this transmission is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

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: Tue, 1 Apr 2003 14:17:46 -0800
Reply-To: Richard Rands <rrands@CFMC.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Richard Rands <rrands@CFMC.COM>
Subject: Re: "Do-Not-Email" Lists Emerging
In-Reply-To: <se89b837.052@srbi.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Mark wrote:

>I just received from Donna Gillin at CMOR some information on "Do-Not-Email" lists, which are similar to the growing "Do-Not-Call" list.

CfMC just held our annual Users Conference last week and this issue came up in a way that may be of interest to AAPOR members. Even though market research surveys are exempt from the DNC legislation, we have some clients who have requested the ability to maintain a DNC database in our CATI (Survent) system as a matter of courtesy for their clients. For example, a company who does an annual customer satisfaction survey has respondents who request not to be contacted, even though it is a research study. The company certainly does not want to enrage its own clients. Rick Weil's abusive respondent situation mentioned earlier is another example. So we have added a DNC feature to our CATI and Web survey system that supports both telephone numbers and E-mail addresses.

The point was made at our Users Conference that by merely providing for a DNC capability, we are weakening the position of the marketing research industry. It is viewed by some as a tacit admission that there are circumstances where a DNC feature is appropriate even in research situations. It was suggested that market researchers should not cave into

anyone who asks a researcher to put them onto a DNC list.

This argument puts CfMC in between a rock and a hard place. We are very anxious to accommodate the requests of OUR clients, but we do not wish to create problems for the industry as a whole. We agreed that we would not pro-actively promote the DNC feature in our system, but that we will make it available to those who request it.

I'm interested in AAPOR member reactions to this situation.

Richard Rands

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, 1 Apr 2003 16:30:57 -0600

Reply-To: ALLAN L MCCUTCHEON <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: ALLAN L MCCUTCHEON <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU>

Subject: Position Announcement: Mayo Clinic Survey Center Director

Comments: cc: "Offord, Kenneth P." <offord.kenneth@mayo.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Director, Survey Research Center
Mayo Clinic

The Mayo Clinic invites qualified individuals to apply for the position of Director of the Survey Research Center, Department of Health Sciences Research. The Survey Research Center was established in 1991 to provide collaboration for conducting surveys at Mayo Clinic in Rochester, MN, Scottsdale, AZ, and Jacksonville, FL. The Center interacts with biomedical investigators and administrative personnel on a wide spectrum of survey topics, including medical outcome and follow-up, continuous improvement, patient satisfaction with provider care, and administrative issues. The Survey Center in the Division of Biostatistics also collaborates with the other departmental divisions: Epidemiology, Health Care Policy and Research, and Medical Informatics Research.

The responsibilities of the position include enhancing and facilitating methodologic survey research in support of the research, education, clinical practice, and administration at Mayo Clinic. The Director also provides leadership and management of Survey Center activities, which includes leading a staff of dedicated, motivated, and specialized Survey Center personnel with a reputation for high quality work. A successful candidate will be expected to continue developing the efficient operational expertise of the Center and promote interactions with new research initiatives. Effective communication skills are essential. The Center also conducts a four-week course on questionnaire and survey design in the Masters in Clinical Research program.

Candidates should have earned a doctorate degree and have an ongoing interest in survey research methodology. A strong record of scholarship evidenced by the collaboration and publication of high quality methodologic research in survey research is desirable. Although the salary for this position does not require extramural support, demonstrated ability to obtain funding will be considered a significant strength. Candidates with demonstrated leadership and administrative and process improvement skills will be given preference.

The deadline for receipt for applications is May 15, 2003. Candidates should send a letter of application, curriculum vitae, and full contact information for three references. Application materials or inquiries should be directed to Dr. Alan R. Zinsmeister, Chair, Survey Research Center Search Committee, Division of Biostatistics, Department of Health Sciences Research, Mayo Clinic, 200 First Street Southwest, Rochester, MN 55905, (507) 284-1933. Mayo Foundation is an affirmative action and equal opportunity educator and employer.

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, 2 Apr 2003 15:36:28 -0500
Reply-To: Diane Bowers <dbowers@casro.org>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Diane Bowers <dbowers@CASRO.ORG>
Organization: CASRO
Subject: Re: "Do-Not-Email" Lists Emerging
Comments: To: Richard Rands <rrands@CFMC.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Richard:

On the email DNC issue, CASRO's standards are very specific that an individual may not be contacted for research via email without having opted-in. The complete rules are included in CASRO's Code of Standards and Ethics for Survey Research on our website (www.casro.org).

With regard to the telephone DNC situation, I have articulated my position in front of many groups (and I believe last year on aapornet): the industry should strongly consider an industry-sponsored, research-specific DNC list for several reasons:

1. Many (I hesitate to say most, but I think it's close) research companies already have internal DNC lists because individual respondents have requested that they not be called again (some respondents have been irate, others have been calm--but such respondent requests generally have been respected, even if the interviewer spends some time trying to soften their position)

2. Most sampling providers clean their sample of DNC names from other sources, before they sell sample.

3. The line between telemarketing and legitimate research is continually blurred by the public, media, regulators.

4. In fact, more and more regulators are looking to include research in DNC requirements.

5. If DNC regulations are inevitable AND if members of the public (1) simply perceives that there is no distinction, (2) doesn't care that research is different from telemarketing, and (3) continues to register complaints, then, I think it would be better to have our own, discrete research-specific DNC list, rather than being included in the FCC/FTC national DNC lists for telemarketers.

6. Telephone response rates are more and more challenging, both to achieve cooperation and to statistically account for those pervasive telephone screening devices.

7. We need to do something internally that addresses this problem from all fronts.

8. A research-specific DNC list would reassure the public that we are responsive to their requests; it would keep the regulatory wolf away from our door; it would allow us to truly separate our profession from direct marketing; and it would, if implemented and executed properly, minimize the number of DNC names and allow the industry to educate and convert these die-hard refusers.

9. I realize there are tremendous administrative details, but I think we could work through these issues.

Diane

Diane Bowers

President

CASRO

(Council of American Survey Research Organizations)

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

From: "Richard Rands" <rrands@CFMC.COM>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2003 5:17 PM

Subject: Re: "Do-Not-Email" Lists Emerging

> Mark wrote:

>> I just received from Donna Gillin at CMOR some information on "Do-Not-
>> Email" lists, which are similar to the growing "Do-Not-Call" list.

>

> CfMC just held our annual Users Conference last week and this issue came
up

> in a way that may be of interest to AAPOR members. Even though market
> research surveys are exempt from the DNC legislation, we have some clients

> who have requested the ability to maintain a DNC database in our CATI

> (Survent) system as a matter of courtesy for their clients. For example,

a

> company who does an annual customer satisfaction survey has respondents
who

> request not to be contacted, even though it is a research study. The

> company certainly does not want to enrage its own clients. Rick Weil's

> abusive respondent situation mentioned earlier is another example. So we

> have added a DNC feature to our CATI and Web survey system that supports
> both telephone numbers and E-mail addresses.
>
> The point was made at our Users Conference that by merely providing for a
> DNC capability, we are weakening the position of the marketing research
> industry. It is viewed by some as a tacit admission that there are
> circumstances where a DNC feature is appropriate even in research
> situations. It was suggested that market researchers should not cave into
> anyone who asks a researcher to put them onto a DNC list.
>
> This argument puts CfMC in between a rock and a hard place. We are very
> anxious to accommodate the requests of OUR clients, but we do not wish to
> create problems for the industry as a whole. We agreed that we would not
> pro-actively promote the DNC feature in our system, but that we will make
> it available to those who request it.
>
> I'm interested in AAPOR member reactions to this situation.
>
> Richard Rands
>
> -----
> 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: Wed, 2 Apr 2003 16:41:58 -0500
Reply-To: Ed Freeland <efreelan@PRINCETON.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ed Freeland <efreelan@PRINCETON.EDU>
Subject: GeoLytics Software and Census Data
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I am posting the request for info below for a colleague. Please reply
directly to me at efreelan@princeton.edu. Thanks.

The data products we are interested in knowing more about are:

"1990 Long Form in 2000 Boundaries" CD, and also
"Neighborhood Change Database (1970 - 2000) CD

Both are from GeoLytics, Inc. (<http://www.geolytics.com/>). We are
interested in using postal Zip Code Area level census data in such a way
that we don't have to adjust either (or both) 1990 and 2000 year's data

to make sure the values are about the same geographic areas (despite the boundary changes and other differences). From the description on the company's web site, the first product seems to do this.

I guess my questions are:

1) does anybody have any experience with the above data product?

2) can anybody suggest any alternative data products, code, or information sources that fit our need better?

Thank you.

Cheers,
Chang

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, 2 Apr 2003 15:43:46 -0600
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: FW: Job Opportunity
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

=20

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

From: Elizabeth Hancock [<mailto:edhancock@nfow.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 02, 2003 3:36 PM
To: Mike Flanagan
Subject: Job Opportunity=20

SENIOR MARKETING PROJECT DIRECTOR POSITION

=20

To apply, forward your resume and salary requirements to the contact =
information listed below.

=20

NFO WorldGroup

Job Code: 03-4402-01

E-mail: <mailto:recruiter6@nfow.com> recruiter6@nfow.com

=20

NFO WORLDGROUP is one of the world's leading providers of research-based = marketing information and counsel. We are "marketing minds who = specialize in research"(tm) and have provided Fortune 500 clients with = consumer and brand knowledge and understanding for more than 50 years.=20

=20

We are currently looking for a talented, energetic individual to join = our team as Senior Marketing Project Director in our Greenwich, CT = location.

=20

The Senior Marketing Project Director will be responsible for = coordinating and monitoring all aspects of custom market research = projects with the client and NFO account executive which includes = scheduling all phases of project from fieldwork to final tables; = assisting in questionnaire design, proofing, and approval process; = communicating project status to clients and NFO personnel; and = interfacing with other departments as necessary to ensure timeliness and = quality of clients projects.

=20

Minimum skill requirements include 3-5 years project director experience = with ad hoc research, excellent communication, interpersonal, = organizational, analytical, and problem-solving skills. Questionnaire = and tab design experience, preferred. Bachelor's degree in Business, = Marketing, or related field, advanced degree accepted in lieu of = experience. MS Suite of products experience with emphasis in Excel and = PowerPoint. The ability to work and think independently, as well as = manage and prioritize multiple tasks and requests.

=20

The ideal candidate will have the following:=20

=D8 Has designed at least some questionnaires

=D8 Has experience in telephone AND interactive studies

=D8 A PLUS to have experience with B2B studies or any = telecommunication studies

=D8 Knows how to define/read/check tables

=D8 Has at least taken a stab at writing presentations

=D8 A PLUS would be to know SPSS

=D8 Has direct client experience=20

=D8 Comes from, or at least has once been at a supplier-side =
company=20

=D8 Has knowledge of sample design

=D8 Knows statistics (has at least 1 or 2 stats courses or =
research methods courses and actually applied this to the work =
environment)

=D8 Someone who can think on their own and propose insightful =
suggestions along all stages of a project from inception to completion

=20

NFO WorldGroup offers excellent benefits, salaries commensurate with =
experience, a business-casual office setting and an incredible work =
environment. =20

=20

NFO WorldGroup, including its affiliate companies, is an Equal =
Opportunity Employer.

=20

=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

=====
Date: Wed, 2 Apr 2003 16:50:13 -0500
Reply-To: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>
Subject: NSF announces new Priority Area -- Human and Social Dynamics
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The following announcement is from Kristin Raymond at NSF:

The National Science Foundation has issued a program announcement for a =
new priority area titled "Human and Social Dynamics." This program =
announcement can be found at:=20

<http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2003/nsf03552/nsf03552.htm>. =20

This special competition will inaugurate the Human and Social Dynamics =
(HSD) priority area. This priority area aims to develop and apply =

multi-scaled, multi-disciplinary approaches to better understand the = causes and ramifications of change and to increase collective capabilities = to anticipate its complex consequences. A related goal is to improve the = understanding of the dynamics of behavior and the human mind. HSD also = aims to advance knowledge of the cognitive and social structures that = create and define change and to help people and organizations better = manage profound or rapid change. In this initial year of a multi-year = effort, the following topical areas will be emphasized: (A) Decision = Making Under Uncertainty (DMUU), a part of the President's Climate Change = Research Initiative; (B) Enhancing Human Performance (EHP); and (C) = Empirical Implications of Theoretical Models (EITM).

Please note that deadline dates are rapidly approaching:

June 11, 2003 -- Enhancing Human Performance (EHP) Proposals=20
June 12, 2003 -- Empirical Implications of Theoretical Models (EITM) =
Proposals=20
July 15, 2003 -- Deadline for Decision Making Under Uncertainty (DMUU) =
Center and Developmental Proposals=20

For more information, please review the program announcement and/or = contact one of the HSD team leads; a list of team leads can be found at = www.nsf.gov/sbe/hsd03/contacts.htm.

Apologies if you receive more than one notice. Sincerely,=20

Kristin Raymond
Science Assistant
Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences
National Science Foundation

kraymond@nsf.gov=20
703-292-7323

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, 2 Apr 2003 14:02:20 -0800
Reply-To: "P. Moy" <pmoy@U.WASHINGTON.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "P. Moy" <pmoy@U.WASHINGTON.EDU>
Subject: AAPOR Authors and Nashville
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Dear AAPOR members and authors,

The Book and Technology Exhibit has been a longstanding tradition at the annual AAPOR conference. The publishers listed below will be exhibiting in Nashville, and we would like to ensure that the works of AAPOR authors who have published with these houses are made available for display and

promotion at the Sheraton.

Blackwell
Cambridge University Press
Elsevier
Politico's
University of Chicago Press
John Wiley

If you have published with these houses, and are interested in having your book(s) exhibited in Nashville, please forward the relevant information (author, title(s), and year) to me no later than Friday, 11 April 2003. I'll forward this information to the respective publishers before they send the books to the Sheraton Music City.

More importantly, if your publisher is not listed below, please contact your editor and encourage him/her to send your works and other public opinion titles to Nashville! AAPOR charges a nominal fee to display books. For more information, please have your editor contact me directly.

Many thanks,

Patricia Moy

Patricia Moy, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Communication
Adjunct Faculty, Political Science
University of Washington, Box 353740
Seattle, WA 98195-3740 U.S.A.

Voice: +1.206.543.9676
Fax: +1.206.543.9285
Email: pmoy@u.washington.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, 2 Apr 2003 17:31:31 -0500
Reply-To: mccarty@TCNJ.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: John McCarty <mccarty@TCNJ.EDU>
Subject: Re: GeoLytics Software and Census Data
Comments: To: efreelan@PRINCETON.EDU
In-Reply-To: <3E8B5926.C53C4CD2@princeton.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

I have worked with Geolytics products for several years and have found them to be excellent products. They are also reasonably priced. The tech support people are very available.

John McCarty

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, 2 Apr 2003 20:39:54 -0500

Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

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

Subject: RFI article and IPSOS - LE Monde poll

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Radio France International (RFI) today published an article on its website titled, "French Politics--Iraq: The evolution of public opinion worries the government."=20

<http://www.rfi.fr/actuhaude/special.asp?m1=3D1&m2=3D1&SurTitre=3D'Politi=que%20fran=E7aise'&Titre=3D'Irak%20%20%20l=92=E9volution%20de%20l=92opinion%20=inqui=E8te%20le%20gouvernement'>

The article highlights a finding from a poll by IPSOS and Le Monde published March 31, 2003 <http://www.ipsos.fr/CanalIpsos/poll/7754.asp> showing that 33% of French adults were not completely hoping for an American/British victory in the U.S. war on Iraq, versus 53% who said there mostly hoped for an American/British victory.

The nationally representative IPSOS survey, conducted 28-28 March 2003 among 948 French adults 18+ by telephone, shows that those in 69% of those supporting the Parliamentary Right (Droite parlementaire) hope for an American/British victory, compared to 47% of those supporting the Parliamentary Left (Droite parlementaire). 50% of Le Pen's National Front(FN/MNR) support U.S./Britain.

When asked which side people supported most, 34% said U.S./Britain, 25% Iraq, 31% [volunteered the word "neither"], and 10% gave no opinion. On this question, 44% of the right sided with U.S./Britain compared to 29% of the left. 45% of Le Pen's party sided with U.S./Britain.

The concern in some political circles is that the anti-war position has turned to an anti-American position, with two main fissures that will emerge in the election a year away:=20

--Atlantic Cooperationists ("Atlantistes") versus nationalists

("souverainistes"), and=20
--Pro-Palestinians versus pro-Israelis. =20

The article points out that last week, la Commission nationale consultative des droits de l'Homme (the National Consultative Commission on Human Rights) sounded an alarm bell: It reported that acts of a racist character are on the rise in France, and have been observed especially related to anti-Semitism especially in certain suburban neighborhoods, and sometimes accompanied by brutal and disturbing acts. The article reports that France has the most significant Arab and Jewish communities in Europe, with an estimated 6 million Arab Muslim people and an estimated 600,000 Jewish people.

The poll shows that 43% believe that it is far from being evident that there will be an American/British victory in this conflict; 33% say an American/British victory is probable and 21% say it is certain. =20

Other findings from the poll, not reported in the article, show that 72% believe that the UN should be in charge of reconstruction and maintenance of the peace in Iraq once the war has ended, versus 23% U.S. and Britain.

After the war, 66% of French hope that France will participate in the reconstruction of Iraq, and 61% hope France will participate militarily in maintaining the peace in Iraq.

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: Thu, 3 Apr 2003 09:18:06 -0500
Reply-To: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>
Subject: Recent article on polling...
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I haven't seen this posted on the list, but a friend just forwarded it to me. Would like some of your opinions on it. Thanks!

=20

Jason

=20

=20

Playing Hide and Seek With Polls=20

by L. Brent Bozell III
March 18, 2003=20

America loves democracy, where the mandates of government are determined by the consent of the governed. The public's temperature is gauged regularly - even daily - by a media obsessed with polling data on absolutely everything.=20

But are these media surveys intended to document public opinion - or affect it?=20

Take the war. At the outset of verbal hostilities, the media's pollsters asked the generic question: Do you favor war in Iraq? Maybe they felt the question too broad, or the number in agreement too high. Whatever the reason, the pollsters felt the need to get more specific. Do you favor war - if the U.S. goes around the United Nations? Do you favor war - even if ground troops are used? As the numbers curved lower, pollsters even asked if the public would still favor war if American ground troops suffered large casualties.=20

Polls are a good way to measure how the country is absorbing politics; how the country is responding to the statements of our political leaders; how the public reacts to sabre-rattling by our enemies; and what we think of our "allies" at the UN. But the media are not just taking the country's temperature. They attempt to manipulate public opinion by touting results gleaned from sometimes loaded questions. What's even more fascinating is how the media selectively report their own poll results.=20

In the pre-war buildup, ABC News found it necessary to report, as a formal news story, the polls showing support slipping for the White House. I'll buy that. But if that's true, how does ABC explain its decision not to tell viewers - as a formal news story - when their own poll numbers revealed growing support for the White House case?=20

On January 21, Peter Jennings reported: "An ABC News/Washington Post poll finds that public support for attacking Iraq has declined somewhat: 57 percent of Americans now support U.S. military action to get rid of Saddam Hussein. It was 62 percent in mid-December, and as high as 78 percent a few months after the 9-11 attacks."=20

The ABC news judgment: the administration's lost support is news.=20

A week later, hours before the State of the Union address, Jennings mentioned - mentioned - the number had risen four points back to 61 percent figure on his newscast. But he did not describe it as an increase. And for good measure, he buried it under a stack of more liberal-pleasing numbers: "An ABC News poll for this occasion finds that 64 percent of Americans believe the UN weapons inspectors should be given a few more months to do their jobs, 61 percent support attacking Iraq eventually. But only 44 percent of American support a war if the UN does not approve."=20

The ABC news judgment: the administration's growing support was not news.=20

Do you doubt me? The night after the President spoke to Congress, ABC's pollsters found the number favoring war rose to 63 percent, but Peter Jennings only said "we conducted a poll when he was finished and we found that people had not changed their minds in significant numbers."=20

So, in a nutshell, this is ABC's idea of news judgment: support for war dropping from 62 to 57 percent was worth a story isolating that fact. Rising back to 61 percent was not reported as a jump, and buried in one sentence of a larger story about other matters. Another bump to 63 percent was dismissed as no change.=20

Poor ABC News. It's hard to imagine how frustrating it must be for their reporters and their Canadian anchorman to report day after day why Bush is moving too rashly, why he isn't sophisticated enough for the French, and why it's wrong to use those gauche words like "evil" to describe the Iraqi regime -- and then see the polls go against them anyway. The numbers climbed after the State of the Union, jumped after Colin Powell laid out Iraqi deceit before the UN, and rose as people saw the strangeness of peace marches and live UN deliberations on TV.=20

By March 10, Jennings reported how a new ABC News poll found that "61 percent believe support from the UN Security Council is not necessary to attack." But he did not explain the number's significance: support had surged 17 points, up from 44 percent in January. The results were even worse for Jennings and his pro-UN cheerleading. ABC's "Poll Vault" Web site report showed the number for those who feel UN authorization is not necessary jumped to an almost-stratospheric 71 percent "if allies participate."=20

Jennings and his ABC team have crusaded relentlessly against this war, and the public rejected them. Any day now, Jennings may again find the American people "threw a two-year-old temper tantrum." That's how he reacted after the 1994 Republican triumph - the last time democracy let him down.

=20
Jason Boxt=20

Vice President=20
Global Strategy Group=20
1825 Connecticut Ave, NW=20
Fifth Floor=20
Washington, D.C. 20009=20

(202) 265-4676=20
(202) 265-4619 (fax)

www.globalstrategygroup.com <<http://www.globalstrategygroup.com/>>=20

=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: Thu, 3 Apr 2003 09:35:56 -0500
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re: Recent article on polling...
Comments: To: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Spinning the news by attaching commentary is what the news business is, and always has been, about.

Best example [in my personal experience]. Some years ago, a gallery owner was tried on obscenity charges for showing some of Robert Mapplethorpe's photographs. The story was reported by a NYTimes reporter under the headline, "Gallery owner found not guilty". The same story was picked up by the Ann Arbor News and published under the headline, "Jury Fails to Convict Gallery Owner."

Of course, it's much easier to spin on TV, with visuals going on behind the talking head, a ribbon crawling across the bottom of the screen, poll results reported by graphs that misrepresent the numbers [check it out; the columns sometimes start at 30%, which makes a 60-40 split look like a 3:1 ratio.]

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: Jason Boxt [mailto:jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM]
Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2003 9:18 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Recent article on polling...

I haven't seen this posted on the list, but a friend just forwarded it to me. Would like some of your opinions on it. Thanks!

Jason

Playing Hide and Seek With Polls

by L. Brent Bozell III

March 18, 2003

America loves democracy, where the mandates of government are determined by the consent of the governed. The public's temperature is gauged regularly - even daily - by a media obsessed with polling data on absolutely everything.

But are these media surveys intended to document public opinion - or affect it?

Take the war. At the outset of verbal hostilities, the media's pollsters asked the generic question: Do you favor war in Iraq? Maybe they felt the question too broad, or the number in agreement too high. Whatever the reason, the pollsters felt the need to get more specific. Do you favor war - if the U.S. goes around the United Nations? Do you favor war - even if ground troops are used? As the numbers curved lower, pollsters even asked if the public would still favor war if American ground troops suffered large casualties.

Polls are a good way to measure how the country is absorbing politics; how the country is responding to the statements of our political leaders; how the public reacts to sabre-rattling by our enemies; and what we think of our "allies" at the UN. But the media are not just taking the country's temperature. They attempt to manipulate public opinion by touting results gleaned from sometimes loaded questions. What's even more fascinating is how the media selectively report their own poll results.

In the pre-war buildup, ABC News found it necessary to report, as a formal news story, the polls showing support slipping for the White House. I'll buy that. But if that's true, how does ABC explain its decision not to tell viewers - as a formal news story - when their own poll numbers revealed growing support for the White House case?

On January 21, Peter Jennings reported: "An ABC News/Washington Post poll finds that public support for attacking Iraq has declined somewhat: 57 percent of Americans now support U.S. military action to get rid of Saddam Hussein. It was 62 percent in mid-December, and as high as 78 percent a few months after the 9-11 attacks."

The ABC news judgment: the administration's lost support is news.

A week later, hours before the State of the Union address, Jennings mentioned - mentioned - the number had risen four points back to 61 percent figure on his newscast. But he did not describe it as an increase. And for good measure, he buried it under a stack of more liberal-pleasing numbers: "An ABC News poll for this occasion finds that 64 percent of Americans believe the UN weapons inspectors should be given a few more months to do their jobs, 61 percent support attacking Iraq eventually. But only 44 percent of American support a war if the UN does not approve."

The ABC news judgment: the administration's growing support was not news.

Do you doubt me? The night after the President spoke to Congress, ABC's pollsters found the number favoring war rose to 63 percent, but Peter Jennings only said "we conducted a poll when he was finished and we found that people had not changed their minds in significant numbers."

So, in a nutshell, this is ABC's idea of news judgment: support for war dropping from 62 to 57 percent was worth a story isolating that fact. Rising back to 61 percent was not reported as a jump, and buried in one sentence of a larger story about other matters. Another bump to 63 percent was dismissed as no change.

Poor ABC News. It's hard to imagine how frustrating it must be for their reporters and their Canadian anchorman to report day after day why Bush is moving too rashly, why he isn't sophisticated enough for the French, and why it's wrong to use those gauche words like "evil" to describe the Iraqi regime -- and then see the polls go against them anyway. The numbers climbed after the State of the Union, jumped after Colin Powell laid out Iraqi deceit before the UN, and rose as people saw the strangeness of peace marches and live UN deliberations on TV.

By March 10, Jennings reported how a new ABC News poll found that "61 percent believe support from the UN Security Council is not necessary to attack." But he did not explain the number's significance: support had surged 17 points, up from 44 percent in January. The results were even worse for Jennings and his pro-UN cheerleading. ABC's "Poll Vault" Web site report showed the number for those who feel UN authorization is not necessary jumped to an almost-stratospheric 71 percent "if allies participate."

Jennings and his ABC team have crusaded relentlessly against this war, and the public rejected them. Any day now, Jennings may again find the American people "threw a two-year-old temper tantrum." That's how he reacted after the 1994 Republican triumph - the last time democracy let him down.

Jason Boxt

Vice President
Global Strategy Group
1825 Connecticut Ave, NW
Fifth Floor
Washington, D.C. 20009

(202) 265-4676
(202) 265-4619 (fax)

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

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: Thu, 3 Apr 2003 10:08:34 -0600
Reply-To: ALLAN L MCCUTCHEON <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: ALLAN L MCCUTCHEON <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU>
Subject: Re: Recent article on polling...
Comments: To: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>
In-Reply-To: <0ED62F7DC6311240A5F3A251086F74514C0D6B@gsg-
mail01.globalstrategygroup.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Hi Jason,

After wading through all of Mr. L. Brent Bozell III's hyperventilation, I see that he is a true to his trade as a pundit (see more of his work on his webpage <http://www.mediaresearch.org/archive/newscol/welcome.asp>). Unfortunately, he displays little talent at interpreting polls or surveys.

According to Mr. Bozell III, on Jan. 21 ABC's "Canadian anchorman" (probably FRENCH Canadian!) reported that ABC's poll results indicated support for the war had "declined somewhat" from 62% to 57%.

A week later, before the State of the Union address, this same (clearly suspect!) anchorman reported that support had "risen four points back to 61 percent."

And if this is not enough to demonstrate the "liberal-pleasing" bent of ABC News, L. Brent notes that a further ABC poll, following the State of the Union address, indicated 63% support--however, the difference between 61% and "63 percent was dismissed as no change."

But, how could this possibly be?! Clear evidence of the "pro-UN cheerleading" bias of the ABC news anchor. (Personally, I prefer the smaller than sampling error explanation, but then I am a professor, so my patriotism is already suspect by some pundits!)

I think I will read through L. B. B. III's most recent (April 2, according to his webpage) contribution to human understanding--"Peter Arnett, Cretinous Liar." I'll bet it is just full of insightful nuggets and hard-hitting TRUTH.

Best,
ALM

On Thu, 3 Apr 2003, Jason Boxt wrote:

> I haven't seen this posted on the list, but a friend just forwarded it
> to me. Would like some of your opinions on it. Thanks!
>
> Jason
>
>
> Playing Hide and Seek With Polls
>
> by L. Brent Bozell III
> March 18, 2003
>
> America loves democracy, where the mandates of government are determined
> by the consent of the governed. The public's temperature is gauged
> regularly - even daily - by a media obsessed with polling data on
> absolutely everything.
>
> But are these media surveys intended to document public opinion - or
> affect it?
>
> Take the war. At the outset of verbal hostilities, the media's pollsters
> asked the generic question: Do you favor war in Iraq? Maybe they felt
> the question too broad, or the number in agreement too high. Whatever
> the reason, the pollsters felt the need to get more specific. Do you
> favor war - if the U.S. goes around the United Nations? Do you favor war
> - even if ground troops are used? As the numbers curved lower, pollsters
> even asked if the public would still favor war if American ground troops
> suffered large casualties.
>
> Polls are a good way to measure how the country is absorbing politics;
> how the country is responding to the statements of our political
> leaders; how the public reacts to sabre-rattling by our enemies; and
> what we think of our "allies" at the UN. But the media are not just
> taking the country's temperature. They attempt to manipulate public
> opinion by touting results gleaned from sometimes loaded questions.
> What's even more fascinating is how the media selectively report their
> own poll results.
>
> In the pre-war buildup, ABC News found it necessary to report, as a
> formal news story, the polls showing support slipping for the White
> House. I'll buy that. But if that's true, how does ABC explain its
> decision not to tell viewers - as a formal news story - when their own
> poll numbers revealed growing support for the White House case?
>
> On January 21, Peter Jennings reported: "An ABC News/Washington Post
> poll finds that public support for attacking Iraq has declined somewhat:
> 57 percent of Americans now support U.S. military action to get rid of
> Saddam Hussein. It was 62 percent in mid-December, and as high as 78
> percent a few months after the 9-11 attacks."
>
> The ABC news judgment: the administration's lost support is news.

>
> A week later, hours before the State of the Union address, Jennings
> mentioned - mentioned - the number had risen four points back to 61
> percent figure on his newscast. But he did not describe it as an
> increase. And for good measure, he buried it under a stack of more
> liberal-pleasing numbers: "An ABC News poll for this occasion finds that
> 64 percent of Americans believe the UN weapons inspectors should be
> given a few more months to do their jobs, 61 percent support attacking
> Iraq eventually. But only 44 percent of American support a war if the UN
> does not approve."
>
> The ABC news judgment: the administration's growing support was not
> news.
>
> Do you doubt me? The night after the President spoke to Congress, ABC's
> pollsters found the number favoring war rose to 63 percent, but Peter
> Jennings only said "we conducted a poll when he was finished and we
> found that people had not changed their minds in significant numbers."
>
> So, in a nutshell, this is ABC's idea of news judgment: support for war
> dropping from 62 to 57 percent was worth a story isolating that fact.
> Rising back to 61 percent was not reported as a jump, and buried in one
> sentence of a larger story about other matters. Another bump to 63
> percent was dismissed as no change.
>
> Poor ABC News. It's hard to imagine how frustrating it must be for their
> reporters and their Canadian anchorman to report day after day why Bush
> is moving too rashly, why he isn't sophisticated enough for the French,
> and why it's wrong to use those gauche words like "evil" to describe the
> Iraqi regime -- and then see the polls go against them anyway. The
> numbers climbed after the State of the Union, jumped after Colin Powell
> laid out Iraqi deceit before the UN, and rose as people saw the
> strangeness of peace marches and live UN deliberations on TV.
>
> By March 10, Jennings reported how a new ABC News poll found that "61
> percent believe support from the UN Security Council is not necessary to
> attack." But he did not explain the number's significance: support had
> surged 17 points, up from 44 percent in January. The results were even
> worse for Jennings and his pro-UN cheerleading. ABC's "Poll Vault" Web
> site report showed the number for those who feel UN authorization is not
> necessary jumped to an almost-stratospheric 71 percent "if allies
> participate."
>
> Jennings and his ABC team have crusaded relentlessly against this war,
> and the public rejected them. Any day now, Jennings may again find the
> American people "threw a two-year-old temper tantrum." That's how he
> reacted after the 1994 Republican triumph - the last time democracy let
> him down.
>
>
>
> Jason Boxt
>
> Vice President

> Global Strategy Group
> 1825 Connecticut Ave, NW
> Fifth Floor
> Washington, D.C. 20009
>
> (202) 265-4676
> (202) 265-4619 (fax)
>
> www.globalstrategygroup.com <<http://www.globalstrategygroup.com/>>
>
>
>
> -----
> 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: Thu, 3 Apr 2003 11:37:06 -0500
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: Recent article on polling...
Comments: To: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>
In-Reply-To: <0ED62F7DC6311240A5F3A251086F74514C0D6B@gsg-mail01.globalstrategygroup.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Posting an article without indicating the source is a disservice to the list members. It also violates the author's copyright, which must be acknowledged when fair use is invoked.

FWIW, Mr. Bozell is the founder of the Media Research Center, a public relations organization whose main purpose is to provide right wing politicians with materials about "Liberal" bias in the media.

If the author didn't take every possible opportunity to smear Peter Jennings and ABC News as unpatriotic and unamerican (Canadian!), it might be worth investigating further. As is, it appears to be little more than a typical hatchet job.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Jason Boxt wrote:

> I haven't seen this posted on the list, but a friend just forwarded it
> to me. Would like some of your opinions on it. Thanks!
>
> Jason
>
>
> Playing Hide and Seek With Polls
>
> by L. Brent Bozell III
> March 18, 2003
>
> America loves democracy, where the mandates of government are determined
> by the consent of the governed. The public's temperature is gauged
> regularly - even daily - by a media obsessed with polling data on
> absolutely everything.
>
> But are these media surveys intended to document public opinion - or
> affect it?
>
> Take the war. At the outset of verbal hostilities, the media's pollsters
> asked the generic question: Do you favor war in Iraq? Maybe they felt
> the question too broad, or the number in agreement too high. Whatever
> the reason, the pollsters felt the need to get more specific. Do you
> favor war - if the U.S. goes around the United Nations? Do you favor war
> - even if ground troops are used? As the numbers curved lower, pollsters
> even asked if the public would still favor war if American ground troops
> suffered large casualties.
>
> Polls are a good way to measure how the country is absorbing politics;
> how the country is responding to the statements of our political
> leaders; how the public reacts to sabre-rattling by our enemies; and
> what we think of our "allies" at the UN. But the media are not just
> taking the country's temperature. They attempt to manipulate public
> opinion by touting results gleaned from sometimes loaded questions.
> What's even more fascinating is how the media selectively report their
> own poll results.
>
> In the pre-war buildup, ABC News found it necessary to report, as a
> formal news story, the polls showing support slipping for the White
> House. I'll buy that. But if that's true, how does ABC explain its
> decision not to tell viewers - as a formal news story - when their own
> poll numbers revealed growing support for the White House case?
>
> On January 21, Peter Jennings reported: "An ABC News/Washington Post
> poll finds that public support for attacking Iraq has declined somewhat:
> 57 percent of Americans now support U.S. military action to get rid of
> Saddam Hussein. It was 62 percent in mid-December, and as high as 78
> percent a few months after the 9-11 attacks."
>

> The ABC news judgment: the administration's lost support is news.
>
> A week later, hours before the State of the Union address, Jennings
> mentioned - mentioned - the number had risen four points back to 61
> percent figure on his newscast. But he did not describe it as an
> increase. And for good measure, he buried it under a stack of more
> liberal-pleasing numbers: "An ABC News poll for this occasion finds that
> 64 percent of Americans believe the UN weapons inspectors should be
> given a few more months to do their jobs, 61 percent support attacking
> Iraq eventually. But only 44 percent of American support a war if the UN
> does not approve."
>
> The ABC news judgment: the administration's growing support was not
> news.
>
> Do you doubt me? The night after the President spoke to Congress, ABC's
> pollsters found the number favoring war rose to 63 percent, but Peter
> Jennings only said "we conducted a poll when he was finished and we
> found that people had not changed their minds in significant numbers."
>
> So, in a nutshell, this is ABC's idea of news judgment: support for war
> dropping from 62 to 57 percent was worth a story isolating that fact.
> Rising back to 61 percent was not reported as a jump, and buried in one
> sentence of a larger story about other matters. Another bump to 63
> percent was dismissed as no change.
>
> Poor ABC News. It's hard to imagine how frustrating it must be for their
> reporters and their Canadian anchorman to report day after day why Bush
> is moving too rashly, why he isn't sophisticated enough for the French,
> and why it's wrong to use those gauche words like "evil" to describe the
> Iraqi regime -- and then see the polls go against them anyway. The
> numbers climbed after the State of the Union, jumped after Colin Powell
> laid out Iraqi deceit before the UN, and rose as people saw the
> strangeness of peace marches and live UN deliberations on TV.
>
> By March 10, Jennings reported how a new ABC News poll found that "61
> percent believe support from the UN Security Council is not necessary to
> attack." But he did not explain the number's significance: support had
> surged 17 points, up from 44 percent in January. The results were even
> worse for Jennings and his pro-UN cheerleading. ABC's "Poll Vault" Web
> site report showed the number for those who feel UN authorization is not
> necessary jumped to an almost-stratospheric 71 percent "if allies
> participate."
>
> Jennings and his ABC team have crusaded relentlessly against this war,
> and the public rejected them. Any day now, Jennings may again find the
> American people "threw a two-year-old temper tantrum." That's how he
> reacted after the 1994 Republican triumph - the last time democracy let
> him down.
>
>
>
> Jason Boxt
>

> Vice President
> Global Strategy Group
> 1825 Connecticut Ave, NW
> Fifth Floor
> Washington, D.C. 20009
>
> (202) 265-4676
> (202) 265-4619 (fax)
>
> www.globalstrategygroup.com <<http://www.globalstrategygroup.com/>>

> -----
> 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: Thu, 3 Apr 2003 12:12:57 -0500
Reply-To: Michael Bocian <michael_bocian@HOTMAIL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Michael Bocian <michael_bocian@HOTMAIL.COM>
Subject: VNS vs. NES
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; format=flowed

As many of you know, there are significant differences between the VNS exit polls and the NES survey data on voters. The differences are most stark and consistent on age and education. VNS has a larger proportion of college graduates, a smaller proportion of voters over 65 years, and a larger proportion of voters under 30 years. Does anyone know of articles that have been written that shed some light on these differences?

Much thanks,
Mike Bocian

Tired of spam? Get advanced junk mail protection with MSN 8.
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

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, 3 Apr 2003 13:25:12 -0500
Reply-To: "Ervin, Kelly ARI" <ErvinK@ARI.ARMY.MIL>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Ervin, Kelly ARI" <ErvinK@ARI.ARMY.MIL>
Subject: Maximum amount of text per page on a web survey
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Greetings!

Do any of you know of any literature that provides guidelines on the maximum amount of text that should/should not appear on each individual page of a web-base survey? Thanks so much!

Kelly

Kelly S. Ervin, Ph.D.
Survey Statistician
U.S. Army Research Institute for
Behavioral & Social Sciences
Army Personnel Survey Office
5001 Eisenhower Ave
Alexandria, Virginia 22333-5600
703-617-0319
703-617-7802 (fax)
DSN: 767-0319
Ervink@ari.army.mil

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, 3 Apr 2003 13:44:32 -0500
Reply-To: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Recent article on polling...
Comments: To: jwerner@jwdp.com
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

My most humble of humble apologies to all of those who had to be reminded of my blatant disregard for copyright laws et al...

[http://www.mediaresearch.org/BozellColumns/newscolumn/2003/col20030318.a
sp](http://www.mediaresearch.org/BozellColumns/newscolumn/2003/col20030318.asp)

Most apologetically,

Jason

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

From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com]=20

Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2003 11:37 AM

To: Jason Boxt

Cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Recent article on polling...

Posting an article without indicating the source is a disservice to the=20
list members. It also violates the author's copyright, which must be=20
acknowledged when fair use is invoked.

FWIW, Mr. Bozell is the founder of the Media Research Center, a public=20
relations organization whose main purpose is to provide right wing=20
politicians with materials about "Liberal" bias in the media.

If the author didn't take every possible opportunity to smear Peter=20
Jennings and ABC News as unpatriotic and unamerican (Canadian!), it=20
might be worth investigating further. As is, it appears to be little=20
more than a typical hatchet job.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Jason Boxt wrote:

> I haven't seen this posted on the list, but a friend just forwarded it

> to me. Would like some of your opinions on it. Thanks!

> =20

> Jason

> =20

> =20

> Playing Hide and Seek With Polls

> =20

> by L. Brent Bozell III

> March 18, 2003

> =20

> America loves democracy, where the mandates of government are=20

> determined by the consent of the governed. The public's temperature is

> gauged regularly - even daily - by a media obsessed with polling data=20

> on absolutely everything.

> =20

> But are these media surveys intended to document public opinion - or=20

> affect it?

> =20

- > Take the war. At the outset of verbal hostilities, the media's=20
- > pollsters asked the generic question: Do you favor war in Iraq? Maybe=20
- > they felt the question too broad, or the number in agreement too high.

- > Whatever the reason, the pollsters felt the need to get more specific.

- > Do you favor war - if the U.S. goes around the United Nations? Do you=20
- > favor war
- > - even if ground troops are used? As the numbers curved lower,
- pollsters
- > even asked if the public would still favor war if American ground
- troops
- > suffered large casualties.=20
- >=20
- > Polls are a good way to measure how the country is absorbing politics;

- > how the country is responding to the statements of our political=20
- > leaders; how the public reacts to sabre-rattling by our enemies; and=20
- > what we think of our "allies" at the UN. But the media are not just=20
- > taking the country's temperature. They attempt to manipulate public=20
- > opinion by touting results gleaned from sometimes loaded questions.=20
- > What's even more fascinating is how the media selectively report their

- > own poll results.
- >=20
- > In the pre-war buildup, ABC News found it necessary to report, as a=20
- > formal news story, the polls showing support slipping for the White=20
- > House. I'll buy that. But if that's true, how does ABC explain its=20
- > decision not to tell viewers - as a formal news story - when their own

- > poll numbers revealed growing support for the White House case?
- >=20
- > On January 21, Peter Jennings reported: "An ABC News/Washington Post=20
- > poll finds that public support for attacking Iraq has declined=20
- > somewhat: 57 percent of Americans now support U.S. military action to=20
- > get rid of Saddam Hussein. It was 62 percent in mid-December, and as=20
- > high as 78 percent a few months after the 9-11 attacks."
- >=20
- > The ABC news judgment: the administration's lost support is news.
- >=20
- > A week later, hours before the State of the Union address, Jennings=20
- > mentioned - mentioned - the number had risen four points back to 61=20
- > percent figure on his newscast. But he did not describe it as an=20
- > increase. And for good measure, he buried it under a stack of more=20
- > liberal-pleasing numbers: "An ABC News poll for this occasion finds=20
- > that 64 percent of Americans believe the UN weapons inspectors should=20
- > be given a few more months to do their jobs, 61 percent support=20
- > attacking Iraq eventually. But only 44 percent of American support a=20
- > war if the UN does not approve."
- >=20
- > The ABC news judgment: the administration's growing support was not=20
- > news.
- >=20
- > Do you doubt me? The night after the President spoke to Congress,=20

> ABC's pollsters found the number favoring war rose to 63 percent, but=20
> Peter Jennings only said "we conducted a poll when he was finished and

> we found that people had not changed their minds in significant=20
> numbers."
>=20
> So, in a nutshell, this is ABC's idea of news judgment: support for=20
> war dropping from 62 to 57 percent was worth a story isolating that=20
> fact. Rising back to 61 percent was not reported as a jump, and buried

> in one sentence of a larger story about other matters. Another bump to

> 63 percent was dismissed as no change.
>=20
> Poor ABC News. It's hard to imagine how frustrating it must be for=20
> their reporters and their Canadian anchorman to report day after day=20
> why Bush is moving too rashly, why he isn't sophisticated enough for=20
> the French, and why it's wrong to use those gauche words like "evil"=20
> to describe the Iraqi regime -- and then see the polls go against them

> anyway. The numbers climbed after the State of the Union, jumped after

> Colin Powell laid out Iraqi deceit before the UN, and rose as people=20
> saw the strangeness of peace marches and live UN deliberations on TV.
>=20
> By March 10, Jennings reported how a new ABC News poll found that "61=20
> percent believe support from the UN Security Council is not necessary=20
> to attack." But he did not explain the number's significance: support=20
> had surged 17 points, up from 44 percent in January. The results were=20
> even worse for Jennings and his pro-UN cheerleading. ABC's "Poll=20
> Vault" Web site report showed the number for those who feel UN=20
> authorization is not necessary jumped to an almost-stratospheric 71=20
> percent "if allies participate."
>=20
> Jennings and his ABC team have crusaded relentlessly against this war,

> and the public rejected them. Any day now, Jennings may again find the

> American people "threw a two-year-old temper tantrum." That's how he=20
> reacted after the 1994 Republican triumph - the last time democracy=20
> let him down.
>=20
>=20
>=20
> Jason Boxt
>=20
> Vice President
> Global Strategy Group=20
> 1825 Connecticut Ave, NW=20
> Fifth Floor=20
> Washington, D.C. 20009=20
>=20
> (202) 265-4676
> (202) 265-4619 (fax)

>=20
> www.globalstrategygroup.com <<http://www.globalstrategygroup.com/>>
>=20
> =20
>=20

> -----
> View the archives and control your settings for AAPORNET at:=20
> <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.
>=20
>=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: Thu, 3 Apr 2003 13:57:42 -0500
Reply-To: "Trussell, Norman" <Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Trussell, Norman" <Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>
Subject: Re: Maximum amount of text per page on a web survey
Comments: To: "Ervin, Kelly ARI" <ErvinK@ARI.ARMY.MIL>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

I recommend Jakob Nielsen's "Designing Web Usability". Geared toward
general web design, but the concepts are still relevant.

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

From: Ervin, Kelly ARI [<mailto:ErvinK@ARI.ARMY.MIL>]
Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2003 1:25 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Maximum amount of text per page on a web survey

Greetings!

Do any of you know of any literature that provides guidelines on the maximum
amount of text that should/should not appear on each individual page of a
web-base survey? Thanks so much!

Kelly

Kelly S. Ervin, Ph.D.
Survey Statistician
U.S. Army Research Institute for
Behavioral & Social Sciences
Army Personnel Survey Office
5001 Eisenhower Ave
Alexandria, Virginia 22333-5600

703-617-0319
703-617-7802 (fax)
DSN: 767-0319
Ervink@ari.army.mil

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: Thu, 3 Apr 2003 14:01:03 -0500
Reply-To: Eric Plutzer <exp12@PSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Eric Plutzer <exp12@PSU.EDU>
Subject: Diversity research
In-Reply-To: <200304010532.AAA133636@f05n16.cac.psu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

RE Rothman et al.'s study of diversity:

The real irony here is that Stanley Rothman has for years criticized the press for misrepresenting expert, scientific opinion on topics like nuclear power and biotechnology. Rothman has argued that even though the great majority of scientists find these technologies to be safe, the press finds one or two contrarian scientists to give an alternative view and then conveys to the public the idea that the scientific community is "divided."

The article in the Chronicle does exactly this, providing readers with the impression that one single study somehow undermines the research consensus based on dozens of other studies that use multiple methods, multiple operationalizations of success, and multiple samples.

And, as Jan Werner points out, the entire research effort rests on an operationalization of "success" that has no possible connection to the goals envisioned by diversity proponents. By this logic, it is clear that medical practice has been ineffective in promoting health and lengthening life because patient satisfaction reports have declined.

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, 3 Apr 2003 14:31:08 -0500
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re: Diversity research
Comments: To: Eric Plutzer <exp12@PSU.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

If nothing else, all of the commentary here is evidence that, on this particular topic at least, no amount of argument seems sufficient to alter the opinions of anyone who actually HAS an opinion. And after the Supreme Court rules, some of us will agree, some of us will disagree, but our opinions seem to be locked in stone.

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: Eric Plutzer [mailto:exp12@PSU.EDU]
Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2003 2:01 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Diversity research

RE Rothman et al.'s study of diversity:

The real irony here is that Stanley Rothman has for years criticized the press for misrepresenting expert, scientific opinion on topics like nuclear power and biotechnology. Rothman has argued that even though the great majority of scientists find these technologies to be safe, the press finds one or two contrarian scientists to give an alternative view and then conveys to the public the idea that the scientific community is "divided."

The article in the Chronicle does exactly this, providing readers with the impression that one single study somehow undermines the research consensus based on dozens of other studies that use multiple methods, multiple operationalizations of success, and multiple samples.

And, as Jan Werner points out, the entire research effort rests on an operationalization of "success" that has no possible connection to the goals envisioned by diversity proponents. By this logic, it is clear that medical practice has been ineffective in promoting health and lengthening life because patient satisfaction reports have declined.

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: Thu, 3 Apr 2003 16:08:11 -0500
Reply-To: Alice Robbin <arobbin@INDIANA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Alice Robbin <arobbin@INDIANA.EDU>
Subject: Re: Maximum amount of text per page on a web survey
Comments: To: "Trussell, Norman" <Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>
In-Reply-To:
<0BC5187E59E2D411A81000508BB0956904BA9EF0@nmrusdunsx6.nielsenmedia.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I highly recommend Mick Couper's workshop on designing surveys on the web that he taught last year and will repeat at our AAPOR May meeting. The last page of his workbook includes a very useful url that will link you with lots of good stuff:

www.websm.org

Don Dillman is also offering a workshop on "total design" for web surveys, I believe.

>
>
> Greetings!
>
> Do any of you know of any literature that provides guidelines on the maximum
> amount of text that should/should not appear on each individual page of a
> web-base survey? Thanks so much!
>
> Kelly
>
>
> Kelly S. Ervin, Ph.D.
> Survey Statistician
> U.S. Army Research Institute for
> Behavioral & Social Sciences
> Army Personnel Survey Office
> 5001 Eisenhower Ave
> Alexandria, Virginia 22333-5600
> 703-617-0319
> 703-617-7802 (fax)
> DSN: 767-0319
> Ervink@ari.army.mil
>

> -----
> 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.

>
>
>

Alice Robbin, Associate Professor
School of Library & Information Science
Indiana University
021 Main Library
1320 East 10th Street
Bloomington, IN 47405-3907
Office: (812) 855-5389 Fax: (812) 855-6166
Email: arobbin@indiana.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: Thu, 3 Apr 2003 22:29:46 -0500
Reply-To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Subject: Wall Street Journal: Is "diversity" on campus even a goal worth
pursuing?
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Here is a good conservative viewpoint from the Wall Street Journal re=20
diversity and affirmative action -- the author ends up with a conclusion=20
with which I personally disagree and which, while sounding plausible, is=20
pretty much unworkable and unrealistic....and probably unfair as a result.

Dick Halpern

JOHN FUND'S POLITICAL DIARY
Not So Affirmative
Is "diversity" on campus even a goal worth pursuing?

WJS, Thursday, April 3, 2003 12:01 a.m.

Diversity. Everyone talks about it. Everyone pledges support for it. It has become a civic religion. It is the backbone of the University of Michigan's legal argument before the Supreme Court this week: that racial discrimination is acceptable if the purpose is to achieve diversity.

But what if diversity isn't all it's cracked up to be? What if it actually has a negative impact when its adherents pursue it too zealously?

Those are the questions raised by a study conducted by three distinguished political scientists who surveyed 1,600 students and 2,400 faculty members and administrators at 140 institutions of higher learning. The authors are Stanley Rothman, a professor at Smith College, Neil Nevitte of the University of Toronto and Seymour Martin Lipset of Stanford University's Hoover Institution. Mr. Lipset has formerly headed the American Sociological Association as well as the American Political Science Association. In reporting on their findings, the New York Times acknowledged that "the study's authors have earned respect from academics on all sides of the affirmative action debate."

2b9ed4b.jpg

The authors found that while everyone pays lip service to diversity, there is a clear, usually quiet undercurrent of dissatisfaction with some of its effects. "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," says Mr. Rothman. Diversity seems to make race relations worse, not better.

That negative attitude may be wholly the result of the methods used to produce diversity. Those methods have silent majorities opposing them. A majority of faculty members oppose relaxing academic standards in order to promote diversity. Even administrators, who oversee diversity policies, are sharply divided, with a full 48% opposing racial preferences. While two-thirds of administrators don't believe that admitting minority students with lower academic qualifications affects academic standards, those who believe they have a negative effect outnumber those who think they have positive effects by a margin of 15 to 1. "Those who argue that diversity will improve the education of everybody haven't made their case," concludes Mr. Rothman. "The data do not support them."

Maybe that's why an obviously frantic University of Michigan felt compelled

to collect a record-breaking 78 friend-of-the-court briefs supporting its position. Michigan assigns 20 bonus points (on a 150-point scale) to black, Hispanic and American Indian applicants to the college; a similar system of racial preferences exists at the law school. Applicants from other ethnic groups, including whites, Asians and Arab-Americans, are held to a higher standard. All of this is designed to promote diversity, which defendant Lee Bollinger (formerly president of the University of Michigan, now at Columbia) has said is "as essential" to education "as the study of the Middle Ages, of international politics and of Shakespeare.

The briefs backing Mr. Bollinger came from dozens of leading companies, labor unions, three former chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and members of Congress. All of them cite diversity's benefits, but they offer scant evidence and little data.

Indeed, some engage in outright deception. Peter Wood, a professor of anthropology and author of "Diversity: The Invention of a Concept," was appalled at what some of the material in the briefs--and he looked at only a few of them. Indiana University's law school, for example, claimed that it gave great weight to law school board scores and undergraduate grades in determining admissions. The school claimed that race was at the end of a long list of "other factors" it looked at. In reality, half of the students are admitted on the basis of their test scores and half of those go into a pool where race is a prime factor in the decision. The Hoosier Review, a student publication, quoted a former admissions committee member as saying that "to meet de facto quotas, we leapfrog less qualified minority applicants over approximately 330 more qualified nonminority applicants." An internal law school memo mentioned the "concern that a minimum of five blacks per section of the first years class is needed." But in practice the quota is a ceiling as well as a floor. Indiana University has seen the number of black applicants to its law school nearly double in the past three years, but the number of blacks admitted is a rigid number (52, 52 and 53).

No doubt many other peculiar practices in admissions policies lurk behind the benign arguments that so many law schools are making before the Supreme Court.

The brief submitted by 28 private colleges and universities defending their use of race to classify applicants contains a breathtaking sentence describing the aftermath of the 1978 Bakke Supreme Court decision that declared quotas unconstitutional but has been interpreted as allowing the

goal of a diverse student body to be weighed in admissions decisions:="After Bakke, each of the [schools] . . . reviewed their admissions procedures in light of Justice [Lewis] Powell's opinion sketching out a permissible approach (which five justices plainly supported), and set sail accordingly." In fact, no other justice joined the relevant portion of Powell's decision. And, as Mr. Woods notes, "we have gone 25 years without a Supreme Court opinion in which any other justice has endorsed Powell's 'permissible approach.' "

2b9ed55.jpg

It would be in the best interest of the country if the Supreme Court the bullet and ended 25 years of uncertainty on the constitutionality of the diversity shell game. Despite massive efforts at propagandizing the benefits of diversity, it hasn't won over nearly as many adherents as the true believers like to think. In a survey last week, only 41% of University of Michigan students backed the school's racial preferences. "Affirmative action, as it's practiced or even imagined, is a half-baked effort," says student Johanna Hanink. "It might be putting students in the seats, but the diversity we're getting out from different-colored people isn't close, for most of us, to the kind that Bollinger envisions."

How can one square Michigan's program with the Constitution's prohibition against racial discrimination? Aggressive outreach to find quality minority candidates is important, but pushing minority candidates into schools they're not ready for doesn't do them or the school any favors. Ultimately, the damage a poor education does to a kid in the lower grades can't be remedied by diversity intervention in his or her teenage years. That's why school-choice programs that provide real alternatives to help students in failing public schools may be the best and most effective affirmative action around.

Copyright © 2003 Dow Jones & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

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, 4 Apr 2003 12:03:11 +0100
Reply-To: "Matthew H. Fleming" <m.fleming@UCL.AC.UK>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Matthew H. Fleming" <m.fleming@UCL.AC.UK>
Subject: interviewing prisoners
MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear list members:

I'm new to the list, so I hope that my message is in line with list protocol. In any case, I'm evaluating a police-related project in the UK, and I am wondering if anyone has any thoughts on interviewing convicted offenders (in prison). I am interested in any general work on the subject (though I have a strong survey-research background, I have not yet in my career interviewed prisoners, so a guidance note-type document would be quite useful). Further, I would welcome any thoughts surrounding response validity and strategic response. Might anyone know of literature on interviewing prisoners (or on interviewing other potentially difficult groups) and on issues of validity/strategic response?

Please feel free to email either on or off-list. I will compile responses, assuming I get any, and post them in due course.

Thanks so much.

Matt Fleming
Research Fellow
University College London

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, 4 Apr 2003 10:56:34 -0500
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Subject: Wash Times--Occupational hazards...
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The Washington Times
Friday, April 4, 2003, page A7

Inside the Beltway
Political tidbits and other shenanigans from around the nation's capital.
<http://www.washingtontimes.com/national/20030404-89481358.htm>

By John McCaslin

Suspicious stash

Erstwhile Washington political pollster Frank Luntz got a rude awakening while traversing the globe to conduct focus groups on the Iraqi war.

Mr. Luntz's focus sessions on behalf of NBC in Egypt, the West Bank and Israel went off without a hitch, but the pollster wasn't so lucky in Turkey, where he suddenly found himself "embedded" with antiwar demonstrators.

So embedded that the mob of Istanbul protesters gladly handed the hapless pollster an assortment of anti-American placards, including one poster that read "Dump Bush, Not Bombs."

Protesting, er, polling completed, Mr. Luntz decided he would display the anti-American mementos that same evening upon arrival in Israel, during his scheduled appearance on MSNBC's "Hardball" with Chris Matthews.

Except that when Mr. Luntz, whose wardrobe more often resembles a protester than a pollster, tried to carry his political stash through the Istanbul airport, more than a dozen police and security officials swarmed over him.

They not only seized his passport and anti-American materials, they detained him long enough to cause him to miss his flight.

Mr. Luntz obviously missed the lesson that every American visiting Turkey should have learned from the movie "Midnight Express."

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: Fri, 4 Apr 2003 09:33:47 -0700

Reply-To: Doris Northrup <coda89@AOL.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Doris Northrup <coda89@AOL.COM>

Subject: web-based survey software

We are interested in purchasing web survey design software. We have been considering Perseus' Survey Solutions, advanced version. Does anyone have any experience with this package or anything better to recommend in the price range of \$3000 - \$5000?

Please respond directly to me and I'll share the responses with all.

Doris Northrup
CODA, Inc.
coda89@aol.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: Fri, 4 Apr 2003 21:16:34 -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 - new data
In-Reply-To: <200303310201.h2V21Kk12550@student.bard.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Interesting thread! See the two questions from the April 2-3, 2003 CBS News poll below. 62% believe that the war with Iraq is a part of the war on terrorism--51% say a major part. 53% think Saddam Hussein was personally involved in Sept. 11. I would be interested to see if there are differences by political party and by those who have family members in the war.

If asked in a poll, I would probably say this war is in part about terrorism--and the Bush Administration apparently thinks so, even though I understand that there is no clear evidence that Saddam Hussein was personally involved. On a socio-psychological level, after Sept. 11 I expect that our nation looks at all events through a new prism. The social psychology of our collective actions and beliefs as they relate to Sept. 11 could be interesting. What are key questions you would want to ask in a survey to examine a socio-psychological perspective as it relates to the war on Iraq and terrorism? Hummmmmmm.....

mark

q27 Do you think of the war with Iraq as part of the war on terrorism, or do you think of it as separate from the war on terrorism? ASK IF PART OF WAR ON TERROR: Is it a major part of the war on terrorism, or a minor part of the war on terrorism?

*** TOTAL RESPONDENTS ***

** Gender **

	Total	Men	Women
	%	%	%
Major part	51	52	51
Minor part	11	10	12
Separate from war on terror	31	31	30
DK/NA	7	7	7

q28 Do you think Saddam Hussein was personally involved in the September 11th, 2001 terrorist attacks against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon?

Mar03b

3/7-9

Yes	53	52	54
-----	----	----	----

45
No 34 37 30
40
DK/NA 13 11 16
15

Mark David Richards

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Mark Lindeman
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2003 9:01 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: False beliefs and the war

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 legitmate 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

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, 5 Apr 2003 13:04:37 -0500

Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

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

Subject: Wash Post--Poll: More Say War Justified Without Finding Weapons

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Post-ABC News Poll

Poll: More Say War Justified Without Finding Weapons

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A31223-2003Apr4.html>

washingtonpost.com

Poll: More Say War Justified Without Finding Weapons

By Richard Morin and Claudia Deane

Washington Post Staff Writers

Saturday, April 5, 2003; Page A26

A growing majority of Americans believe the war in Iraq is justified even if the United States does not find weapons of mass destruction. At the same time, public optimism about the progress of the fighting has surged as recent gains on the battlefield have eased fears that the allies will become bogged down in a long and costly war, according to a new Washington Post-ABC News poll.

The survey found that more than nine out of 10 Americans believe the war is going well. Nearly half -- 47 percent -- said the conflict is going "very well," up 13 percentage points in a week.

But that upbeat assessment could just as quickly become more guarded, the survey suggested. Eight in 10 Americans see a hard and bloody battle immediately ahead as U.S. troops mass outside Baghdad for what may be the showdown with forces loyal to Iraqi President Saddam Hussein.

"I think they'll probably get into chemical warfare," said Marlene Montgomery, 56, a homemaker who lives in Portsmouth, Ohio. "And I think they'll get into a battle, heavy. But I think they're prepared."

More than two-thirds of those interviewed -- 69 percent -- said that going to war with Iraq was the right thing to do even if the United States fails to turn up biological or chemical weapons, up from 53 percent in a survey taken the day after the war started.

President Bush has repeatedly said Iraq has weapons of mass destruction, a claim that was central to the administration's rationale for going to war. So far, allied forces have not found any chemical or biological weapons, although they have found large Iraqi stores of special clothing used to protect soldiers from chemical or biological agents.

But the poll and follow-up interviews with some survey participants suggested that relatively few Americans are disturbed that no hard evidence that Iraq currently possesses these weapons has yet surfaced. Many said they would not be bothered if none was ever found.

"I would not feel that I had been sold a bill of goods by the Bush administration," said Brad Stephens, 27, a law student living in Morgantown, W.Va. "I think the guy [Hussein] is a threat. If nothing else, he's paying the families of Palestinian suicide bombers. That alone is enough to show his militant stance toward the West."

But others worry what the rest of the world will think of the United States if no hard evidence of chemical, biological or nuclear weapons is uncovered.

The war "will seem like an overzealous act on the part of the United States and Britain if we don't find anything," said Kevin Scollans, 60, an engineer who lives in Denville, N.J. "I would feel a lot better if we do, being that I support the war. I think it will leave a lot less questions to be answered."

The survey also found that overall support for the war remains strong. Three in four Americans approve of the decision to invade Iraq and 58 percent strongly support the conflict -- figures that have not changed since the war broke out more than two weeks ago.

Bush's overall job approval rating continues to rise and now stands at 71 percent, its highest level since late last summer. A majority of Americans -- 54 percent -- strongly approve of the job Bush is doing as president, up 16 points in a month and higher than at any time in more than a year.

A total of 511 randomly selected adults were interviewed Thursday night for this Post-ABC News poll. Margin of sampling error for the overall results is plus or minus 5 percentage points.

One in four Americans continue to oppose the war in Iraq, a proportion that has not fluctuated despite shifting views of the coalition's progress. Democrats remain the most divided in their support: 52 percent said they backed the war, while 42 percent opposed it. In contrast, 95 percent of Republicans are behind the invasion.

Peter Baish, 23, a graphic designer in Fairfax, is one of the opponents. "It seemed to me anyway that there is no clear link between Iraq and terrorism, and that seemed like one of the reasons the administration was using as a justification," Baish said. "I do feel oil plays a big part. I don't want to be cynical, but it seems pretty obvious to me that by getting Iraq into some kind of democracy and having them more

economically tied to us, it will be a huge benefit."

Overall, the poll found that fears that the war with Iraq will be long and bloody have ebbed in the past week. Less than half of all Americans -- 44 percent -- now expect the war to last months, down from 57 percent last week. And the proportion that anticipates a significant number of additional casualties has fallen from 82 percent to 69 percent.

And while a majority of Americans say the Iraqi resistance is about what they expected, the proportion that say enemy soldiers are putting up a tough fight has declined in the past week from 28 percent to 17 percent.

"Actually I think it's going really, really well," said Alan Nealley, 34, a high school teacher who lives in Sonoma, Calif. "Going into the war, I was expecting to have really high casualties from this one. I've been kind of relieved that the number of casualties has been as few as it has been."

Nearly two in three -- 63 percent -- said they believe that U.S. military leaders did not underestimate the difficulty of the war, while 33 percent disagreed. The public was somewhat more critical of the Bush administration: 57 percent said administration officials had not miscalculated how hard it would be to defeat the Iraqis while 39 percent said they had.

© 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: Sat, 5 Apr 2003 15:14:17 -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: Wash Post--Poll: More Say War Justified Without Finding Weapons
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Finding WMDs has declined in importance. Since the earlier poll was taken, numerous large stockpiles of protective clothing, gas masks, and antidotes have been discovered. This chemical gear is presumed to be for offensive purposes, not for defensive reasons according to news reports.

So one reason for the change could be that finding circumstantial

evidence is just as good, sufficient justification for many Americans.

11. Do you think the United States will be able to justify this war ONLY if it finds weapons of mass destruction, such as chemical or biological weapons, in Iraq; or do you think the United States will be able to justify this war for other reasons, even if it does NOT find weapons of mass destruction in Iraq?

	Justify only if find WMD	Justify even if no WMD	Neither/No justification	No opinion
4/3/03	22	69	6	3
3/20/03	35	53	7	6

Also, other factors may have increased as reasons for justification.

Nick

Mark David Richards wrote:

- >
- > Post-ABC News Poll
- > Poll: More Say War Justified Without Finding Weapons
- >
- > <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A31223-2003Apr4.html>
- >
- > washingtonpost.com
- > Poll: More Say War Justified Without Finding Weapons
- >
- > By Richard Morin and Claudia Deane
- > Washington Post Staff Writers
- > Saturday, April 5, 2003; Page A26
- >
- > A growing majority of Americans believe the war in Iraq is justified
- > even if the United States does not find weapons of mass destruction. At
- > the same time, public optimism about the progress of the fighting has
- > surged as recent gains on the battlefield have eased fears that the
- > allies will become bogged down in a long and costly war, according to a
- > new Washington Post-ABC News poll.
- >
- > The survey found that more than nine out of 10 Americans believe the war
- > is going well. Nearly half -- 47 percent -- said the conflict is going
- > "very well," up 13 percentage points in a week.
- >
- > But that upbeat assessment could just as quickly become more guarded,
- > the survey suggested. Eight in 10 Americans see a hard and bloody battle
- > immediately ahead as U.S. troops mass outside Baghdad for what may be
- > the showdown with forces loyal to Iraqi President Saddam Hussein.
- >
- > "I think they'll probably get into chemical warfare," said Marlene
- > Montgomery, 56, a homemaker who lives in Portsmouth, Ohio. "And I think
- > they'll get into a battle, heavy. But I think they're prepared."
- >
- > More than two-thirds of those interviewed -- 69 percent -- said that
- > going to war with Iraq was the right thing to do even if the United
- > States fails to turn up biological or chemical weapons, up from 53
- > percent in a survey taken the day after the war started.

>
> President Bush has repeatedly said Iraq has weapons of mass destruction,
> a claim that was central to the administration's rationale for going to
> war. So far, allied forces have not found any chemical or biological
> weapons, although they have found large Iraqi stores of special clothing
> used to protect soldiers from chemical or biological agents.
>
> But the poll and follow-up interviews with some survey participants
> suggested that relatively few Americans are disturbed that no hard
> evidence that Iraq currently possesses these weapons has yet surfaced.
> Many said they would not be bothered if none was ever found.
>
> "I would not feel that I had been sold a bill of goods by the Bush
> administration," said Brad Stephens, 27, a law student living in
> Morgantown, W.Va. "I think the guy [Hussein] is a threat. If nothing
> else, he's paying the families of Palestinian suicide bombers. That
> alone is enough to show his militant stance toward the West."
>
> But others worry what the rest of the world will think of the United
> States if no hard evidence of chemical, biological or nuclear weapons is
> uncovered.
>
> The war "will seem like an overzealous act on the part of the United
> States and Britain if we don't find anything," said Kevin Scollans, 60,
> an engineer who lives in Denville, N.J. "I would feel a lot better if we
> do, being that I support the war. I think it will leave a lot less
> questions to be answered."
>
> The survey also found that overall support for the war remains strong.
> Three in four Americans approve of the decision to invade Iraq and 58
> percent strongly support the conflict -- figures that have not changed
> since the war broke out more than two weeks ago.
>
> Bush's overall job approval rating continues to rise and now stands at
> 71 percent, its highest level since late last summer. A majority of
> Americans -- 54 percent -- strongly approve of the job Bush is doing as
> president, up 16 points in a month and higher than at any time in more
> than a year.
>
> A total of 511 randomly selected adults were interviewed Thursday night
> for this Post-ABC News poll. Margin of sampling error for the overall
> results is plus or minus 5 percentage points.
>
> One in four Americans continue to oppose the war in Iraq, a proportion
> that has not fluctuated despite shifting views of the coalition's
> progress. Democrats remain the most divided in their support: 52 percent
> said they backed the war, while 42 percent opposed it. In contrast, 95
> percent of Republicans are behind the invasion.
>
> Peter Baish, 23, a graphic designer in Fairfax, is one of the opponents.
> "It seemed to me anyway that there is no clear link between Iraq and
> terrorism, and that seemed like one of the reasons the administration
> was using as a justification," Baish said. "I do feel oil plays a big
> part. I don't want to be cynical, but it seems pretty obvious to me that

> by getting Iraq into some kind of democracy and having them more
> economically tied to us, it will be a huge benefit."
>
> Overall, the poll found that fears that the war with Iraq will be long
> and bloody have ebbed in the past week. Less than half of all Americans
> -- 44 percent -- now expect the war to last months, down from 57 percent
> last week. And the proportion that anticipates a significant number of
> additional casualties has fallen from 82 percent to 69 percent.
>
> And while a majority of Americans say the Iraqi resistance is about what
> they expected, the proportion that say enemy soldiers are putting up a
> tough fight has declined in the past week from 28 percent to 17 percent.
>
> "Actually I think it's going really, really well," said Alan Nealley,
> 34, a high school teacher who lives in Sonoma, Calif. "Going into the
> war, I was expecting to have really high casualties from this one. I've
> been kind of relieved that the number of casualties has been as few as
> it has been."
>
> Nearly two in three -- 63 percent -- said they believe that U.S.
> military leaders did not underestimate the difficulty of the war, while
> 33 percent disagreed. The public was somewhat more critical of the Bush
> administration: 57 percent said administration officials had not
> miscalculated how hard it would be to defeat the Iraqis while 39 percent
> said they had.
>
> C 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

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, 6 Apr 2003 22:09:36 -0400
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: [Fwd: Privacy and Confidentiality informational web site]
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The following was posted today on SRMSNET.

It is reposted here for the benefit of AAPOR members who do not subscribe to SRMSNET. The usual apologies for any cross-posting.

Jan Werner

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

Subject: Privacy and Confidentiality informational web site
Date: Sun, 6 Apr 2003 20:39:35 -0400
From: Alan Zaslavsky <zaslavsk@HCP.MED.HARVARD.EDU>
Reply-To: Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA
<SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU>
To: SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU

Dear SRMSnetters:

A subcommittee of the American Statistical Association Committee on Privacy and Confidentiality is now going public with the first phase of its Web site project. This is an informational site with links to a wide variety of materials, mostly available on the Web.

The site can be found at

<http://www.amstat.org/comm/cmtepc>

I invite you take a look and give your comments, whether general or quite specific. (If you write to me I will forward to the committee. There is also a link for sending comments and suggestions on the Web site itself.) In the future, in addition to adding further references, we hope to structure more basic educational materials into the site so it can be used as a training tool as well as a reference resource.

Much appreciation is due to the leadership group of Kim McGuigan, Al Zarate, Gerald Gates, and consultant Joyce Weil as well as the members of the P&C Committee and of the external advisory committee for this project (listed on the site). We look forward to your comments.

best regards
Alan Zaslavsky

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, 6 Apr 2003 22:28:08 -0500
Reply-To: Rick Weil <fweil@COX.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Rick Weil <fweil@COX.NET>
Subject: Summary of response: Abusive respondent; Student access to phone banks

MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

A summary of feedback to my question, mostly from university survey lab directors, supervisors, etc. -

Everyone said that abusive respondents, as I described one, were very rare. There were a couple suggestions for reassuring skeptical respondents (callback numbers to campus police, or to the department, as we already do). Some people suggested notifying the city or campus police and other authorities ahead of time that we are conducting a poll in case a complaint comes to them.

More central to my concern, everyone also said that the phone banks at their survey labs could be used at no charge for instruction. A couple people were shocked that we don't have access.

A couple provisos: long distance usage would be charged, and access to cati equipment might be regulated (neither our situation), and provisions for supervision would have to be made (instructor provided or charged) so that nothing in the lab is harmed. One person suggested running faculty and staff extensions into a "call room" for after-hour usage. Another noted that publicity from the surveys carries its own rewards to the university. There were a couple suggestions that there might be other phone banks at the university or alumni center.

Many thanks to everyone. I'll prepare a case to argue for our access.

Rick Weil

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

From: "Rick Weil" <fweil@COX.NET>
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2003 11:23 AM
Subject: Abusive respondent; Student access to phone banks

I'd like feedback about an issue that came up. Please reply off-list, and I'll summarize answers for the list, unless you want to send an on-list comment of general interest.

I teach a sociology methods class, and for the 4th year, we're doing a local survey (see <http://members.cox.net/fweil/s2211guide.html>). The students design, conduct, & analyze the survey with my guidance. The content is GSS/NES-style omnibus; universe is general population in our parish (county); sample is telephone purchased from Genesys; N is 400+ completed; and we've had good reception: several news reports, and the mayor visited the class last year & plans to visit this year. Nice project.

One problem we've had is that the students have no access to university phone banks and have to call from their own phones or make alternative arrangements. I've told the students that their safety has the highest

priority, and they can block their outgoing caller ID if they want - even though this can affect the sample representativeness. (Other students have agreed to try numbers that auto-refuse blocked calls.)

This year a student reached an abusive & threatening respondent - sounded like an older man. The student called from his parents' phone, didn't block the outgoing caller ID, and the R called the police, who called the student/parents. The student and parents were very upset, & contacted me and the dept chair. To avoid further complications, I gave the student permission to stop interviewing. This is the first instance of this magnitude in 4 years of the project, ie, out of 8,000+ call attempts.

2 Questions -

1. Has anyone noticed an increase in abusive respondents? If so, any thoughts about reasons? I haven't noticed any major trend in response rate in our short 4 years; and I've thought about the usual possible reasons for R non-cooperation.

2. More importantly, I'd like to argue for access to a university phone bank so as to avoid the problem becoming this big. How do people at different universities handle access to phone banks for instructional purposes. It doesn't have to be a CATI system, as long as it's university phones with a blocked- or university caller ID. Note: our survey research lab director has denied us access with the argument that all projects have to be self-financing, but our department contributes to the lab's support. Do people think this gives me grounds to argue for access? What's been your experience?

As I said, reply off-list & I'll summarize answers, or on-list if you think it's of general interest.

Thanks much. Rick Weil

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

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, 7 Apr 2003 08:49:57 -0400
Reply-To: "Ervin, Kelly ARI" <ErvinK@ARI.ARMY.MIL>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Ervin, Kelly ARI" <ErvinK@ARI.ARMY.MIL>
Subject: How much text in Web Surveys

MIME-version: 1.0

All,

Here is an interesting response that I received.

Kelly

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

From: Roske-Shelton, Renate [mailto:Renate.Roske-Shelton@ssa.gov]

Sent: Friday, April 04, 2003 1:00 PM

To: 'Ervin, Kelly ARI'

Cc: 'roskehf@cs.com'; Roske-Shelton, Renate

Subject: Re: how much trest

Kelly:

As a usability engineer, a question like yours to the AAPOR listserv gives me great consternation. There is NO READY ANSWER for your inquiry of how much text should be on a page of a web survey! The reason for this is that the answer begs for a more contextual approach. With web surveys you are at the intersection of Usability Engineering (font size, text length, contrast, layout, widgetry-etc) all of which influence both cognitive and manual performance and Survey Design (understandability, effectiveness, validity -etc.). It all boils down to understandability (readability) on the part of the user (respondent). Text pages become screen presentations for the user with "response affordances" and it is not so much the "filled page" that should be fretted over in design but the total user experience of reading the display, understanding the content, deciding upon a response, and executing (indicating) a response (mouse-click) in a way that leads to desirable survey results, i.e. let's the respondent indicate the choice that he/she intended. The best way to know for sure is to employ usability testing with the finished result and prompt for comments about "too much text". If you get these then re-design.

FYI - the following factors which may apply are supported with empirical data (multiple sources):

Font size for most folks should be at least 12 pt.

Best readability contrast is achieved with black on light type.

Use mixed Caps text - this is easier to read.

Leave sufficient white space to (de)mark any single question.

Employ border frames or other demarcation devices to indicate which items go together.

Use radio buttons only when only one option can be selected.

Use "slider widgets" for continuous choices with a numerical popup readout (as in 6.5") but label the extremes and the midpoint.

Employ drop down menus for specified answers but put the entry "Please Choose" in the visible menu default option.

Don't ever require the user to scroll horizontally!

Vertical scrolling is ok but folks in generally don't know how to use all of windows application functionality (jump to top, bottom, increment, etc.)

Keep the survey flow from top to bottom - this is how folks respond naturally.

Use NEXT and BACK buttons when possible for different page sections (do allow people to go back and change/reference - just keep track of this within a single session.

If presenting in "page format" tell the user how many more pages (questions there are).

If responses to questions are timed - let the user know.

Warn the user BEFORE a time-out occurs and give them the option of CONTINUE to reset

the timer.

If you'd like further specific information I'll be glad to help and share what we have found in our testing labs at Social Security.

A book that I thought was a great reminder of many aspects of survey design (online or not) is "How to conduct your own survey" by Priscilla Salant and Don Dillman. (John Wiley 1994). That combined with the previous suggestions on Nielsen Usability should about address all the issues.

(PS - The AAPOR listserv would not let me post from here (this e-mail address) so I am sending this to you directly - feel free to share with the rest of the AAPOR folks by submitting to the list).

Thanks and Cheers,

Renate

Renate Roske-Shelton, Ph.D.

E-Government Usability and Testing

Division of Usability, Accessibility, and Security

Lockheed Martin Technology Services

SSA phone (410) 966- 9262

Cell phone (410) 279-2481

Renate Roske-Shelton

SSA phone (410) 966- 9262

Cell phone (410) 279-2481

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, 7 Apr 2003 09:35:07 -0500

Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>

Subject: Inquiry

Comments: cc: carolyn@marketquest.ca

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Would anyone be able to answer this individual's question? Please =
respond directly to Carolyn O'Keefe at carolyn@marketquest.ca =20

=20

=20

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

From: Carolyn O'Keefe [<mailto:carolyn@marketquest.ca>]

Sent: Monday, April 07, 2003 8:35 AM

To: AAPOR-INFO
Subject: inquiry

Hi:
=20

I am the manager of a Canadian based Market Research firm. We are =
currently conducting telephone surveys in the New England region of the =
US. I have heard that there is some new legislation making it illegal to =
make telemarketing and research calls in the state of Mass. Is this =
true? We have received a fair number of complaints from households in =
the region.

=20
Please advise
=20

Carolyn O'Keefe
Research Manager
Market Quest Research
Ph: (709) 753-5172 Fax: (709) 738-5288

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, 7 Apr 2003 11:36:30 -0400
Reply-To: Mark Lamias <Mark.Lamias@GRIZZARD.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark Lamias <Mark.Lamias@GRIZZARD.COM>
Subject: Re: How much text in Web Surveys
Comments: To: "Ervin, Kelly ARI" <ErvinK@ARI.ARMY.MIL>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Kelly,

You may want to check out the following citation:

Couper, Mick P., Beatty, Paul, Hansen, Sue Ellen, Lamias, Mark J.,
Marvin, Theresa. CAPI Design Recommendations. Report Submitted to the
Bureau of Labor Statistics. Interface Design Group, Survey Methodology
Program, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan.

The authors cite a study by Grabinger and Osman-Jouchoux (1996), where they
discovered the optimal line length to be around 45-60 characters (8-10
words).

Sincerely yours,

Mark J. Lamias

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

From: Ervin, Kelly ARI [mailto:ErvinK@ARI.ARMY.MIL]
Sent: Monday, April 07, 2003 8:50 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: How much text in Web Surveys

All,

Here is an interesting response that I received.

Kelly

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

From: Roske-Shelton, Renate [mailto:Renate.Roske-Shelton@ssa.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 04, 2003 1:00 PM
To: 'Ervin, Kelly ARI'
Cc: 'roskeh@cs.com'; Roske-Shelton, Renate
Subject: Re: how much trext

Kelly:

As a usability engineer, a question like yours to the AAPOR listserv gives me great consternation. There is NO READY ANSWER for your inquiry of how much text should be on a page of a web survey! The reason for this is that the answer begs for a more contextual approach. With web surveys you are at the intersection of Usability Engineering (font size, text length, contrast, layout, widgetry-etc) all of which influence both cognitive and manual performance and Survey Design (understandability, effectiveness, validity -etc.). It all boils down to understandability (readability) on the part of the user (respondent). Text pages become screen presentations for the user with "response affordances" and it is not so much the "filled page" that should be fretted over in design but the total user experience of reading the display, understanding the content, deciding upon a response, and executing (indicating) a response (mouse-click) in a way that leads to desirable survey results, i.e. let's the respondent indicate the choice that he/she intended. The best way to know for sure is to employ usability testing with the finished result and prompt for comments about "too much text". If you get these then re-design.

FYI - the following factors which may apply are supported with empirical data (multiple sources):

Font size for most folks should be at least 12 pt.

Best readability contrast is achieved with black on light type.

Use mixed Caps text - this is easier to read.

Leave sufficient white space to (de)mark any single question.

Employ border frames or other demarcation devices to indicate which items go together.

Use radio buttons only when only one option can be selected.

Use "slider widgets" for continuous choices with a numerical popup readout (as in 6.5") but label the extremes and the midpoint.

Employ drop down menus for specified answers but put the entry "Please Choose" in the visible menu default option.

Don't ever require the user to scroll horizontally!

Vertical scrolling is ok but folks in generally don't know how to use all of windows application functionality (jump to top, bottom, increment, etc.)

Keep the survey flow from top to bottom - this is how folks respond naturally.

Use NEXT and BACK buttons when possible for different page sections (do allow people to go back and change/reference - just keep track of this within a single session.

If presenting in "page format" tell the user how many more pages (questions there are).

If responses to questions are timed - let the user know.

Warn the user BEFORE a time-out occurs and give them the option of CONTINUE to reset

the timer.

If you'd like further specific information I'll be glad to help and share what we have found in our testing labs at Social Security.

A book that I thought was a great reminder of many aspects of survey design (online or not) is "How to conduct your own survey" by Priscilla Salant and Don Dillman. (John Wiley 1994). That combined with the previous suggestions on Nielsen Usability should about address all the issues.

(PS - The AAPOR listserv would not let me post from here (this e-mail address) so I am sending this to you directly - feel free to share with the rest of the AAPOR folks by submitting to the list).

Thanks and Cheers,

Renate

Renate Roske-Shelton, Ph.D.

E-Government Usability and Testing

Division of Usability, Accessibility, and Security

Lockheed Martin Technology Services

SSA phone (410) 966- 9262

Cell phone (410) 279-2481

Renate Roske-Shelton

SSA phone (410) 966- 9262

Cell phone (410) 279-2481

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: Mon, 7 Apr 2003 08:57:48 -0700

Reply-To: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>

Subject: Re: How much text in Web Surveys

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

My two bits of contribution to what has been said:

1. Scrolling and page breaks need to be balanced with the awareness of = natural content breaks and some common sense. Too many page breaks and = the load time tests the patience of respondents and leads to = terminations. Too much scrolling and it creates a sense that the survey = never ends, plus the page may not load as quickly as necessary. =20
2. Keep graphics to an absolute minimum and when necessary, save images = with as few bytes as possible. =20
3. KISS: as with any writing, the fewest words and the simplest = sentence structure lead to quick comprehension. Writing plainly is not = dumbing down: it's recognizing that you don't want to create unnecessary = barriers. For example, you don't need to repeat the scale for each = question when it's in plain view.=20

leora

Leora Lawton, Ph.D.
Director of Consumer & Demographic Research
Population Research Systems, LLC
A Member of the FSC Group
100 Spear, Suite 1700
San Francisco, CA 94105
v: 415 777-0707, ex. 117; f: 415 777-2420;
m: 510 928-7572
www.populationresearchsystems.com

This information is intended solely for the individual or entity named = as the recipient hereof and may be, or contain privileged (i.e. attorney-client), confidential and/or proprietary information. If you = are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this transmission is prohibited. = If you have received this communication in error, please notify us = immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and = destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Mark Lamias [mailto:Mark.Lamias@GRIZZARD.COM]
> Sent: Monday, April 07, 2003 8:37 AM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Re: How much text in Web Surveys
>=20
>=20
> Kelly,
>=20

> You may want to check out the following citation:

>=20

> Couper, Mick P., Beatty, Paul, Hansen, Sue Ellen,=20

> Lamias, Mark J.,

> Marvin, Theresa. CAPI Design Recommendations. Report=20

> Submitted to the

> Bureau of Labor Statistics. Interface Design Group, Survey=20

> Methodology

> Program, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan.

>=20

> The authors cite a study by Grabinger and Osman-Jouchoux=20

> (1996), where they

> discovered the optimal line length to be around 45-60 characters (8-10

> words).

>=20

> Sincerely yours,

>=20

> Mark J. Lamias

>=20

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

> From: Ervin, Kelly ARI [mailto:ErvinK@ARI.ARMY.MIL]

> Sent: Monday, April 07, 2003 8:50 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: How much text in Web Surveys

>=20

>=20

> All,

>=20

> Here is an interesting response that I received.

>=20

> Kelly

>=20

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

> From: Roske-Shelton, Renate [mailto:Renate.Roske-Shelton@ssa.gov]

> Sent: Friday, April 04, 2003 1:00 PM

> To: 'Ervin, Kelly ARI'

> Cc: 'roskehf@cs.com'; Roske-Shelton, Renate

> Subject: Re: how much trext

>=20

>=20

>=20

> Kelly:

>=20

>=20

>=20

> As a usability engineer, a question like yours to the AAPOR=20

> listserv gives

> me great consternation. There is NO READY ANSWER for your=20

> inquiry of how

> much text should be on a page of a web survey! The reason for=20

> this is that

> the answer begs for a more contextual approach. With web=20

> surveys you are at

> the intersection of Usability Engineering (font size, text=20

- > length, contrast,
- > layout, widgetry-etc) all of which influence both cognitive and manual
- > performance and Survey Design (understandability,=20
- > effectiveness, validity
- > -etc.). It all boils down to understandability (readability)=20
- > on the part of
- > the user (respondent). Text pages become screen presentations=20
- > for the user
- > with "response affordances" and it is not so much the "filled=20
- > page" that
- > should be fretted over in design but the total user=20
- > experience of reading
- > the display, understanding the content, deciding upon a response, and
- > executing (indicating) a response (mouse-click) in a way that leads to
- > desirable survey results, i.e. let's the respondent indicate=20
- > the choice that
- > he/she intended. The best way to know for sure is to employ usability
- > testing with the finished result and prompt for comments=20
- > about "too much
- > text". If you get these then re-design.
- >=20
- >=20
- >=20
- > FYI - the following factors which may apply are supported=20
- > with empirical
- > data (multiple sources):
- >=20
- > Font size for most folks should be at least 12 pt.
- >=20
- > Best readability contrast is achieved with black on light type.
- >=20
- > Use mixed Caps text - this is easier to read.
- >=20
- > Leave sufficient white space to (de)mark any single question.
- >=20
- > Employ border frames or other demarcation devices to indicate=20
- > which items go
- > together.
- >=20
- > Use radio buttons only when only one option can be selected.
- >=20
- > Use "slider widgets" for continuous choices with a numerical=20
- > popup readout
- > (as in 6.5") but label the extremes and the midpoint.
- >=20
- > Employ drop down menus for specified answers but put the entry "Please
- > Choose" in the visible menu default option.
- >=20
- > Don't ever require the user to scroll horizontally!
- >=20
- > Vertical scrolling is ok but folks in generally don't know=20
- > how to use all of
- >=20
- > windows application functionality (jump to top, bottom,=20

> increment, etc.)
>=20
> Keep the survey flow from top to bottom - this is how folks respond
> naturally.
>=20
> Use NEXT and BACK buttons when possible for different page=20
> sections (do
> allow people to go back and change/reference - just keep track of this
> within a single session.
>=20
> If presenting in "page format" tell the user how many more=20
> pages (questions
> there are).
>=20
> If responses to questions are timed - let the user know.
>=20
> Warn the user BEFORE a time-out occurs and give them the=20
> option of CONTINUE
> to reset
>=20
> the timer.
>=20
>=20
>=20
> If you'd like further specific information I'll be glad to=20
> help and share
> what we have found in our testing labs at Social Security.
>=20
>=20
>=20
> A book that I thought was a great reminder of many aspects of=20
> survey design
> (online or not) is "How to conduct your own survey" by=20
> Priscilla Salant and
> Don Dillman. (John Wiley 1994). That combined with the=20
> previous suggestions
> on Nielsen Usability should about address all the issues.
>=20
>=20
>=20
>=20
>=20
>=20
>=20
> (PS - The AAPOR listserv would not let me post from here (this e-mail
> address) so I am sending this to you directly - feel free to=20
> share with the
> rest of the AAPOR folks by submitting to the list).
>=20
>=20
>=20
> Thanks and Cheers,
>=20
> Renate

>=20
>=20
>=20
> Renate Roske-Shelton, Ph.D.
>=20
> E-Government Usability and Testing
>=20
> Division of Usability, Accessibility, and Security
>=20
> Lockheed Martin Technology Services
>=20
> SSA phone (410) 966- 9262
>=20
> Cell phone (410) 279-2481
>=20
>=20
>=20
>=20
>=20
>=20
> Renate Roske-Shelton
>=20
> SSA phone (410) 966- 9262
>=20
> Cell phone (410) 279-2481
>=20

> -----
> 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
>=20

> -----
> 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
>=20

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, 7 Apr 2003 10:25:49 -0700
Reply-To: Jim Fletcher <jfletcher@CSUCHICO.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Jim Fletcher <jfletcher@CSUCHICO.EDU>
Subject: Internet survey software
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I am preparing a survey that will be administered by respondents logging into a website and completing the questionnaire. Could some of you please recommend the Internet software that you believe is best, and could you please comment on why you believe that it is the best? Thanks.

Jim Fletcher
Applied Research and Evaluation
California State University, Chico

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, 8 Apr 2003 09:45:43 -0400
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Arianna Huffington in Mother Jones
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

A Driving Force
Arianna Huffington Interviewed by Colleen O'Brien

Arianna Huffington didn't like Washington's propaganda, so she decided to go out and make some of her own.
April 7, 2003

http://www.motherjones.com/news/qa/2003/15/we_350_01.html

" MJ: So, if Poll-Free America is a serious campaign, how would refusing pollsters force our leaders to lead, as your website says?

AH: Right now most of our political leaders are spineless and addicted to following public opinion polls. And yet, the secret of pollsters is that response rates are down to 35 percent. Most people refuse to talk to pollsters, and yet upon this small and unrepresentative minority, we base an enormous amount of our public policy. I'm arguing that, since we can't do anything about reducing the demand for polls, we should do something about drying up the supply. It's an easy, small way to participate in taking back democracy, refusing to talk to pollsters. Of course, you can talk to them socially. "

Boy, am I relieved.

--

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: Tue, 8 Apr 2003 09:50:30 -0400

Reply-To: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>

Subject: Re: Arianna Huffington in Mother Jones

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 my drive into work this morning is any indication (I was almost run over by at least four SUVs), our jobs may even get easier with Detective Huffington on the case....

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

From: Leo G. Simonetta [<mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>]=20

Sent: Tuesday, April 08, 2003 9:46 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Arianna Huffington in Mother Jones

A Driving Force

Arianna Huffington Interviewed by Colleen O'Brien

Arianna Huffington didn't like Washington's propaganda, so she decided to go out and make some of her own. April 7, 2003

http://www.motherjones.com/news/qa/2003/15/we_350_01.html

" MJ: So, if Poll-Free America is a serious campaign, how would refusing pollsters force our leaders to lead, as your website says?

AH: Right now most of our political leaders are spineless and addicted to following public opinion polls. And yet, the secret of pollsters is that response rates are down to 35 percent. Most people refuse to talk to pollsters, and yet upon this small and unrepresentative minority, we base an enormous amount of our public policy. I'm arguing that, since we can't do anything about reducing the demand for polls, we should do something about drying up the supply. It's an easy, small way to

participate in taking back democracy, refusing to talk to pollsters. Of course, you can talk to them socially. "

Boy, am I relieved.

--

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

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, 8 Apr 2003 10:00:47 -0400
Reply-To: "Trussell, Norman" <Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Trussell, Norman" <Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>
Subject: Re: Arianna Huffington in Mother Jones
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

So if we adopt her methodology, we would all refuse to attend her Plenary Session, but talk to her at the cash bar afterward... But wait, she is going to get paid to talk to us pollsters. Hmmmm.

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

From: Leo G. Simonetta [<mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 08, 2003 9:46 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Arianna Huffington in Mother Jones

A Driving Force
Arianna Huffington Interviewed by Colleen O'Brien

Arianna Huffington didn't like Washington's propaganda, so she decided to go out and make some of her own.

April 7, 2003

http://www.motherjones.com/news/qa/2003/15/we_350_01.html

" MJ: So, if Poll-Free America is a serious campaign, how would refusing pollsters force our leaders to lead, as your website says?

AH: Right now most of our political leaders are spineless and addicted to following public opinion polls. And yet, the secret of pollsters is that response rates are down to 35 percent. Most people refuse to talk to pollsters, and yet upon this small and unrepresentative minority, we base an enormous amount of our public policy. I'm arguing that, since we can't do anything about reducing the demand for polls, we should do something about drying up the supply. It's an easy, small way to participate in taking back democracy, refusing to talk to pollsters. Of course, you can talk to them socially. "

Boy, am I relieved.

--

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

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, 8 Apr 2003 10:47:29 -0400
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: "Do-Not-Email" Lists Emerging
Comments: To: Diane Bowers <dbowers@casro.org>
In-Reply-To: <[05cb01c2f957\\$89c27a10\\$6401a8c0@DKBLaptop](mailto:05cb01c2f957$89c27a10$6401a8c0@DKBLaptop)>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Diane Bowers wrote:

> Richard:

> On the email DNC issue, CASRO's standards are very specific that an
> individual may not be contacted for research via email without having
> opted-in.

This is not true.

The CASRO rules, as posted on their web site, require that:

- c. Individuals are offered the choice to be removed from future email contact in each invitation; and,
- d. The invitation list excludes all individuals who have previously taken the appropriate and timely steps to request the list owner to remove them.

This places the burden on the respondent to opt out of email surveys, which is NOT the same as opting in.

- > 3. The line between telemarketing and legitimate research is
- > continually blurred by the public, media, regulators.
- > 4. In fact, more and more regulators are looking to include research in
- > DNC requirements.

According to the information posted on the official state web site, the Massachusetts DNC law that went into effect this year exempts only "Noncommercial polls or surveys, e.g. political polls" which means that that commercial market research calls are included in the Massachusetts DNC requirements.

More information on the Massachusetts DNC law is available at:
<http://www.state.ma.us/donotcall/solicitorinfo.htm>

Jan Werner

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, 8 Apr 2003 11:07:56 -0400
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: Arianna Huffington in Mother Jones
Comments: To: "Trussell, Norman" <Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>
In-Reply-To: <0BC5187E59E2D411A81000508BB0956904BA9F10@nmrusdunsx6.nielsenmedia.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I think it was a fine idea to invite Ms. Huffington to speak at the conference and I have no problem with AAPOR covering her travel and lodging expenses, but I consider the \$5,000 speaking fee she will be paid to be an outrageous misuse of my membership dues.

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

Trussell, Norman wrote:

> So if we adopt her methodology, we would all refuse to attend her Plenary
> Session, but talk to her at the cash bar afterward... But wait, she is
> going to get paid to talk to us pollsters. Hmmmm.

>

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

> From: Leo G. Simonetta [mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM]

> Sent: Tuesday, April 08, 2003 9:46 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Arianna Huffington in Mother Jones

>

>

> A Driving Force

> Arianna Huffington Interviewed by Colleen O'Brien

>

> Arianna Huffington didn't like Washington's propaganda, so she decided
> to go out and make some of her own.

> April 7, 2003

>

> http://www.motherjones.com/news/qa/2003/15/we_350_01.html

>

> " MJ: So, if Poll-Free America is a serious campaign, how would refusing
> pollsters force our leaders to lead, as your website says?

>

> AH: Right now most of our political leaders are spineless and addicted
> to following public opinion polls. And yet, the secret of pollsters is
> that response rates are down to 35 percent. Most people refuse to talk
> to pollsters, and yet upon this small and unrepresentative minority, we
> base an enormous amount of our public policy. I'm arguing that, since we
> can't do anything about reducing the demand for polls, we should do
> something about drying up the supply. It's an easy, small way to
> participate in taking back democracy, refusing to talk to pollsters. Of
> course, you can talk to them socially. "

>

>

> Boy, am I relieved.

> --

> 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

>
> -----
> 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, 8 Apr 2003 11:19:12 -0400
Reply-To: jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: James Murphy <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Re: "Do-Not-Email" Lists Emerging
Comments: To: jwerner@JWDP.COM
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Concerning the Massachusetts statute:

Could it be argued that, because in a commercial market research survey there is no economic transaction between the parties (interviewer and interviewee) and no attempt to influence future purchasing behavior, this is a noncommercial activity?

JAMES P. MURPHY
J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY

jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

(610) 408-8800

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, 8 Apr 2003 11:53:09 -0400
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: American Omnibus Surveys
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Does anyone know of a good resource that would tell me who does national RDD omnibus polls, their schedules, costs, demographics, etc?

--

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: Tue, 8 Apr 2003 08:59:56 -0700
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Internet survey software
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Hi folks,
This question has been coming up a lot lately. After working at a dotcom that provided web-based ASP survey software for several years (Informative), I left to join a research and consulting firm. I decided to evaluate the features and capabilities of both software and ASP packages available, which I hadn't done in several years. I'm attaching an .pdf article I wrote that was published in AMA's Marketing News last year, but without the attached table. This should help you evaluate what you need.=20
best,
leora

Leora Lawton, Ph.D.
Director of Consumer & Demographic Research
Population Research Systems, LLC
A Member of the FSC Group
100 Spear, Suite 1700
San Francisco, CA 94105
v: 415 777-0707, ex. 117; f: 415 777-2420;
m: 510 928-7572
www.populationresearchsystems.com

This information is intended solely for the individual or entity named as the recipient hereof and may be, or contain privileged (i.e. attorney-client), confidential and/or proprietary information. If you are

not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this transmission is prohibited. =
If
you have received this communication in error, please notify us =
immediately
by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and =
destroy
this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

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

> From: Jim Fletcher [mailto:jfletcher@CSUCHICO.EDU]

> Sent: Monday, April 07, 2003 10:26 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Internet survey software

>=20

>=20

> I am preparing a survey that will be administered by=20

> respondents logging

> into a website and completing the questionnaire. Could some=20

> of you please

> recommend the Internet software that you believe is best, and=20

> could you

> please comment on why you believe that it is the best? Thanks.

>=20

> Jim Fletcher

> Applied Research and Evaluation

> California State University, Chico

>=20

> -----

> 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=20

> not at your

> main email address.

> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:=20

> 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

Date: Tue, 8 Apr 2003 12:01:50 -0400

Reply-To: DivaleBill@AOL.COM

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: William Divale <DivaleBill@AOL.COM>

Subject: Re: Arianna Huffington in Mother Jones

Comments: To: jwerner@jwdp.com

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I agree. A \$5,000 fee is much too high. \$1,500 plus expenses is more than enough plus we can allow her to hawk her new book, "Pigs at the Trough."

Bill Divale
York College, CUNY

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, 8 Apr 2003 09:29:58 -0700
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Internet survey software
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Hmm, the attachment didn't make it through AAPOR's email. I'll try to =
get it up to a website for your download. Stay tuned.
leora

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

> From: Leora Lawton=20
> Sent: Tuesday, April 08, 2003 9:00 AM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: RE: Internet survey software
>=20
>=20
> Hi folks,
> This question has been coming up a lot lately. After working=20
> at a dotcom that provided web-based ASP survey software for=20
> several years (Informative), I left to join a research and=20
> consulting firm. I decided to evaluate the features and=20
> capabilities of both software and ASP packages available,=20
> which I hadn't done in several years. I'm attaching an .pdf=20
> article I wrote that was published in AMA's Marketing News=20
> last year, but without the attached table. This should help=20
> you evaluate what you need.=20
> best,
> leora
>=20
> Leora Lawton, Ph.D.
> Director of Consumer & Demographic Research
> Population Research Systems, LLC
> A Member of the FSC Group
> 100 Spear, Suite 1700
> San Francisco, CA 94105
> v: 415 777-0707, ex. 117; f: 415 777-2420;
> m: 510 928-7572
> www.populationresearchsystems.com

>=20
> This information is intended solely for the individual or=20
> entity named as
> the recipient hereof and may be, or contain privileged (i.e.
> attorney-client), confidential and/or proprietary=20
> information. If you are
> not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying,
> distribution, or use of the contents of this transmission is=20
> prohibited. If
> you have received this communication in error, please notify=20
> us immediately
> by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com,=20
> and destroy
> this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.
>=20

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

>> From: Jim Fletcher [mailto:jfletcher@CSUCHICO.EDU]

>> Sent: Monday, April 07, 2003 10:26 AM

>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>> Subject: Internet survey software

>>=20

>>=20

>> I am preparing a survey that will be administered by=20

>> respondents logging

>> into a website and completing the questionnaire. Could some=20

>> of you please

>> recommend the Internet software that you believe is best, and=20

>> could you

>> please comment on why you believe that it is the best? Thanks.

>>=20

>> Jim Fletcher

>> Applied Research and Evaluation

>> California State University, Chico

>>=20

>> -----

>> 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=20

>> not at your

>> main email address.

>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:=20

>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>=20

>=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

=====
Date: Tue, 8 Apr 2003 09:55:26 -0700

Reply-To: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
Subject: Link for Internet survey software article
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Fortunately I know html! =20
You can find the article on our website, at =
<http://www.populationresearchsystems.com/about/>
Scroll down a bit and you'll see a link for web-based surveys. Click on =
that and it will open up the document. Alternatively, right click and =
save it to your harddrive.
Leora

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

> From: Leora Lawton=20
> Sent: Tuesday, April 08, 2003 9:30 AM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Re: Internet survey software
>=20
>=20
> Hmm, the attachment didn't make it through AAPOR's email.=20
> I'll try to get it up to a website for your download. Stay tuned.
> leora
>=20

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

>> From: Leora Lawton=20
>> Sent: Tuesday, April 08, 2003 9:00 AM
>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>> Subject: RE: Internet survey software
>>=20
>>=20
>> Hi folks,
>> This question has been coming up a lot lately. After working=20
>> at a dotcom that provided web-based ASP survey software for=20
>> several years (Informative), I left to join a research and=20
>> consulting firm. I decided to evaluate the features and=20
>> capabilities of both software and ASP packages available,=20
>> which I hadn't done in several years. I'm attaching an .pdf=20
>> article I wrote that was published in AMA's Marketing News=20
>> last year, but without the attached table. This should help=20
>> you evaluate what you need.=20
>> best,
>> leora
>>=20
>> Leora Lawton, Ph.D.
>> Director of Consumer & Demographic Research
>> Population Research Systems, LLC
>> A Member of the FSC Group
>> 100 Spear, Suite 1700
>> San Francisco, CA 94105
>> v: 415 777-0707, ex. 117; f: 415 777-2420;
>> m: 510 928-7572

>> www.populationresearchsystems.com
>>=20
>> This information is intended solely for the individual or=20
>> entity named as
>> the recipient hereof and may be, or contain privileged (i.e.
>> attorney-client), confidential and/or proprietary=20
>> information. If you are
>> not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying,
>> distribution, or use of the contents of this transmission is=20
>> prohibited. If
>> you have received this communication in error, please notify=20
>> us immediately
>> by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com,=20
>> and destroy
>> this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.
>>=20

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

>>> From: Jim Fletcher [mailto:jfletcher@CSUCHICO.EDU]

>>> Sent: Monday, April 07, 2003 10:26 AM

>>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>>> Subject: Internet survey software

>>>=20

>>>=20

>>> I am preparing a survey that will be administered by=20

>>> respondents logging

>>> into a website and completing the questionnaire. Could some=20

>>> of you please

>>> recommend the Internet software that you believe is best, and=20

>>> could you

>>> please comment on why you believe that it is the best? Thanks.

>>>=20

>>> Jim Fletcher

>>> Applied Research and Evaluation

>>> California State University, Chico

>>>=20

>>> -----

>>> 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=20

>>> not at your

>>> main email address.

>>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:=20

>>> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>>=20

>>>=20

>>>=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:=20

> 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

Date: Sun, 6 Apr 2003 17:53:11 -0400

Reply-To: "Raghavan K. Mayur" <mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Raghavan K. Mayur" <mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM>

Subject: Investor's Business Daily/TIPP Poll: Confidence Up Sharply In
First Survey Taken Since Iraqi War Began

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY

Feature Story

Tuesday, April 8, 2003

Confidence Up Sharply In First Survey Taken Since Iraqi War Began BY IBD STAFF

Americans' economic confidence surged in April amid signs of dramatic gains by coalition forces in the war in Iraq, the latest IBD/TIPP Poll shows.

The IBD/TIPP Economic Optimism Index jumped 7.6 points to 56.4 in April, a 10-month high and breaking a long slide that began in June 2002.

April's 15.5% jump in the index was the biggest ever, surpassing even the 10.6% leap in October 2001 following the 9-11 attack.

"In the month after 9-11, Americans rallied behind the flag, which had a positive impact on their broader outlook," said Raghavan Mayur, president of TIPP, a unit of TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence, IBD's polling partner.

"Now we're seeing the same kind of 'rally behind the flag' effect," he added, noting that IBD/TIPP data show nearly 8 in 10 say they think the war is "going well."

That's a big change from just a little over two weeks ago, when Americans were flooded with reports from the war zone suggesting fierce fighting and stiff resistance on the road to Baghdad.=20

A number of polls back then showed growing concerns about the war's economic impact - and its likely duration.

'Rally Effect'

But in recent days, U.S. and British forces have made stunning gains against Iraqi forces, all but destroying Saddam Hussein's vaunted Republican Guard and overrunning or seizing key Iraqi cities with unexpected speed.

"The military's success so far lifts some of the uncertainty overhanging the economy," said Mayur. "That had been a significant drain on consumers' confidence in the past few months."

April's confidence gains, if sustained, could lead to a "robust recovery," Mayur said.

IBD/TIPP conducted the poll of 906 adults from April 2 to April 6. A reading above 50 means optimism, below 50 means pessimism and 50 is neutral.

The IBD/TIPP Economic Confidence Index is normally the first major release on consumer sentiment each month. It predicts with 90% reliability changes in confidence indicators issued later each month by the University of Michigan and the Conference Board.

The current reading takes on added significance because it is the first take on consumer confidence based entirely on interviews taken after the war in Iraq began.

Turning A Corner?

Mayur noted some experts were skeptical about the confidence rebound immediately after 9-11.

But, as it turned out, most economists now believe the economy left recession in November of 2001 - captured by the IBD/TIPP Poll's 11% surge that month.

"Consumers are still concerned about a tight job market and rising fuel costs hurting pocket books," said Mayur. But despite such hurdles, most people are now "hopeful the economy will gain momentum," Mayur said.

That shows in the data.

The share of Americans who think the economy will enter a recession fell to 19% in April, from 26% in March.

Meanwhile, the share of those who believe the war will help the economy rose to 31% in April vs. 26% in March. And 41% think the economy will slow, but not fall into recession.=20

The confidence gain was broad-based, with all of the 21 key demographic groups that=20

IBD/TIPP track showing gains. All but Democrats scored above 50.

Households earning under \$30,000 a year improved from 47.5 to 53.8, and those in the \$30,000 to \$50,000 brackets rose from 48.7 to 57.1.

Families in the \$50,000 to \$75,000 range gained 5.8 points to 57.6, and those above \$75,000 advanced 5.3 to 57.3.=20

Among the 21 key demographic groups, Democrats showed the least confidence at 45.0, while Republicans showed the most, at 70.7.

Independents scored 54.5.=20

Of the economic optimism index's three components, the one that measures how consumers feel about the economy's prospects six months from now

made its biggest advance ever, jumping to 52.8 from 40.2 in March, a 31.2% gain.=20

The component that measures Americans' views of government policies rose from 49.7 in March, a record low, to 57.0 in April. All key groups improved, and only Democrats and West Coast residents remained below 50.

The third component of the index - one that gauges how Americans feel about their personal finances in the next six months - jumped from 56.6 in March, an all-time low, to 59.4 in April. All groups are above 50.

Reflecting the upsurge in Americans' economic confidence, the IBD/TIPP quality of life measure, a component of the national outlook index, jumped to 55.9 from 52.2.

The "rally effect" is also boosting President Bush's approval ratings. The IBD/TIPP Presidential Leadership Index soared to 69.4 in April from 59.3 in March. And the share of those who give Bush an A or B on "handling the economy" rose to 44% in April from 40% in January.

=A9 Investor's Business Daily, Inc. 2003. All Rights Reserved.=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

=====

Date: Tue, 8 Apr 2003 17:13:50 -0400

Reply-To: Stephanie Berg <stberg@gtcinternet.com>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Stephanie Berg <stberg@GTCINTERNET.COM>

Subject: Re: Investor's Business Daily/TIPP Poll: Confidence Up Sharply
In First Survey Taken Since Iraqi War Began

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8BIT

I took an extreme interest in this article. I run several customer tracking surveys and I've noticed significant improvements in satisfaction since the war began. While NetSol has made some improvements that could account for this, much of the increase in March has been difficult to explain. We've also experienced a significant drop in customer service call volume.

Has anyone else noticed or heard of how the war with Iraq might be affecting consumers attitudes other than general economic or political opinions?

I realize this list is geared to public opinion issues, but I'm checking all possible sources in search of information.

=====
Stephanie Berg
Manager of Market Research
Network Solutions

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

From: Raghavan K. Mayur

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Sent: Sunday, April 06, 2003 5:53 PM

Subject: Investor's Business Daily/TIPP Poll: Confidence Up Sharply In First Survey Taken Since Iraqi War Began

INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY

Feature Story

Tuesday, April 8, 2003

Confidence Up Sharply In First Survey Taken Since Iraqi War Began

BY IBD STAFF

Americans' economic confidence surged in April amid signs of dramatic gains by coalition forces in the war in Iraq, the latest IBD/TIPP Poll shows.

The IBD/TIPP Economic Optimism Index jumped 7.6 points to 56.4 in April, a 10-month high and breaking a long slide that began in June 2002.

April's 15.5% jump in the index was the biggest ever, surpassing even the 10.6% leap in October 2001 following the 9-11 attack.

"In the month after 9-11, Americans rallied behind the flag, which had a positive impact on their broader outlook," said Raghavan Mayur, president of TIPP, a unit of TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence, IBD's polling partner.

"Now we're seeing the same kind of 'rally behind the flag' effect," he added, noting that IBD/TIPP data show nearly 8 in 10 say they think the war is "going well."

That's a big change from just a little over two weeks ago, when Americans were flooded with reports from the war zone suggesting fierce fighting and stiff resistance on the road to Baghdad.

A number of polls back then showed growing concerns about the war's economic impact - and its likely duration.

'Rally Effect'

But in recent days, U.S. and British forces have made stunning gains against Iraqi forces, all but destroying Saddam Hussein's vaunted Republican Guard and overrunning or seizing key Iraqi cities with unexpected speed.

"The military's success so far lifts some of the uncertainty overhanging the economy," said Mayur. "That had been a significant drain on consumers' confidence in the past few months."

April's confidence gains, if sustained, could lead to a "robust recovery," Mayur said.

IBD/TIPP conducted the poll of 906 adults from April 2 to April 6. A reading above 50 means optimism, below 50 means pessimism and 50 is

neutral.

The IBD/TIPP Economic Confidence Index is normally the first major release on consumer sentiment each month. It predicts with 90% reliability changes in confidence indicators issued later each month by the University of Michigan and the Conference Board.

The current reading takes on added significance because it is the first take on consumer confidence based entirely on interviews taken after the war in Iraq began.

Turning A Corner?

Mayur noted some experts were skeptical about the confidence rebound immediately after 9-11.

But, as it turned out, most economists now believe the economy left recession in November of 2001 - captured by the IBD/TIPP Poll's 11% surge that month.

"Consumers are still concerned about a tight job market and rising fuel costs hurting pocket books," said Mayur. But despite such hurdles, most people are now "hopeful the economy will gain momentum," Mayur said.

That shows in the data.

The share of Americans who think the economy will enter a recession fell to 19% in April, from 26% in March.

Meanwhile, the share of those who believe the war will help the economy rose to 31% in April vs. 26% in March. And 41% think the economy will slow, but not fall into recession.

The confidence gain was broad-based, with all of the 21 key demographic groups that IBD/TIPP track showing gains. All but Democrats scored above 50.

Households earning under \$30,000 a year improved from 47.5 to 53.8, and those in the \$30,000 to \$50,000 brackets rose from 48.7 to 57.1. Families in the \$50,000 to \$75,000 range gained 5.8 points to 57.6, and those above \$75,000 advanced 5.3 to 57.3.

Among the 21 key demographic groups, Democrats showed the least confidence at 45.0, while Republicans showed the most, at 70.7. Independents scored 54.5.

Of the economic optimism index's three components, the one that measures how consumers feel about the economy's prospects six months from now made its biggest advance ever, jumping to 52.8 from 40.2 in March, a 31.2% gain.

The component that measures Americans' views of government policies rose from 49.7 in March, a record low, to 57.0 in April. All key groups improved, and only Democrats and West Coast residents remained below 50.

The third component of the index - one that gauges how Americans feel

about their personal finances in the next six months - jumped from 56.6 in March, an all-time low, to 59.4 in April. All groups are above 50.

Reflecting the upsurge in Americans' economic confidence, the IBD/TIPP quality of life measure, a component of the national outlook index, jumped to 55.9 from 52.2.

The "rally effect" is also boosting President Bush's approval ratings. The IBD/TIPP Presidential Leadership Index soared to 69.4 in April from 59.3 in March. And the share of those who give Bush an A or B on "handling the economy" rose to 44% in April from 40% in January.

© Investor's Business Daily, Inc. 2003. All Rights Reserved.

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, 8 Apr 2003 17:44:04 -0400
Reply-To: Scott Keeter <skeeter@GMU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Scott Keeter <skeeter@GMU.EDU>
Organization: George Mason University
Subject: Re: Investor's Business Daily/TIPP Poll: Confidence Up Sharply
InFirst Survey Taken Since Iraqi War Began
Comments: cc: Stephanie Berg <stberg@GTCINTERNET.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

During and just after the first Persian Gulf War, consumer confidence rose as well. In 1991, the air war began January 16. The ground invasion began Feb 23 and was suspended Feb 28.

Univ of Michigan consumer confidence index:

1991
Jan: 66.8
Feb: 70.4
Mar: 87.7
Apr: 81.8

Conference Board, Consumer Confidence:

1991
Jan: 55.1

Feb: 59.4
Mar: 81.1
Apr: 79.4

Stephanie Berg wrote:

>
> I took an extreme interest in this article. I run several customer tracking
> surveys and I've noticed significant improvements in satisfaction since the
> war began.

--
Scott Keeter
Pew Research Center for the People and the Press
1150 18th Street, NW, Suite 975
Washington, DC 20036
Voice 202-293-3126 extension 16
Personal fax 703 832 0209
E-mail keeters@people-press.org
Web site <http://mason.gmu.edu/~skeeter>

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, 8 Apr 2003 18:46:43 -0400
Reply-To: Reg_Baker@MARKETSTRATEGIES.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Reginald Baker <Reg_Baker@MARKETSTRATEGIES.COM>
Subject: Re: Link for Internet survey software article
Comments: To: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Leora's article table does not reference the 500 pound gorilla in this market: mrInterview from SPSS.

Reg Baker
MSInteractive/Market Strategies

Leora Lawton
<leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
cc:
Sent by: Subject: Link for Internet
survey software
AAPORNET article
<AAPORNET@asu.edu>
u>

04/08/2003 12:55

PM
Please respond
to Leora Lawton

Fortunately I know html!

You can find the article on our website, at

<http://www.populationresearchsystems.com/about/>

Scroll down a bit and you'll see a link for web-based surveys. Click on that and it will open up the document. Alternatively, right click and save it to your harddrive.

Leora

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

> From: Leora Lawton

> Sent: Tuesday, April 08, 2003 9:30 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Internet survey software

>

>

> Hmm, the attachment didn't make it through AAPOR's email.

> I'll try to get it up to a website for your download. Stay tuned.

> leora

>

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

>> From: Leora Lawton

>> Sent: Tuesday, April 08, 2003 9:00 AM

>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>> Subject: RE: Internet survey software

>>

>>

>> Hi folks,

>> This question has been coming up a lot lately. After working

>> at a dotcom that provided web-based ASP survey software for

>> several years (Informative), I left to join a research and

>> consulting firm. I decided to evaluate the features and

>> capabilities of both software and ASP packages available,

>> which I hadn't done in several years. I'm attaching an .pdf

>> article I wrote that was published in AMA's Marketing News

>> last year, but without the attached table. This should help

>> you evaluate what you need.

>> best,

>> leora

>>

>> Leora Lawton, Ph.D.

>> Director of Consumer & Demographic Research

>> Population Research Systems, LLC

>> A Member of the FSC Group

>> 100 Spear, Suite 1700

>> San Francisco, CA 94105
>> v: 415 777-0707, ex. 117; f: 415 777-2420;
>> m: 510 928-7572
>> www.populationresearchsystems.com

>>
>> This information is intended solely for the individual or
>> entity named as
>> the recipient hereof and may be, or contain privileged (i.e.
>> attorney-client), confidential and/or proprietary
>> information. If you are
>> not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying,
>> distribution, or use of the contents of this transmission is
>> prohibited. If
>> you have received this communication in error, please notify
>> us immediately
>> by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com,
>> and destroy
>> this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

>>
>>> -----Original Message-----
>>> From: Jim Fletcher [<mailto:jfletcher@CSUCHICO.EDU>]
>>> Sent: Monday, April 07, 2003 10:26 AM
>>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>>> Subject: Internet survey software

>>>
>>> I am preparing a survey that will be administered by
>>> respondents logging
>>> into a website and completing the questionnaire. Could some
>>> of you please
>>> recommend the Internet software that you believe is best, and
>>> could you
>>> please comment on why you believe that it is the best? Thanks.

>>>
>>> Jim Fletcher
>>> Applied Research and Evaluation
>>> California State University, Chico

>>> -----
>>> 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

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, 9 Apr 2003 07:10:39 -0400

Reply-To: Linda Young <young@PIRE.ORG>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Linda Young <young@PIRE.ORG>

Subject: passive vs active consent

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Colleagues,

The NIH Project Officer for one of our grants has questioned our IRB's approval of using passive consent for school based (anonymous) student survey. The Research Scientist for this project is looking for methodological studies comparing the response rates, data quality, costs, etc. for active vs passive consent. We would very much appreciate any references you may be aware of that address this issue.

Thanks!

Linda Young

Center Director

Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation

(502) 634-3694, ext. 11

FAX: (502) 634-5690

Email: Young@PIRE.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: Wed, 9 Apr 2003 09:49:14 -0400

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

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

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

Subject: Gallup files suit against Medicare officials

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Lawsuit Filed Against Medicare Officials
By SIOBHAN McDONOUGH
Associated Press Writer

April 8, 2003, 9:23 PM EDT

WASHINGTON -- Members of Congress are looking into allegations that the federal Medicare administrator improperly shut the Gallup Organization and other polling firms out of a chance to develop a new survey of patient satisfaction, which is used in evaluating hospital performance.

Gallup sued Medicaid chief Thomas A. Scully and five unnamed co-workers at the federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services on Tuesday. The lawsuit alleged Scully tried to bully a Gallup official who was looking into alleged collusion over the patient satisfaction surveys between the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services and the small Nebraska survey firm, National Research Corp.-Picker.

The suit cites a March 5 e-mail message Scully sent to Bob Nielsen, managing partner for Gallup, calling him an "idiot," "jerk" and "weasel" for trying to get the new survey's financing stopped until an investigation was conducted.

SNIP

Copyright C 2003, The Associated Press

For the complete story see:

<http://www.newsday.com/news/health/wire/sns-ap-medicare-chief-lawsuit,0,209685.story?coll=sns-ap-health-headlines>

--

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, 9 Apr 2003 09:48:46 -0400
Reply-To: Ed Freeland <efreelan@PRINCETON.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ed Freeland <efreelan@PRINCETON.EDU>
Subject: Re: passive vs active consent

Comments: To: Linda Young <young@PIRE.ORG>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Linda - It may be a matter of law as well as cost. According to the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment (PPRA), the use of passive consent is not allowed on surveys funded by the US Dept. of Education that ask questions about:

1. Political affiliations;
2. Mental and psychological problems potentially embarrassing to the student and his/her family;
3. Sex behavior and attitudes;
4. Illegal, anti-social, self-incriminating and demeaning behavior;
5. Critical appraisals of other individuals with whom respondents have close family relationships;
6. Legally recognized privileged or analogous relationships, such as those of lawyers, physicians, and ministers; or
7. Income (other than that required by law to determine eligibility for participation in a program or for receiving financial assistance under such program).

This applies regardless of whether the survey is anonymous or confidential. If your survey is funded by ED and asks any of these types of questions, you need to use active consent.

See <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OM/fpco/ppra/> for more details.

In addition to the federal law covering ED funded studies, there are many states that have identical laws that pertain to ANY school based survey, regardless of funding source. New Jersey passed such a law two years ago (http://www.njleg.state.nj.us/2000/Bills/a3500/3359_i1.htm). As a result, you can't ask any questions on the seven topics if you want to use passive consent.

Ed

Linda Young wrote:

> Colleagues,

>

> The NIH Project Officer for one of our grants has questioned our IRB's approval of using passive consent for school based (anonymous) student survey. The Research Scientist for this project is looking for methodological studies comparing the response rates, data quality, costs, etc. for active vs passive consent. We would very much appreciate any references you may be aware of that address this issue.

> Thanks!

>

> Linda Young

> Center Director

> Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation

> (502) 634-3694, ext. 11

> FAX: (502) 634-5690

> Email: Young@PIRE.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.

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, 9 Apr 2003 10:17:33 -0400
Reply-To: Ed Freeland <efreelan@PRINCETON.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ed Freeland <efreelan@PRINCETON.EDU>
Subject: Re: passive vs active consent
Comments: To: Linda Young <young@PIRE.ORG>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

For previous research on this topic see:

Moberg, D. Paul and Douglas Piper. "Obtaining Active Parental Consent Via Telephone in Adolescent Substance Abuse Prevention" Evaluation review 14: June 1990, 315-323.

Anderman, C. et al. "Selection Bias Related to Parental Consent in School-Based Research." Evaluation Review 19: Dec 1995, 663-674.

Ellickson, P. and J. Hawes. "An Assessment of Active Versus Passive Methods for Obtaining Parental Consent" Evaluation Review 13:Feb 1989, 45-55.

Hollman, C. and J. McNamara. "Considerations in the Use of Active and Passive Parental Consent Procedures" Jour of Psychology 133: 1999, 141-156.

Esbensen, F. et al. "Differential Attrition Rates and Active Parental Consent" Evaluation Review 23:June 1999:316-335.

Esbensen, F. et al. "Active Parental Consent in School-Based Research" Evaluation Review 20: Dec 1996, 737-753.

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, 9 Apr 2003 07:42:13 -0700

Reply-To: Kat Lind <kat_lind99@YAHOO.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Kat Lind <kat_lind99@YAHOO.COM>
Subject: Wanted: Old Time Fiddler at Conference
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Are you a fiddler? Guitar and banjo player would like to have a fiddler to join them for some old time tunes at AAPOR on Friday night.

If you are interested, please let me know ASAP.

Kat Lind
Assoc. Conference Operations Chair

=====
Katherine "Kat" Lind
Kat_Lind99@yahoo.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: Wed, 9 Apr 2003 10:23:22 -0700
Reply-To: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>
Subject: Re: passive vs active consent
In-Reply-To: <se93c840.007@mail>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Linda,

In recent years some school districts have required active parental consent for all school-based surveys regardless of survey content or survey administration procedures (e.g., group-administered anonymous).

Some states have laws that require active parental consent under certain conditions. For example, California's Education code requires active parental consent for surveys if there any questions pertaining to family life, morality, sex or religion. School districts tend to interpret this very broadly and many in California have extended the active parental consent requirement to include school-based surveys that incorporate any sensitive questions (e.g., alcohol, tobacco, or drug use, illegal behavior).

Joel

At 4/9/2003 04:10 AM, Linda Young wrote:

>Colleagues,

>

>The NIH Project Officer for one of our grants has questioned our IRB's
>approval of using passive consent for school based (anonymous) student
>survey. The Research Scientist for this project is looking for
>methodological studies comparing the response rates, data quality,
>costs, etc. for active vs passive consent. We would very much
>appreciate any references you may be aware of that address this issue.

> Thanks!

>

>Linda Young

>Center Director

>Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation

>(502) 634-3694, ext. 11

>FAX: (502) 634-5690

>Email: Young@PIRE.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.

Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.

Director

Center for Family and Community Health

School of Public Health

University of California, Berkeley

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

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, 9 Apr 2003 14:52:17 -0500

Reply-To: "mary.losch@uni.edu" <mary.losch@UNI.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "mary.losch@uni.edu" <mary.losch@UNI.EDU>

Subject: Re: passive vs active consent

In-Reply-To: <5.1.1.5.2.20030409101350.02b0a060@uclink.berkeley.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: Quoted-printable

<color><param>0100,0100,0100</param>Dear Linda,

The federal human research participant regulations do not (and have never, to my knowledge) recognized passive consent. A waiver of documentation of consent or a waiver of parental consent can be

approved by an IRB but only in very prescribed circumstances. A quick search of the web provided this information (reproduced below) from Wayne State University regarding their policy. I thought it provided a good overview of the regulatory issues and hope it is helpful. Mary Losch=
<bold>

~~~~~  
**Consent Procedures**

Children cannot consent to participate in research themselves, therefore, the written permission (i.e. informed consent) of parents/guardians and the assent of the child must be obtained as stated below. Written assent is recommended for children age 13 and older and oral assent is recommended for children age 8 and older. These ages can be modified at the request of the investigator or at the discretion of the IRB for any individual protocol.

In general, a child's dissent should be respected. Every effort should be made to reach consensus between parent(s) and child, however, when the research offers the child the possibility of direct benefit important to his/her own health and is available only through research, the parent's wishes generally prevail.

For minimal risk research studies, (category 1), the written permission (i.e. informed consent) of one parent/guardian is sufficient. Children should give assent as appropriate.

For research involving greater than minimal risk but with a potential of benefit to the subject, (category 2), the written permission (i.e. informed consent) of one parent/ guardian is, again, sufficient. Children should give assent as appropriate.

For research involving greater than minimal risk and with no prospect of direct benefit to the child, (category 3), both parents must give written permission (i.e. informed consent) unless one parent is deceased, unknown, incompetent, or not reasonably available, or only one parent has the legal responsibility for the care and custody of the child. Children should give assent as appropriate.

In the past when research was conducted with adolescents, the term "passive consent" was often used. For example, a notice may have been sent to the parents that their child would be asked to participate in a research project conducted in the school setting unless the parent called a certain number or returned a post card. The investigator then assumed that because he/she did not hear from the parent, the parent had given "passive consent" (i.e., waived consent) for their child to participate in the research activity. From an IRB perspective, that term actually

referred to a "waiver" of parental permission (assent was still obtained from the child).

Federal regulations do not acknowledge the concept of "passive consent". The use of this term infers that the investigator is unfamiliar with the principles upon which the Federal Regulations are based. Investigators who wish to utilize this concept should request a "waiver" of parental permission.

WSU HIC will not approve the use of the term passive consent. Minimal risk projects involving children may be approved through the use of a "waiver of consent" based upon Federal regulation 45 CFR 46.116. In such instances, the IRB may waive consent by approving the use of an information sheet containing all the elements of informed consent for the parent and an assent form for the child.

If the IRB determines that a research protocol is designed for conditions or subject populations for which parental or guardian permission is not a reasonable requirement to protect the child, it may also waive the consent requirement based on Federal regulation 45 CFR 46.408(c).1 Under such circumstances, the IRB must determine an appropriate substitute mechanism for protecting the child.

**Note:** For guidelines on drawing blood for research purposes in children, please see WSU HIC general policy " Research Studies Involving the Collection of Blood Samples ".

145 CFR 46.408 (c) In addition to the provisions for waiver contained in 46.116 of Subpart A, if the IRB determines that a research protocol is designed for conditions or for a subject population for which parental or guardian permission is not a reasonable requirement to protect the subjects (for example, neglected or abused children), it may waive the consent requirements in Subpart A of this part and paragraph (b) of this section, provided an appropriate mechanism for protecting the children who will participate as subjects in the research is substituted, and provided further that the waiver is not inconsistent with Federal State or

local law. The choice of an appropriate mechanism would depend upon the nature and purpose of the activities described in the protocol, the risk and anticipated benefit to the research subjects, and their age, maturity, status, and condition.

-----  
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, 10 Apr 2003 12:12:49 -0500  
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

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

From: Rita Koontz [mailto:koontz@mail.wsu.edu]  
Sent: Wednesday, April 09, 2003 11:24 PM  
To: Mike Flanagan  
Subject: Job Posting

F

A Survey Research Assistant is needed to oversee daily operations in the data collection center of the UALR Institute of Government Survey = Research Unit. This Research Assistant position is responsible for planning, supervising and monitoring the data collection operations, and is accountable for providing high quality data and maximizing workforce productivity. The position reports to the Director of Survey Research.

Major responsibilities include:

- \* Recruiting, hiring, training, evaluating and motivating a competent workforce to assure the timely and cost-effective provision of data collection services.
- \* Overseeing the efficient scheduling and allocation of projects to = achieve optimum utilization of staff and resources and timely completion of projects.
- \* Providing quality control through monitoring and supervision of data collection activities to ascertain quality and identify training and questionnaire design issues.

Qualifications:

- \* BA required and MA preferred
- \* 1-year supervisory experience in a telephone survey research data collection environment.
- \* Proficient using CATI software.
- \* Excellent multitasking, communication and personal and organizational skills.
- \* Ability to work evenings and weekends.

Salary range is between upper twenties to lower thirties. Send one-page letter stating interest in position, resume, and names of three = references

to: Jan Jackson, UALR Institute of Government, Library 501, 2801 South University Avenue, Little Rock, AR 72204 or email as attachments to = Cindy Bennett Boland (cbboland@ualr.edu).

UALR is a metropolitan university of 11,000 students, located in the state's capital city. The Institute is comprised of the survey research group, applied research group, Master in Public Administration program, and public and non-profit management training.

UALR is committed to the policy of providing equal opportunity for all persons and will not discriminate in admissions, age, race, national origin, color, disability, or religion. In carrying out this commitment, the University follows the principles of Affirmative Action and operates within the federal laws and executive orders prohibiting discrimination. Under Arkansas law, all applications are subject to disclosure. Persons hired must have proof of legal authority to work in the United States.

---

Cindy Bennett Boland  
University of Arkansas at Little Rock  
2801 S. University Avenue  
Little Rock AR 72204  
ph - 501.569.8559 fx - 501.569.8538

---

\*\*\*\*\*  
Rita Koontz  
Social & Economic Sciences Research Center  
Washington State University  
PO Box 644014, Wilson Hall #133  
Pullman, WA 99164-4014  
509-335-1512/Fax 509-335-0116  
koontz@wsu.edu  
<http://www.sesrc.wsu.edu/>  
<http://www.sesrc.wsu.edu/ifdte/>  
\*\*\*\*\*

-----  
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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Fri, 11 Apr 2003 15:23:13 -0400  
Reply-To: [mark@bisconti.com](mailto:mark@bisconti.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mark David Richards <[mark@BISCONTI.COM](mailto:mark@BISCONTI.COM)>  
Subject: Wash Times--Americans opine on events of war  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

THE WASHINGTON TIMES

April 11, 2003, page A16

## AMERICANS OPINE ON EVENTS OF WAR

Polls show support for military

By Jennifer Harper

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/national/20030411-68198564.htm>

The fall of Baghdad has instant historic status. Toppled statues, mixed emotions and a worldwide TV audience made Wednesday's events a true cultural moment, with a full complement of surveys to gauge the American mind-set.

And what of symbolic gestures?

After Marine Cpl. Edward Chin briefly draped the face of a Saddam Hussein statue with a U.S. flag, the act spawned spirited discussion - pro and con - in the Western and Middle Eastern media. It was "the draping debate," according to ABC News.

"The Iraqi crowd, they were egging us on," Cpl. Chin told CNN. "They were happy to see us do it. We took it down after a brief moment and put their flag up."

An online poll at Vote.com asked yesterday whether the flag symbolized "the beginning of Iraqi freedom" or American invasion. Of the 5,700 respondents, 79 percent said they saw it as a symbol of freedom and approved of the gesture.

Meanwhile, an overnight Gallup/CNN/USA Today poll released yesterday found 46 percent of Americans think the fall of the city is as significant as the downing of the Berlin Wall in 1989. But 46 percent also think Baghdad is not as important as Berlin, while 2 percent find it more significant.

The Gallup Poll also found 76 percent of those surveyed believe Iraq is worth going to war over - up from 67 percent April 7 and 8. Another 63 percent say the war is going "very well" - up from 47 percent just two days earlier. Thirty-two percent say the war is going "moderately well."

The success has surprised many. Six days ago, 73 percent predicted the battle in Baghdad would be difficult. In the aftermath, 63 percent perceived it as easy. But 85 percent say the war is not over yet. Forty-eight percent think the United States should take control of Iraq; another 48 percent say we won't have victory until Saddam Hussein is killed or captured.

The Gallup Poll of 495 adults was conducted Wednesday.

A Pew Research Center survey released yesterday had similar results, with 51 percent of respondents saying the United States hasn't won until Saddam is accounted for. Sixty-nine percent feel it is too early to tell whether the war has been "won," though 29 percent believe America is already victorious. Ninety-four percent said the war is going well.

Ninety percent gave the military favorable ratings in defeating Iraqi forces. Seventy-six percent approve of Mr. Bush's handling of the war and 76 percent say military action was the right decision.

Americans worry most over the cost of war (34 percent) followed by

increased hatred in the Mideast (28 percent), guerrilla warfare (19 percent) and a rift with our allies (15 percent).

The Pew survey of 809 adults was conducted April 8 and 9.

An ABC News/Washington Post poll also released yesterday finds that 77 percent approve of Mr. Bush's job as president, 80 percent support the war, 81 percent say it was "the right thing to do" and 96 percent say the action is going well.

Among those who support the war, 90 percent said it was justified regardless of whether weapons of mass destruction are discovered in Iraq.

Seventy percent say they were not surprised at how quickly American and British forces took over Baghdad, but 77 percent agree "there's still more difficult fighting ahead." Seventy-seven percent believe the people of Iraq back the U.S. effort and 66 percent say the number of U.S. casualties has been acceptable.

The ABC survey of 509 adults was conducted Wednesday.

---

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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Fri, 11 Apr 2003 16:38:49 -0400  
Reply-To: "Safir, Adam" <[ASafir@UI.URBAN.ORG](mailto:ASafir@UI.URBAN.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Safir, Adam" <[ASafir@UI.URBAN.ORG](mailto:ASafir@UI.URBAN.ORG)>  
Subject: Position Available at The Urban Institute  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

The Urban Institute is a non-profit, non-partisan public policy research organization. We have an opening for the position of Research Assistant. Please direct responses to the contact address below, or to [resumes@ui.urban.org](mailto:resumes@ui.urban.org).

best, Adam

\*\*\*\*\*

JOB TITLE: Research Assistant (#03044-ANF)

#### SUMMARY

Performs a combination of tasks in support of the preparation of analysis files from a large, multi-year survey. Specific tasks include: serving as a resource for internal data users; using statistical software to tabulate data for analytic purposes; assisting in checking, recoding and editing survey data; testing public use files created from survey data; and

providing support for data imputation and weighting. Assists in the writing of methodology reports and other survey-related documentation. Provides support for research presented at professional conferences.

#### EXPERIENCE

Experience related to working with survey data would be helpful. Incumbent should possess SAS programming skills, solid organizational, MS Office and technical writing skills.

#### EDUCATION

Bachelor's Degree in Economics, Statistics, Mathematics, Survey Methodology or related Social Science

#### HOW TO APPLY

Send resume, cover letter, transcripts, and writing sample to:

The Urban Institute  
Search Committee - Job #03044-ANF  
2100 M Street N.W.  
Washington, DC 20037

No phone calls please. Fax: (202) 887-5189 - Please limit transmissions to 6 pages. We are able to accept resumes via e-mail at [resumes@ui.urban.org](mailto:resumes@ui.urban.org). Send text only, no attachments please.

The Urban Institute is an Equal Opportunity Employer M/F/V/H. We welcome diversity in the workplace and encourage all minorities and women to apply.

-----  
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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Fri, 11 Apr 2003 21:09:54 +0000  
Reply-To: [alisu1@ATTBI.COM](mailto:alisu1@ATTBI.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Alis U <[alisu1@ATTBI.COM](mailto:alisu1@ATTBI.COM)>  
Subject: Focus group facilities in Arlington/LA/Queens?  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

I am looking for a focus group facility in Arlington, VA, one in Los Angeles and one in Queens, NY. Any recommendations? An added bonus would be if they are good at recruiting Hispanic participants.

Thanks in advance,

Alisú

\*\*\*\*\*  
Alisú Schoua-Glusberg, Ph.D.

General Partner  
Research Support Services

-----  
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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 10:11:26 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Appeal court reduces jail terms for Iranian pollsters  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Zagbi?

<http://www.iranmania.com/News/ArticleView/Default.asp?NewsCode=15056&NewsKind=Current%20Affairs>

Appeal court reduces jail terms for Iranian pollsters

Monday, April 14, 2003 - C2003 IranMania.com

TEHRAN, April 13 (AFP) - An Iranian appeal court has slashed the jail terms on two reformist opinion pollsters responsible for a survey which showed Iranians in favour of resuming dialogue with Washington, state radio said Sunday.

C2002 IranMania & AFP

The report said Hossein-Ali Ghazian, who was initially handed a nine-year jail term, and Abbas Abdi, who was sentenced to eight years behind bars, had had their punishments reduced to four-and-a-half years each.

It said the court had "considered the expression of repentance by the defendants and their cooperation".

Abdi and Ghazian, who headed the Ayandeh polling institute, were jailed after they published a survey which showed three-quarters of Iranian favoured resuming talks with the US.

They were convicted of selling information to the US Gallup, French VM and Zagbi (a Gallup Middle East subsidiary) polling institutes and engaging in "propaganda against the Islamic regime".

Ties with the US were severed after the 1979 revolution in Iran and the

topic of resuming links remains delicate.

Abdi, a leading figure in Iran's main reformist party backing President Mohammad Khatami, was also heavily involved in hostage-taking at the US embassy after the 1979 Islamic revolution.

Behrouz Gheranpayeh, the head of the National Society of Public Opinion Studies and also involved in the survey, was freed in January on bail after spending some 80 days in solitary confinement.

All three men admitted in court to negligence.

--

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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 14:16:32 -0400  
Reply-To: [cporter@hp.ufl.edu](mailto:cporter@hp.ufl.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Colleen Kay Porter <[cporter@HP.UFL.EDU](mailto:cporter@HP.UFL.EDU)>  
Subject: Getting ready for Nashville...  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Since one of the AAPOR conference events involves dinner at The Hermitage, I thought I might share the novel I am reading, in case anyone else might find it of interest.

I am re-reading THE PRESIDENT'S LADY by Irving Stone, a biographical novel about the Jacksons from Rachel's point of view. When I read this book some decades ago, it really had an impact, because their partnership was so unusual for its time--she played a key role in running his businesses, and she was divorced from an abusive first marriage at a time when divorce was almost-unheard-of.

I gained an appreciation for both Rachel and Andrew Jackson from reading this book. Here is one of my favorite parts, an excerpt from one

of Andrew's speech during his state's  
Constitutional Convention:

"Georgia was named after a King; the Carolinas,  
Virginia and Maryland after Queens; Pennsylvania  
after a colonial proprietor; Delaware after a Lord  
and New York after a Royal Duke. Since Independence  
there is no reason for copying anything from England  
in our new geography. We should adopt for our new  
state the Indian name of THE GREAT CROOKED RIVER,  
Tennessee, a word that has as sweet a flavor on the  
tongue as hot corncakes and honey."

This is an old book, but my library had a paperback  
copy, and it has been interesting airplane reading  
for the past few weeks.

I would have been too embarrassed to admit that I  
am reading a, you know, romance novel. But it really  
is a lot more than that. And on NPR last week, a  
reviewer said of another book of historical fiction,  
"It's important that we live these events through  
novels and not just read about them in history  
books."

Yeah, that's it.

Although I'm sure the political scientists among us  
can recommend some more serious works about Jackson.

Colleen K. Porter  
Project Coordinator, University of Florida  
\*\*\*AT OUR NEW OFFICE & PHONE NUMBER\*\*  
cporter@hp.ufl.edu  
phone: 352/273-6068  
Department of Health Services Administration  
Location: 101 Newell Drive, Rm. 4136  
US Mail: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

-----  
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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 15:02:55 -0400  
Reply-To: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>  
Subject: Poor media reporting continues....  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable



If this paper had circulation of more than about 800 people, it might be worth a letter...This is clearly an example of the MISreporting of a "push" poll.

=20  
Illinois Capitol Fax's Miller reports, The poll "gives us a rare peek inside at least some of his strategy for" '04. Fitzgerald "plans to hit hard on the issue of 'independence,'" as "several of the poll's 'push' questions dealt with that topic." However, "it also looks like Fitz will be trying to accentuate his more liberal leanings in the coming campaign."=20

After the "push questions" -- "which, incidentally, included a few nasty jabs at" Speaker Denny Hastert -- "the number of people who said Fitzgerald deserved reelection rose about 20 points, from 42 percent to 63 percent among people who didn't vote in the last Republican primary, and from 56 percent to 74 percent among those who did vote in the last GOP primary" (4/14).=20

=20  
and the link (fool me once...)

=20  
<http://www.capitolfax.com/>

=20  
=20  
=20  
=20  
=20  
Jason Boxt=20

Vice President=20  
Global Strategy Group=20  
1825 Connecticut Ave, NW=20  
Fifth Floor=20  
Washington, D.C. 20009=20

(202) 265-4676=20  
(202) 265-4619 (fax)

[www.globalstrategygroup.com](http://www.globalstrategygroup.com) <<http://www.globalstrategygroup.com>>=20

=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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 15:23:28 -0400  
Reply-To: "Dimitropoulos, Linda L." <[lld@RTI.ORG](mailto:lld@RTI.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Dimitropoulos, Linda L." <[lld@RTI.ORG](mailto:lld@RTI.ORG)>  
Subject: This is one hot T-shirt!  
MIME-version: 1.0

The proof of this year's AAPOR T-Shirt just arrived and it is the best

conference T-shirt I've seen yet.

The T-shirt is an Ash color (soft grey) with the terrifically colorful graphic on the front (You can see the graphic on the AAPOR web site).

On the back is this year's very popular winning slogan, "The Ns justify the Xs"

All T-shirts need to be ordered in advance so get to the web site and order yours today!

Linda

Linda L. Dimitropoulos, Ph.D.  
Survey Director  
RTI International  
203 N. Wabash Suite #1900  
Chicago, IL 60601  
phone: 312/456-5246  
fax: 312/456-5250  
lld@rti.org <mailto:lld@rti.org>

-----  
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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 15:48:46 -0400  
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>  
Subject: Sofres Poll: Views of French young people on U.S. and Iraq  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

FYI--Following is a quick translation of a SOFRES study of French youth 15-25 years old, conducted for L'Express et M6. The study is published at this location:  
[http://www.sofres.com/etudes/pol/100403\\_jeunesirakus\\_r.htm](http://www.sofres.com/etudes/pol/100403_jeunesirakus_r.htm)  
mark

-----  
Le regard des jeunes sur les Etats-Unis et le conflit en Irak=20  
--The views of French young people on the United States and the conflict in Iraq

Fiche Technique  
--Method

Etude r=E9alis=E9e par t=E9l=E9phone du 3 au 5 avril 2003 pour L'Express =

et M6

auprès d'un échantillon national de 400 jeunes, représentatif de la population française de 15 à 25 ans. Méthode des quotas (sexe, âge, profession du chef de ménage PCS) et stratification par région et catégorie d'agglomération.

--Nationally representative telephone survey of 400 French youth 15-25 years old conducted 3-5 April, 2003.

Les résultats  
--Results

Question : Avez-vous pour les Etats-Unis plutôt de la sympathie, de l'antipathie ou encore ni sympathie, ni antipathie ? // Do you have more sympathy/good will for the U.S., or more antipathy/ill feelings toward the U.S., or neither sympathy nor antipathy?

- Plus de la sympathie / more sympathy - 16%
- Plus de l'antipathie / more antipathy - 25%
- Ni sympathie, ni antipathie / neither - 58%
- Sans opinion - no opinion - 1%

Question : Vous personnellement, aimeriez-vous (ou auriez-vous aimé) ?  
/ Personally, would you like to ....

% Yes, % No

- ...Vivre aux Etats-Unis / Live in the U.S. - 25% yes, 75% no
- ...Travailler aux Etats-Unis / Visit the U.S. - 32% yes, 67% no
- ...Etudier aux Etats-Unis / Study in the U.S. - 40% yes, 60% no

Question : Dans cette liste de mots, qu'est-ce qui évoque le plus pour vous les Etats- Unis ? / From this list of words, which evoke the United States for you? (MULTIPLE RESPONSES)

% Rang

- La puissance / power - 56%
- Les inégalités / inequality - 42
- La violence / violence - 36
- La richesse / wealth - 36
- L'imperialisme / imperialism - 31
- Le racisme / racism - 22
- Le dynamisme /energy, vitality - 17
- Le rêve / the dream - 14
- La liberté / liberty - 13
- La jeunesse / youth - 10
- La culture / culture - 9
- Sans opinion / no opinion - 0

Question : Certains reprochent à la France de ne pas être solidaire des Etats-Unis dans le conflit en Irak, alors que les Etats-Unis avaient

=E9t=E9

solidaires de la France pendant la seconde guerre mondiale. Selon vous, ce reproche est-il justifi=E9 ou pas justifi=E9 ? / Some criticize = France for not supporting the U.S. in the Iraq conflict, because the U.S. supported France in WWII. In your opinion, is this criticism justified or not justified?

- Tout =E0 fait justifi=E9 / Completely justified - 3%=20
- Plut=F4t - Somewhat justified - 16=20
- Justifi=E9 / JUSTIFIED - 19=20
- Plut=F4t pas / Not really - 22
- Pas du tout justifi=E9 / Not at all justified - 57=20
- ST Pas justifi=E9 / NOT JUSTIFIED - 79=20
- Sans opinion / no opinion - 2=20

Question : Approuvez-vous ou d=E9sapprouvez-vous l'intervention = militaire en Irak de la coalition men=E9e par les Am=E9ricains ? / Do you approve = or disapprove of the military intervention in Iraq by the coalition organized by the Americans?

- Approuve tout =E0 fait / Completely approve - 3%=20
- Approuve plut=F4t / Somewhat - 9=20
- ST Approuve / APPROVE - 12=20
- D=E9sapprouve plut=F4t / Somewhat disapprove - 33=20
- D=E9sapprouve tout =E0 fait / Completely disapprove - 52=20
- ST D=E9sapprouve / DISAPPROVE - 85=20
- Sans opinion / no opinion - 3=20

Question : Selon vous, quelle est la raison principale de l'intervention en Irak de la coalition men=E9e par les Am=E9ricains ? / In your view, = what is the main reason for the intervention in Iraq by the coalition organized by the Americans? (MULTIPLE RESPONSE)

- Acc=E9der aux ressources p=E9troli=E8res irakiennes / Access to Iraq petroleum resources - 53%=20
- Imposer la domination am=E9ricaine au Moyen-orient / To impose U.S. domination on the Middle East - 21
- Renverser le r=E9gime de Saddam Hussein / Overthrow the Saddam Hussein regime - 14
- Lutter contre le terrorisme =E0 la suite des =E9v=E8nements du 11 = septembre / Fight against terrorism following September 11, 2001 - 9=20
- Promouvoir la d=E9mocratie en Irak / To encourage democracy in Iraq - = 2
- Sans opinion / no opinion - 1=20

Question : Au fond de vous-m=E9me, que souhaitez-vous : / Which do you personally want to see...

- La victoire de la coalition men=E9e par les Am=E9ricains / the victory =

of  
the coalition organized by the Americans - 48%=20

- La victoire de l'Irak / Victory by Iraq - 24=20
- Ni l'un, ni l'autre (R=E9ponse non sugg=E9r=E9e) / Neither - 24=20
- Sans opinion / no opinion - 4=20

Question : Dans ce conflit avec l'Irak, approuvez-vous ou d=E9sapprouvez-vous les prises de position de : In this conflict with Iraq, do you approve or disapprove with the position taken by...

- Jacques CHIRAC 84% approve, 13% disapprove
- Tony BLAIR 11% approve, 80% disapprove
- George W. BUSH 10% approve, 87% disapprove

Question : De Saddam Hussein, diriez-vous qu'il est avant tout : /Regarding Saddam Hussein, would you say that he is above all...=20

- Un dictateur / a dictator - 83%
- Un alli=E9 de Ben Laden / an allie of Ben Laden - 12
- Un h=E9ros qui r=E9siste aux Etats-Unis / A hero who is resisting the = U.S. - 3=20
- Rien de tout cela / None - 1=20
- Sans opinion /no opinion - 1=20

Question : Au bout du compte, =E0 l'issue de cette guerre, pensez-vous = que (=85=85..) sortira (ont) plut=F4t renforc=E9 ou plut=F4t affaibli : / In = the end, regarding this war, do you think that ... will come out strengthened or weakened.

- Les relations entre la France et le Moyen-Orient / relations between France and the Middle East - 69% strengthened, 24% weakened=20
- La France / France - 54 strengthened, 41% weakened
- Les relations entre les pays du Moyen-Orient / Relations among Middle Eastern countries - 37% strengthened, 58 weakened=20
- L'Union Europ=E9enne / EU - 35% strengthened, 61 weakened=20
- Les Etats-Unis / the U.S. - 34% strengthened, 62% weakened=20
- L'ONU / THE UN - 22 strengthened, 73 weakened=20
- Les relations franco-am=E9ricaines / Franco-American relations - 10 strengthened, 88 weakened=20

Question : Vous-m=EAm=, avez-vous d=E9j=E0, ou avez-vous l'intention de = : / Have you personally already done this, or do intend to ... =20

- Donner de l'argent =E0 des associations humanitaires / Give money to humanitarian associations - 18% have done, 29% plan to=20
- Manifester contre la guerre en Irak / Demonstrate against the war in Iraq 28% have done, 16% plan to =20
- Acheter des produits d'entreprises ou de marques engag=E9es contre la guerre / buy products or brands that are against the war - 6% have done, 25% plan to =20

- Ne plus acheter des produits ou des services de marques am=E9ricaines = /
- Boycott U.S. products or services - 12% have done, 6% plan to =20
- Manifester pour soutenir les Am=E9ricains / Demonstrate in support of the U.S. - 2% have done, 1% plan to

-----  
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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 15:57:28 -0500  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: Re: Poor media reporting continues....  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I don't think this qualifies as a push poll. Too few respondents. It did include push questions.

The Sun-Times only reported results (re-elect, heats) obtained prior to the asking of push questions. However, those were also asked somewhat late in the interview.

Jason Boxt wrote:

- >
- > If this paper had circulation of more than about 800 people, it might be
- > worth a letter...This is clearly an example of the MISreporting of a
- > "push" poll.
- >
- > Illinois Capitol Fax's Miller reports, The poll "gives us a rare peek
- > inside at least some of his strategy for" '04. Fitzgerald "plans to hit
- > hard on the issue of 'independence,'" as "several of the poll's 'push'
- > questions dealt with that topic." However, "it also looks like Fitz will
- > be trying to accentuate his more liberal leanings in the coming
- > campaign."
- > After the "push questions" -- "which, incidentally, included a few
- > nasty jabs at" Speaker Denny Hastert -- "the number of people who said
- > Fitzgerald deserved reelection rose about 20 points, from 42 percent to
- > 63 percent among people who didn't vote in the last Republican primary,
- > and from 56 percent to 74 percent among those who did vote in the last
- > GOP primary" (4/14).
- >

>  
> and the link (fool me once...)  
>  
> <http://www.capitolfax.com/>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> Jason Boxt  
>  
> Vice President  
> Global Strategy Group  
> 1825 Connecticut Ave, NW  
> Fifth Floor  
> Washington, D.C. 20009  
>  
> (202) 265-4676  
> (202) 265-4619 (fax)  
>  
> [www.globalstrategygroup.com](http://www.globalstrategygroup.com) <<http://www.globalstrategygroup.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](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 22:59:32 +0200  
Reply-To: Lyberg Lars VL-S <[lars.lyberg@SCB.SE](mailto:lars.lyberg@SCB.SE)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Lyberg Lars VL-S <[lars.lyberg@SCB.SE](mailto:lars.lyberg@SCB.SE)>  
Subject: Customer satisfaction surveys  
Comments: To: [SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU](mailto:SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

=20

I am interested in articles discussing quality issues associated with  
the design and execution of customer satisfaction surveys. Any  
references or other information would be much appreciated. Please answer  
to me and I will eventually provide a summary to all of you.

=20

=20

Lars Lyberg  
Statistics Sweden

-----  
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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 17:07:45 -0400  
Reply-To: Jason Boxt <[jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM](mailto:jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jason Boxt <[jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM](mailto:jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Poor media reporting continues....  
Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I have a copy of the survey in front of me, and I fail to see any "push" questions, I see message questions, but nothing I personally would call something from a push poll--that said, I believe the definition of a push poll lies more in the methodology (or lack thereof) than it does in the composition of the questions.

If you could share what you believe the "push" questions are, I think we could get closer to understanding the misunderstanding...

Respectfully,

Jason

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

From: Nick Panagakis [<mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>]=20  
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2003 4:57 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Re: Poor media reporting continues....

I don't think this qualifies as a push poll. Too few respondents. It did include push questions.

The Sun-Times only reported results (re-elect, heats) obtained prior to the asking of push questions. However, those were also asked somewhat late in the interview.

Jason Boxt wrote:

>  
> If this paper had circulation of more than about 800 people, it might=20  
> be worth a letter...This is clearly an example of the MISreporting of=20  
> a "push" poll.  
>  
> Illinois Capitol Fax's Miller reports, The poll "gives us a rare peek=20  
> inside at least some of his strategy for" '04. Fitzgerald "plans to=20



> hit hard on the issue of 'independence,'" as "several of the poll's=20  
> 'push' questions dealt with that topic." However, "it also looks like=20  
> Fitz will be trying to accentuate his more liberal leanings in the=20  
> coming campaign."  
> After the "push questions" -- "which, incidentally, included a=20  
> few nasty jabs at" Speaker Denny Hastert -- "the number of people who=20  
> said Fitzgerald deserved reelection rose about 20 points, from 42=20  
> percent to 63 percent among people who didn't vote in the last=20  
> Republican primary, and from 56 percent to 74 percent among those who=20  
> did vote in the last GOP primary" (4/14).

> and the link (fool me once....)

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

> Jason Boxt

> Vice President

> Global Strategy Group

> 1825 Connecticut Ave, NW

> Fifth Floor

> Washington, D.C. 20009

> (202) 265-4676

> (202) 265-4619 (fax)

> [www.globalstrategygroup.com](http://www.globalstrategygroup.com) <<http://www.globalstrategygroup.com/>>

> -----  
> Need to signoff? Don't send email, go to:=20

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

> then click on 'Join or leave the list'

> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:=20

> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====

Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 17:31:42 -0400  
Reply-To: Ward Kay <wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Ward Kay <wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM>  
Organization: Adirondack Communications  
Subject: Re: This is one hot T-shirt!  
Comments: To: "Dimitropoulos, Linda L." <lld@RTI.ORG>  
In-Reply-To: <CF84FB232B8B6A45A3C9C928B202936AFD695C@rtints26.rti.org>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Linda Dimitropoulos wrote:

>All T-shirts need to be ordered in advance so get to the web site and  
order  
>yours today!

Only problem is that you can't order the T-shirt on the online  
registration.

-----  
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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 16:35:49 -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: Poor media reporting continues....  
Comments: To: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I call push questions those questions giving statements favorable to  
Fitzgerald or unfavorable to Hastert (Q20-Q33) asking does this make you  
more/less likely to vote for Fitzgerald followed by the same heat and  
re-elect questions asked earlier in the interview (prior to Q 20) to  
find the extent to which they "pushed" voters toward Fitzgerald.

That's my understanding of push questions. Q20-Q33 are also called  
message questions testing which statements make voters feel more like  
voting for Fitzgerald. There is a pretty fine line between the two.

Nick

Jason Boxt wrote:

>  
> I have a copy of the survey in front of me, and I fail to see any "push"  
> questions, I see message questions, but nothing I personally would call

> something from a push poll--that said, I believe the definition of a  
> push poll lies more in the methodology (or lack thereof) than it does in  
> the composition of the questions.  
>  
> If you could share what you believe the "push" questions are, I think we  
> could get closer to understanding the misunderstanding...

> Respectfully,

> Jason

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

> From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM]

> Sent: Monday, April 14, 2003 4:57 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Poor media reporting continues....

> I don't think this qualifies as a push poll. Too few respondents. It did  
> include push questions.

> The Sun-Times only reported results (re-elect, heats) obtained prior to  
> the asking of push questions. However, those were also asked somewhat  
> late in the interview.

> Jason Boxt wrote:

>> If this paper had circulation of more than about 800 people, it might  
>> be worth a letter...This is clearly an example of the MISreporting of  
>> a "push" poll.

>> Illinois Capitol Fax's Miller reports, The poll "gives us a rare peek  
>> inside at least some of his strategy for" '04. Fitzgerald "plans to  
>> hit hard on the issue of 'independence,'" as "several of the poll's  
>> 'push' questions dealt with that topic." However, "it also looks like  
>> Fitz will be trying to accentuate his more liberal leanings in the  
>> coming campaign."

>> After the "push questions" -- "which, incidentally, included a  
>> few nasty jabs at" Speaker Denny Hastert -- "the number of people who  
>> said Fitzgerald deserved reelection rose about 20 points, from 42  
>> percent to 63 percent among people who didn't vote in the last  
>> Republican primary, and from 56 percent to 74 percent among those who  
>> did vote in the last GOP primary" (4/14).

>> and the link (fool me once....)

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

>> Jason Boxt

>> Vice President

>> Global Strategy Group  
>> 1825 Connecticut Ave, NW  
>> Fifth Floor  
>> Washington, D.C. 20009  
>>  
>> (202) 265-4676  
>> (202) 265-4619 (fax)  
>>  
>> www.globalstrategygroup.com <<http://www.globalstrategygroup.com/>>  
>>  
>>  
>>

>> -----  
>> 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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 15:02:08 -0700  
Reply-To: Ellis Godard <[ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU](mailto:ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Ellis Godard <[ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU](mailto:ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: This is one hot T-shirt!  
Comments: To: Ward Kay <[wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM](mailto:wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM)>  
In-Reply-To: <[000001c302cd\\$40d77880\\$6501a8c0@Ward](mailto:000001c302cd$40d77880$6501a8c0@Ward)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

It's very hidden. You need to print out the PDF form, find the t-shirt option on the second page, and mail or fax it in.

-eg

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Ward Kay

> Sent: Monday, April 14, 2003 2:32 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: This is one hot T-shirt!

>

>

> Linda Dimitropoulos wrote:

>

> > All T-shirts need to be ordered in advance so get to the web site and

> order

> > yours today!

>

> Only problem is that you can't order the T-shirt on the online

> registration.

>

> -----

> 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](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 14:59:13 -0700

Reply-To: Joel Bloom <[jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU](mailto:jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU)>

Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>

From: Joel Bloom <[jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU](mailto:jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU)>

Subject: message testing vs. push polling

In-Reply-To: <[0ED62F7DC6311240A5F3A251086F74514C0FDC@gsg-mail01.globalstrategygroup.com](mailto:0ED62F7DC6311240A5F3A251086F74514C0FDC@gsg-mail01.globalstrategygroup.com)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

This would indeed seem to be a case of a message-testing poll, not a push poll. While some items on this survey do resemble the types of items one might expect to see on a push poll, there are fundamental differences.

Push polls don't even attempt to measure public opinion; they simply get negative "information" out to as many people as possible under the guise of a public opinion poll. Message testing questions are instead meant to determine what impact certain types of information might have on public opinion. They are meant for internal strategic purposes, not for publication. In many ways they resemble the types of experimental questions we academic surveyor organizations include on our surveys all the time.

In my opinion we as an organization need to make it quite clear what is acceptable and what is not in this regard and cases like this are excellent case studies.

It is perfectly acceptable for politicians and organizations to engage in message-testing in surveys they commission to help them develop successful public relations strategies.

It is equally clear to me, however, that pollsters need to take steps to ensure that the "results" from these items never see the light of day. The Augusta National poll that created such a flap on this list-serve last Fall is an excellent case study too. The pollster did nothing wrong by including "message-testing" questions on the survey; however, it was quite inappropriate and misleading for Augusta National to turn around and release the "results" from those questions as if they represented public opinion. They did not represent public opinion and they were never meant to. I am perfectly willing to believe that the pollster was mortified when results from those questions were included in the press release, but that doesn't completely free her of responsibility.

One obvious solution would be to require pollsters including legitimate message-testing series in their surveys to specifically require contractual language barring their clients from releasing to the public results of these types of questions. Is this something AAPOR ought to take up?

-- Joel

\*\*\*\*\*  
Joel David Bloom                      Oregon Survey Research Laboratory  
Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate      5245 University of Oregon  
Telephone: 541-346-0891                      Eugene, OR 97403-5245  
jbloom@uoregon.edu                      Facsimile: 541-346-0388  
http://www.uoregon.edu/~jbloom                      http://osrl.uoregon.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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date:      Mon, 14 Apr 2003 17:38:05 -0500  
Reply-To:   Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>  
Sender:     AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From:      Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>  
Subject:    Re: This is one hot T-shirt!  
Comments: To: Ward Kay <wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

We'll see if we can get that added to the on-line registration form =  
quickly. In the interim, you can order the T-shirt via the download =  
form and fax it to the AAPOR Executive Office (913) 599-5340. You can =  
order just the T-Shirt if you are not able to join us in Nashville, but =  
you'll be missing out on a GREAT conference program.=20

Mike Flanagan=20

Michael P. Flanagan, CAE=20  
Executive Coordinator=20  
American Association for Public Opinion Research =20  
P. O. Box 14263=20  
Lenexa, KS 66285-4263=20  
(913) 495-4470=20  
FAX: (913) 599-5340 =20  
www.aapor.org <<http://www.aapor.org>> =20  
=20

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

From: Ward Kay [mailto:[wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM](mailto:wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM)]  
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2003 4:32 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: This is one hot T-shirt!

Linda Dimitropoulos wrote:

>All T-shirts need to be ordered in advance so get to the web site and  
order  
>yours today!

Only problem is that you can't order the T-shirt on the online  
registration.

-----  
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](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 17:51:26 -0700  
Reply-To: "H. H. Kassanjian" <[hkassanjian@ADELPHIA.NET](mailto:hkassanjian@ADELPHIA.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "H. H. Kassanjian" <[hkassanjian@ADELPHIA.NET](mailto:hkassanjian@ADELPHIA.NET)>  
Subject: Fwd: This is one hot T-shirt!  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

It may be a lovely T-shirt, but ordering one is exceptionally  
user-unfriendly. The order form is hidden, at least from the computer

clucks like myself.  
Hal Kassarjian

>Date: Mon, 14 Apr 2003 15:23:28 -0400  
>From: "Dimitropoulos, Linda L." <lld@RTI.ORG>  
>Subject: This is one hot T-shirt!  
>Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>Reply-to: "Dimitropoulos, Linda L." <lld@RTI.ORG>  
>X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

>  
>The proof of this year's AAPOR T-Shirt just arrived and it is the best  
>conference T-shirt I've seen yet.

>  
>The T-shirt is an Ash color (soft grey) with the terrifically colorful  
>graphic on the front (You can see the graphic on the AAPOR web  
>site).

>  
>On the back is this year's very popular winning slogan, "The Ns justify the  
>Xs"

>  
>All T-shirts need to be ordered in advance so get to the web site and order  
>yours today!

>  
>Linda

>  
>Linda L. Dimitropoulos, Ph.D.  
>Survey Director  
>RTI International  
>203 N. Wabash Suite #1900  
>Chicago, IL 60601  
>phone: 312/456-5246  
>fax: 312/456-5250  
>lld@rti.org <mailto:lld@rti.org>

>-----  
>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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

\*\*\*\*\*

Harold H. Kassarjian  
[hkassarjian@adelphia.net](mailto:hkassarjian@adelphia.net)

-----  
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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

---

Date: Tue, 15 Apr 2003 07:00:42 -0700



Reply-To: "P. Moy" <pmoy@U.WASHINGTON.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "P. Moy" <pmoy@U.WASHINGTON.EDU>  
Subject: Sage and other new publishers in Nashville  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Dear AAPOR members and authors,

We have added to our list of publishers who will be exhibiting in Nashville. Sage will be sending a full booth and representatives; Columbia University Press, Harvard University Press, and Rowman & Littlefield will be sending titles to the Book and Technology Exhibit.

If you have published with these houses and/or would like to see particular public opinion-related titles in Nashville, please email me the titles and I'll forward these to the respective publishers.

Many thanks,

Patricia Moy

-----  
Patricia Moy, Ph.D.  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Communication  
Adjunct Faculty, Political Science  
University of Washington, Box 353740  
Seattle, WA 98195-3740 U.S.A.

Voice: +1.206.543.9676  
Fax: +1.206.543.9285  
Email: pmoy@u.washington.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, 15 Apr 2003 09:08:41 -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: Poor media reporting continues...  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Update

Sponsored by

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/chi-0304150265apr15,1,2663641.story?coll=chi%2Dnews%2Dhed>

Fitzgerald not going to pursue re-election

By Rick Pearson, Tribune political reporter. Tribune staff reporters Diane Rado and Mike Dorning contributed to this report

April 15, 2003

First-term U.S. Sen. Peter Fitzgerald (R-Ill.) told close associates Monday night that he would not seek re-election next year, saying he had "no fire in the belly" and citing concerns about the personal cost of another campaign and the lament that his independence had left him with few political friends, sources said.

Neither Fitzgerald, 42, nor his top aides responded to requests for comment as questions about his political future swirled from Washington to Chicago. But sources said he began notifying close political supporters of his decision late Monday.

On Tuesday, Fitzgerald plans to make a formal announcement at a luncheon of what was supposed to have been his Chicago-based campaign finance and business leadership committee, the sources said.

The decision by Fitzgerald, a wealthy banking heir from Inverness who was known for bucking the traditional Republican establishment, immediately created the potential for a wide-open GOP primary for the party nomination next March. A handful of Republicans, including businessman Andrew McKenna, had been exploring the possibility of a primary challenge to Fitzgerald.

That list is likely to grow with him out of the race. Former Atty. Gen. Jim Ryan, the unsuccessful GOP candidate for governor last fall, has expressed interest, GOP sources said. Other names being mentioned included former state Sen. Patrick O'Malley of Palos Park and DuPage County Board Chairman Robert Schillerstrom.

\* Early polling results questioned Fitzgerald's political viability\* , causing concern in the White House that a weak GOP candidate in Illinois could threaten the party's bare majority in the Senate and undermine President Bush's re-election efforts in a state he lost badly in 2000. Fitzgerald was regarded by many Republicans as the most imperiled of all GOP senators up for election in 2004.

Publicly, the White House opposed any primary challenge to Fitzgerald. But a Republican close to the Bush administration said efforts had been under way to see if Fitzgerald could be encouraged to drop out.

snip

Copyright © 2003, Chicago Tribune

-----  
Improved archives!

Searching Chicagotribune.com archives back to 1985 is cheaper and easier than ever. New prices for multiple articles can bring your cost as low as 30 cents an article: <http://www.chicagotribune.com/archives>

-----  
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, 16 Apr 2003 07:05:36 -0400  
Reply-To: Herb Abelson <[abelson@BELLATLANTIC.NET](mailto:abelson@BELLATLANTIC.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Herb Abelson <[abelson@BELLATLANTIC.NET](mailto:abelson@BELLATLANTIC.NET)>  
Subject: URL for survey research web site  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

If you link to my survey research web site, please change the URL. (Two = days ago verizon - without notice - changed "bellatlantic" to = "verizon"). The url should now be: [members.verizon.net/~abelson/](http://members.verizon.net/~abelson/).

=20

As of this morning there have been 136,855 visits. The site is kept = current. =20

-----  
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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 16 Apr 2003 08:46:35 -0400  
Reply-To: "Featherston, Fran A." <[ffeather@NSF.GOV](mailto:ffeather@NSF.GOV)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Featherston, Fran A." <[ffeather@NSF.GOV](mailto:ffeather@NSF.GOV)>  
Subject: Looking for web sites on designing web surveys  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Can anyone suggest web sites that give tips for designing web surveys? I'm especially interested in suggestions for font size and type and other things that affect readability, but any sites you recommend on web survey design would be welcome.

I tried to find some sites using Google yesterday, and it was very frustrating. No matter what the search I tried, I would get over 5,000 hits and most would be commercial sites that want to design the web survey for you.

I will compile the suggestions I receive and forward them back to AAPORNET.

If you have links to papers on this topic, that would also be appreciated. Or, if you've written a paper on the topic that you could send to me, that would be great, too. Again, I can compile your offerings and send back to the group.

Thanks so much,

(fran)

Fran Featherston

ffeather@nsf.gov

National Science Foundation

4201 Wilson Boulevard

Arlington, Virginia 22230

Phone: 703-292-4221

-----  
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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====

Date: Wed, 16 Apr 2003 10:54:46 -0400

Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)

Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>

From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>

Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing

Subject: Re: Looking for web sites on designing web surveys

Comments: To: "Featherston, Fran A." <[ffeather@NSF.GOV](mailto:ffeather@NSF.GOV)>

In-Reply-To: <[F6017D7863389E42BD52A45B164E37B109DC06@nsfmail01.nsf.gov](mailto:F6017D7863389E42BD52A45B164E37B109DC06@nsfmail01.nsf.gov)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Web design is NOT the same as print design, although many web designers insist on applying principles of page layout as if it were. Elements such as font size and type may not look at all the same in different browsers or even in the same browser at different screen resolutions.

You will most likely do better investigating what web designers refer to as "usability," since I doubt you will find much useful material online about web surveys per se.

One major resource is maintained by the National Cancer Institute at <http://usability.gov>. Another good source of usability information is Jakob Nielsen's site at <http://www.useit.com>.

Anyone interested in this topic should begin by reading "Don't Make Me Think" by Steve Krug, a short and humorous introduction to the general subject of web site usability that will actually give you plenty to think about.

Jan Werner

-----  
Featherston, Fran A. wrote:

> Can anyone suggest web sites that give tips for designing web surveys? I'm  
> especially interested in suggestions for font size and type and other things  
> that affect readability, but any sites you recommend on web survey design  
> would be welcome.  
> I tried to find some sites using Google yesterday, and it was very  
> frustrating. No matter what the search I tried, I would get over 5,000 hits  
> and most would be commercial sites that want to design the web survey for  
> you.  
> I will compile the suggestions I receive and forward them back to AAPORNET.  
>  
> If you have links to papers on this topic, that would also be appreciated.  
> Or, if you've written a paper on the topic that you could send to me, that  
> would be great, too. Again, I can compile your offerings and send back to  
> the group.  
> Thanks so much,  
> (fran)  
> Fran Featherston  
> ffeather@nsf.gov  
> National Science Foundation  
> 4201 Wilson Boulevard  
> Arlington, Virginia 22230  
> Phone: 703-292-4221

> -----  
> 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](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 16 Apr 2003 11:34:53 -0700  
Reply-To: Ellis Godard <[ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU](mailto:ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Ellis Godard <[ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU](mailto:ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU)>  
Subject: Protests (sort of) at August  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

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

[http://charleston.net/stories/041303/spo\\_13protest.shtml](http://charleston.net/stories/041303/spo_13protest.shtml)

After 10 months of threats, boycotts and countless media reports against the club's men-only policy, Martha Burk arrived with little more than two-dozen

supporters and spent barely an hour before taking off in a Chevy Trail Blazer.

...

"There has never been much support for her by women on this issue," said Tampa, Fla.-resident Todd Manzi, who started [www.theburkstopshere.com](http://www.theburkstopshere.com) last fall. "It's media driven. She has used the world-famous golf tournament as a backdrop for this circus."

-----  
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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 16 Apr 2003 13:36:06 -0500

Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>

Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>

From: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>

Subject: Question about software for question tracking and development

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Please respond directly to Ms. Behrens at [jbehrens@worldbank.org](mailto:jbehrens@worldbank.org) =20

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

From: [jbehrens@worldbank.org](mailto:jbehrens@worldbank.org) [<mailto:jbehrens@worldbank.org>]

Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2003 1:07 PM

To: AAPOR-INFO

Subject: Question about software for question tracking and development

Hello, I work with the World Bank Institute Evaluation Group, the =  
evaluation  
unit within the capacity-building arm of the World Bank. We use a =  
variety of  
survey questionnaires to evaluate training activities involving about =  
5,000  
participants per year.

We are considering developing an interactive database that would help us =  
keep  
track of the text of questions used in past and present surveys, and =  
that would  
also keep statistical information about the psychometric performance of =  
each  
question over time. Ideally, this database would also be a tool for =  
building  
future surveys.

Before developing it, however, we wonder whether software that does =

something  
like this already exists in the market. Do you know of any such =  
software?  
Could you refer me to any colleagues with expertise in question =  
development  
methods who might know of software that could perform this function?

I very much appreciate your help with this search.

With best regards,

Joy Behrens

Joy Behrens  
World Bank Institute Evaluation Group  
jbehrens@worldbank.org  
202-458-5053

-----  
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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 16 Apr 2003 13:58:24 -0500  
Reply-To: Lydia\_Saad@GALLUP.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Lydia Saad <Lydia\_Saad@GALLUP.COM>  
Subject: Re: Question about software for question tracking and  
development  
Comments: To: MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

I expect the replies to this question would interest many on aapornet, at  
least they would me.

Thus, I would encourage responding to the group as well as directly to Ms.  
Behrens.

Lydia Saad

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

From: Mike Flanagan [mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM]  
Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2003 2:36 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Question about software for question tracking and development

Please respond directly to Ms. Behrens at [jbehrens@worldbank.org](mailto:jbehrens@worldbank.org)

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

From: jbehrens@worldbank.org [mailto:jbehrens@worldbank.org]  
Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2003 1:07 PM  
To: AAPOR-INFO  
Subject: Question about software for question tracking and development

Hello, I work with the World Bank Institute Evaluation Group, the evaluation unit within the capacity-building arm of the World Bank. We use a variety of survey questionnaires to evaluate training activities involving about 5,000 participants per year.

We are considering developing an interactive database that would help us keep track of the text of questions used in past and present surveys, and that would also keep statistical information about the psychometric performance of each question over time. Ideally, this database would also be a tool for building future surveys.

Before developing it, however, we wonder whether software that does something like this already exists in the market. Do you know of any such software? Could you refer me to any colleagues with expertise in question development methods who might know of software that could perform this function?

I very much appreciate your help with this search.

With best regards,

Joy Behrens

Joy Behrens  
World Bank Institute Evaluation Group  
jbehrens@worldbank.org  
202-458-5053

-----  
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](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 16 Apr 2003 12:07:57 -0700



Reply-To: John Oehlert <joehlert@FRISOLUTIONS.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: John Oehlert <joehlert@FRISOLUTIONS.COM>  
Subject: Re: Question about software for question tracking and development  
In-Reply-To: <BFC17A2EB27CD411A9E30000D1ECEFE413F55BEB@Exchng7.gallup.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

I concur .... or someone could post a summary?  
I am new to the group and would find the responses interesting.

John

At 11:58 AM 4/16/2003, Lydia Saad wrote:

>I expect the replies to this question would interest many on aapornet, at  
>least they would me.  
>  
>Thus, I would encourage responding to the group as well as directly to Ms.  
>Behrens.  
>  
>Lydia Saad

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

>From: Mike Flanagan [mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM]  
>Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2003 2:36 PM  
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>Subject: Question about software for question tracking and development

>Please respond directly to Ms. Behrens at jbehrens@worldbank.org

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

>From: jbehrens@worldbank.org [mailto:jbehrens@worldbank.org]  
>Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2003 1:07 PM  
>To: AAPOR-INFO  
>Subject: Question about software for question tracking and development

>Hello, I work with the World Bank Institute Evaluation Group, the evaluation  
>unit within the capacity-building arm of the World Bank. We use a variety  
>of  
>survey questionnaires to evaluate training activities involving about 5,000  
>participants per year.

>We are considering developing an interactive database that would help us  
>keep  
>track of the text of questions used in past and present surveys, and that  
>would  
>also keep statistical information about the psychometric performance of each  
>question over time. Ideally, this database would also be a tool for  
>building  
>future surveys.

>

>Before developing it, however, we wonder whether software that does  
>something  
>like this already exists in the market. Do you know of any such software?  
>Could you refer me to any colleagues with expertise in question development  
>methods who might know of software that could perform this function?

>  
>I very much appreciate your help with this search.

>  
>With best regards,

>  
>Joy Behrens

>  
>Joy Behrens

>World Bank Institute Evaluation Group

>jbehrens@worldbank.org

>202-458-5053

>-----  
>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, 16 Apr 2003 15:26:08 -0400

Reply-To: "Featherston, Fran A." <ffeather@NSF.GOV>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Featherston, Fran A." <ffeather@NSF.GOV>

Subject: My report: Help on the Web for designing web surveys

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Thanks to all of you that responded to me. Some of you felt my request duplicated the earlier threads of Kelly Erwin's request last month. We had gotten a marvelous summary of web design issues from a usability expert at the Social Security Usability lab. Besides forgetting that interchange due to my aging memory, I apologize that I did not explain that I particularly wanted to find places on the Web for web survey designers. Here is my report as of only six hours after my request for help. If you feel you have

another source of information to contribute, please send it to me and I will file a second report later on.

As you may recall, Jan Werner suggested the National Cancer Institute's usability site: <http://usability.gov/>

Among many helpful things, they have a great page with links to guidelines for web design that has many of the practical tips I sought:

<http://usability.gov/guidelines/index.html>

I also found information on this site for designing an on-line form:

<http://usability.gov/lessons/form.html>

Sunghee Lee told me about the website that Kent Norman's talented class built at the University of Maryland, "On-line Survey Design Guide." It is very impressive for a one-semester project.

[http://lap.umd.edu/survey\\_design/](http://lap.umd.edu/survey_design/)

Several people mentioned the University of Ljubljana site (Slovenia) for its wealth of research on web surveys. I did not find the practical tips I sought, but it shows upcoming conferences that include web survey design. (AAPOR 2003 is mentioned.) It also has links to abstracts and some full versions of previous papers:

<http://www.websm.org/>

Joan Black pointed me to these slides from a presentation (August 5, 2001), "Web-based Survey Methods," by Tracy L. Tuten and Michael Bosnjak (73 pages). It also includes examples of web survey pages. Although the first couple examples of web surveys are in German, most are in English, so don't be discouraged:

[http://www.or.zuma-mannheim.de/aom2001/files/AoM2001\\_PDWslides\\_Webbased\\_Survey\\_Methods.pdf](http://www.or.zuma-mannheim.de/aom2001/files/AoM2001_PDWslides_Webbased_Survey_Methods.pdf)

If you are interested in an on-line course on web survey design, Bill McCready found this one for me:

<http://www.gactr.uga.edu/is/mr/webresearch/>

William Divale thinks Zoomerang.com is very good. It is a site that helps the user create surveys. From the opening page, it looks to be a free service at this point in time.

<http://www.zoomerang.com/Login/index.zgi>

Again, I am grateful for everyone's help.

(fran)

Fran Featherston

[ffather@nsf.gov](mailto:ffather@nsf.gov)

National Science Foundation

4201 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, Virginia 22230  
Phone: 703-292-4221

-----  
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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Wed, 16 Apr 2003 13:21:00 -0700  
Reply-To: Hank Zucker <[hank@surveysystem.com](mailto:hank@surveysystem.com)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Hank Zucker <[hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM](mailto:hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Looking for web sites on designing web surveys  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Fran,

Jan's suggestion about general web site usability advice is a good one, but there are also some tips that relate specifically to surveys on the web. We have a commercial site, but there is a survey design page that provides general tips with very little mention of our software (and nothing about our wanting to design a survey for you). Most of it is probably too basic for most AAPORNET members, but you might find the section specifically on web surveys useful.

The page is <http://www.surveysystem.com/sdesign.htm>. The web survey tips are near the bottom of the very long page. In IE you can press Ctrl-F and tell it to find "Tips for Web" to go directly there.

Regards,  
Hank

Hank Zucker, Ph.D.  
Creative Research Systems  
makers of The Survey System: Survey software that makes you look good  
[www.surveysystem.com](http://www.surveysystem.com)  
(707) 765-1001

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

From: "Jan Werner" <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
To: <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2003 7:54 AM  
Subject: Re: Looking for web sites on designing web surveys

> Web design is NOT the same as print design, although many web designers  
> insist on applying principles of page layout as if it were. Elements

> such as font size and type may not look at all the same in different  
> browsers or even in the same browser at different screen resolutions.  
>  
> You will most likely do better investigating what web designers refer to  
> as "usability," since I doubt you will find much useful material online  
> about web surveys per se.  
>  
> One major resource is maintained by the National Cancer Institute at  
> <http://usability.gov>. Another good source of usability information is  
> Jakob Nielsen's site at <http://www.useit.com>.  
>  
> Anyone interested in this topic should begin by reading "Don't Make Me  
> Think" by Steve Krug, a short and humorous introduction to the general  
> subject of web site usability that will actually give you plenty to  
> think about.  
>  
> Jan Werner  
> \_\_\_\_\_  
>  
> Featherston, Fran A. wrote:  
>> Can anyone suggest web sites that give tips for designing web surveys?  
I'm  
>> especially interested in suggestions for font size and type and other  
things  
>> that affect readability, but any sites you recommend on web survey  
design  
>> would be welcome.  
>> I tried to find some sites using Google yesterday, and it was very  
>> frustrating. No matter what the search I tried, I would get over 5,000  
hits  
>> and most would be commercial sites that want to design the web survey  
for  
>> you.  
>> I will compile the suggestions I receive and forward them back to  
AAPORNET.  
>>  
>> If you have links to papers on this topic, that would also be  
appreciated.  
>> Or, if you've written a paper on the topic that you could send to me,  
that  
>> would be great, too. Again, I can compile your offerings and send back  
to  
>> the group.  
>> Thanks so much,  
>> (fran)  
>> Fran Featherston  
>> [ffeather@nsf.gov](mailto:ffeather@nsf.gov)  
>> National Science Foundation  
>> 4201 Wilson Boulevard  
>> Arlington, Virginia 22230  
>> Phone: 703-292-4221  
>>  
>> -----  
>> 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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 16 Apr 2003 15:34:08 -0500  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject: FW: Question  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Would anyone be in a position to assist this individual? =20

Please respond directly to: [Judy.Guzman@intersearch.tnsolfres.com](mailto:Judy.Guzman@intersearch.tnsolfres.com)

Can you suggest any articles discussing the value of contracting with a =  
3rd  
party to conduct market research?

Judy Guzman  
Senior Vice President

TNS Intersearch  
410 Horsham Road  
Horsham, PA 19044  
215-444-9678

-----  
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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 17 Apr 2003 12:04:31 -0400  
Reply-To: Anne Ciemnecki <[ACiemnecki@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM](mailto:ACiemnecki@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Anne Ciemnecki <[ACiemnecki@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM](mailto:ACiemnecki@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM)>  
Subject: Career Opportunities at Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

Mathematica Policy Research, a national leader in social policy research, survey design, and data collection, seeks Survey Researchers and 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
- \* Extensive knowledge of survey research methods including survey design, survey management, questionnaire development, data analysis, and report writing
- \* Demonstrated ability to write proposals and manage complex surveys
- \* Excellent communication skills

MPR is an employee owned company and offers competitive salaries, a comprehensive benefits package, and convenient office locations. Visit our web site as [www.mathematica-mpr.com](http://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](mailto:HRNJ@mathematica-mpr.com) or fax to (609) 799-4394.

Mathematica is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer.

---

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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 17 Apr 2003 14:26:16 -0400  
Reply-To: Michael Lemay <[michael.lemay@UMONTREAL.CA](mailto:michael.lemay@UMONTREAL.CA)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Michael Lemay <[michael.lemay@UMONTREAL.CA](mailto:michael.lemay@UMONTREAL.CA)>  
Subject: RE : Question about software for question tracking and development  
Comments: cc: [jbehrens@worldbank.org](mailto:jbehrens@worldbank.org)  
In-Reply-To: <[669C9575C5E1D511B7B5001083FCEE8D02092456@amp1.goAMP.com](mailto:669C9575C5E1D511B7B5001083FCEE8D02092456@amp1.goAMP.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

You might want to check this article:

=93What Good is a Metadata System without Documentation?=94 =20  
by Pat Doyle, U.S. Census Bureau, Demographic Surveys Division

Contact: patricia.j.doyle@census.gov

Michael Lemay  
Universit=E9 de Montr=E9al, d=E9partement de sociologie  
C.P. 6128, succursale Centre-ville, Montr=E9al QC Canada, H3C 3J7  
=20  
T=E9l.: 1 (514) 343-7885; Fax.: 1 (514) 343-5722  
E-mail.: michael.lemay@umontreal.ca

-----Message d'origine-----

De=A0: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] De la part de Mike Flanagan  
Envoy=E9=A0: 16 avril 2003 14:36  
=C0=A0: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Objet=A0: Question about software for question tracking and development

Please respond directly to Ms. Behrens at jbehrens@worldbank.org =20

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

From: jbehrens@worldbank.org [mailto:jbehrens@worldbank.org]  
Sent: Wednesday, April 16, 2003 1:07 PM  
To: AAPOR-INFO  
Subject: Question about software for question tracking and development

Hello, I work with the World Bank Institute Evaluation Group, the =  
evaluation  
unit within the capacity-building arm of the World Bank. We use a =  
variety  
of  
survey questionnaires to evaluate training activities involving about =  
5,000  
participants per year.

We are considering developing an interactive database that would help us  
keep  
track of the text of questions used in past and present surveys, and =  
that  
would  
also keep statistical information about the psychometric performance of =  
each  
question over tiem. Ideally, this database would also be a tool for  
building  
future surveys.

Before developing it, however, we wonder whether software that does  
something  
like this already exists in the market. Do you know of any such =  
software?



Could you refer me to any colleagues with expertise in question =  
development  
methods who might know of software that could perform this function?

I very much appreciate your help with this search.

With best regards,

Joy Behrens

Joy Behrens  
World Bank Institute Evaluation Group  
jbehrens@worldbank.org  
202-458-5053

-----  
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](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 17 Apr 2003 16:22:36 -0400  
Reply-To: [JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM](mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <[JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM](mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Mail survey sponsorship and incentives  
Comments: cc: [dbirnberg@selzerco.com](mailto:dbirnberg@selzerco.com)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

We're working on a project for a state agency and, based on some recent positive experience, we're planning a mail survey. The trade-off we're considering (and would welcome thoughts and suggestions) is between having the packet appear to come from the state agency with no incentive, OR having it come from our company, but include an incentive. Any thoughts on which would yield the higher response rate? We believe that in the current economic climate, we can't include incentives if the package comes from a state agency. Again, you may have experience with whether that's sound thinking or not.

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
Selzer & Company, Inc.  
Des Moines, Iowa 50312  
515.271.5700

visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)

E-mail address for purposes of this list: [JAnnSelzer@aol.com](mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com); otherwise,  
contact [JASelzer@SelzerCo.com](mailto:JASelzer@SelzerCo.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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Fri, 18 Apr 2003 10:13:40 -0400

Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>

Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>

From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>

Subject: Pew Research Center Tracks "Net Evaders" and "Net Dropouts"

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Pew Research Center Tracks "Net Evaders" and "Net Dropouts"

<http://www.convergedigest.com/DSL/lastmilearticle.asp?ID=7138>

A new report from the Pew Research Center finds that 42% of Americans say they don't use the Internet, with many of them either have been Internet users at one time or have a once-removed relationship with the Internet through family or household members. The Pew Internet Project tracking data shows a flattening of the overall growth of the Internet population since late 2001. The Internet penetration rate hovers at between 57% to 61% of the population. The report also identifies a trend of people dropping offline -- "Net Dropouts" -- and a certain population of "Net Evaders," who proudly reject the Internet and proclaim their independence from the online world. Most of the non-users are in "close proximity" to the Internet, meaning that they have occasional access through a school, library, or family member. The Pew report also tracks the digital divide in terms of race, age, income, educational level and region of the country. The report is online (50 pages).

<http://www.pewinternet.org/reports/toc.asp?Report=88>

--

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, 18 Apr 2003 12:39:09 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Cell phones and sample  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Can someone tell me how RDD polling handles the growth of the segment of the population that just has cell phones?

--

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, 18 Apr 2003 15:20:30 -0400  
Reply-To: "Lavrakas, Paul" <Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>  
Subject: FW: Cell phones and sample  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Leo,

A Cell Phone "summit" (hosted by Nielsen) was held in Feb '03 in NYC. It was attended by a group of telephone survey sampling experts from the U.S. academic, government, and commercial sectors, including many AAPOR members (Clyde Tucker, Charlotte Steeh, Charlie Palit, Mike Brick, Linda Piekarski, Michael Weeks, Dale Kulp, Jim Lepkowski, and others).

The group focused on identifying issues that need answering and possible approaches to crafting "best practices" on how to deal with this very complex realm, including the question you have posed. One key result of the summit has been an agreement by the government to gather some data later this year to provide preliminary population parameters about the proportion of U.S. people/households that can/cannot be reached via cell phone numbers vs. land-line numbers.

Linda Piekarski has organized a Cell Phone roundtable session for the 2003

AAPOR conference at which your question certainly will be discussed.

PJL

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

From: Leo G. Simonetta [mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM]  
Sent: Friday, April 18, 2003 12:39 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Cell phones and sample

Can someone tell me how RDD polling handles the growth of the segment of the population that just has cell phones?

--

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: Fri, 18 Apr 2003 16:05:18 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Cell Phones at AAPOR  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

In addition to the roundtable that Paul mentioned there will be several other AAPOR sessions of interest on cell phones:

Differences in the Political Attitudes and Behavior of Cell and Land  
Line Telephone Users  
Michael W. Traugott - University of Michigan  
Sung-Hee Joo - University of Michigan

Survey of Cell Phone Users: Identifying Cell Phone Only Households

Lester J. Jones - Arbitron  
Dan Ames - Arbitron

Surveys Using Cellular Telephones: a Feasibility Study  
Charlotte G. Steeh - Georgia State University

Unfortunately I will not be able to make it this year.

Several people asked me for the copy of any responses that I received so early next week I will post to the list a summary of what I get.

--

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

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Sun, 20 Apr 2003 17:53:28 -0400  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Subject: Call for Research Proposals: Sexual Orientation Harassment in  
the

U.S. Military

MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Posted for "Kenneth. Sherrill" <kenneth.sherrill@hunter.cuny.edu>

Call for Research Proposals: Sexual Orientation Harassment in the U.S.  
Military

The Center for the Study of Sexual Minorities in the Military at the University of California, Santa Barbara is commissioning a study comparing rates of sexual orientation harassment in the armed forces and civilian society. Because the military is unlikely to allow original survey research, the study should adopt a "next-best" approach by summarizing research on the incidence of sexual orientation harassment in the armed forces and civilian society, and then discussing factors such as the demographics and regional background of service members that may influence whether the rates can be compared. To the extent possible, the study should try to determine whether the rate of abuse in the armed forces is higher or lower than the civilian rate. If the rate is different, the

study should address mechanisms that may account for the difference. The Center will pay \$9,000 for the completion of such a study, but the author should also feel free to submit the manuscript for publication to a journal under her or his name. Interested scholars should contact Professor Aaron Belkin, Director, Center for the Study of Sexual Minorities in the Military, (805) 893-5664; belkin@polsci.ucsb.edu.

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

212 496-2945  
212 496-0846 FAX

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

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

---

Date: Mon, 21 Apr 2003 08:29:29 -0400  
Reply-To: Anna Greenberg <agreenberg@GREENBERGRESEARCH.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Anna Greenberg <agreenberg@GREENBERGRESEARCH.COM>  
Subject: summer programs  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Hello,  
Does anyone know of any summer polling and statistics programs in Africa =  
and Europe, similar to the ICPSR programs?  
Thanks,  
Anna

Anna Greenberg  
Vice President  
Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research  
10 G Street, NE Ste. 400  
Washington, DC 20002  
202-478-8330

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

---

Date: Mon, 21 Apr 2003 08:21:13 -0500  
Reply-To: ALLAN L MCCUTCHEON <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: ALLAN L MCCUTCHEON <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU>

Subject: Re: summer programs  
Comments: To: Anna Greenberg <agreenberg@GREENBERGRESEARCH.COM>  
In-Reply-To: <sea3abf3.059@mail.greenbergresearch.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Hi,

Yes, in Europe there is the Essex Summer School in Social Science Data Analysis and Collection. You can read more about it at

<http://www.essex.ac.uk/methods/>

Best,  
Allan

On Mon, 21 Apr 2003, Anna Greenberg wrote:

> Hello,  
> Does anyone know of any summer polling and statistics programs in Africa and Europe, similar to the ICPSR programs?  
> Thanks,  
> Anna  
>  
> Anna Greenberg  
> Vice President  
> Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research  
> 10 G Street, NE Ste. 400  
> Washington, DC 20002  
> 202-478-8330  
>  
> -----  
> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>

--  
,

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Mon, 21 Apr 2003 10:25:34 -0500  
Reply-To: Brian Vargus <igem100@IUPUI.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Brian Vargus <igem100@IUPUI.EDU>  
Subject: Position Opening  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

=20

## POSITION ANNOUNCEMENT

=20

### DIRECTOR

#### INDIANA UNIVERSITY PUBLIC OPINION LABORATORY

=20

The Indiana University Public Opinion Laboratory (IU POL) is seeking a new director. The IU POL--an interdisciplinary survey research center of the School of Liberal Arts at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI). It serves as a data gathering and data analysis center for a wide variety of research clients, including schools and programs on the campus, such as Medicine, Nursing, Dentistry, Public Health, Public and Environmental Affairs, and the Center on Philanthropy.

=20

Located on a new campus (current enrollment 29,000+ students) in the center of Indianapolis, the IU POL also serves as an applied data gathering center for a wide variety of governmental and private organizations. The campus enjoys extraordinary technical support, being the home of Abilene, the Internet2 backbone network. For additional information about the IU POL visit the Web site: <http://polecat.iupui.edu>

=20

The Public Opinion Laboratory is at an important turning point in its history. The new director will be expected to consolidate and strengthen relationships with existing clients which have given it a solid reputation and track record. The school and campus have a five-year plan for incremental growth and development to enhance its standing in the academic survey research community and take advantage of new opportunities presented by a dynamic and growing urban university with a large and comprehensive health center in the capital and largest city of the state.

=20

The responsibilities of the director's position include:

- 1.. Securing external contracts and grants
- 2.. Supervising a survey research staff (currently 5 full-time, 8 half-time, and 75 hourly employees) to conduct all varieties of survey research, e.g., telephone, Internet, mail, and face-to-face.
- 3.. Directing the gathering and analysis of survey data, using programs including Sawtooth WIN-CATI, SPSS, SAS, Excel and others, and an internal network-based computer system supporting 20 WIN-CATI stations.



4.. Managing and developing work processes and standards that = incorporate best practices in survey research and maintain the highest = attainable levels of data quality.

5.. Developing and maintaining relations with clients and research = sponsors to promote and enhance their usage of IU POL's services.

6.. Writing research reports and conducting workshop-style sessions = with clients and faculty on campus.

7.. Supervising the recruitment and training of student interviewers.

8.. Teaching, depending on qualifications and interests.

=20

Minimum qualifications are:

1.. An appropriate terminal graduate degree (Ph.D. preferred)

2.. At least five years of experience in a management position in a = CATI facility, plus experience in data analysis, proposal preparation, = sampling, research design, and interpretation of survey data.

3.. Demonstrated expertise in programs including Sawtooth WIN-CATI, = SPSS, SAS, and Excel.

4.. Excellent record in attracting external funding

5.. Strong writing and communication skills.

=20

Salary commensurate with experience and credentials. Excellent = benefits. EO/AA.

=20

Applicants should submit the following materials:

1.. A cover letter expressing interest in the position and describing = qualifications and experience.

2.. A curriculum vitae (c.v.)

3.. Three letters of reference

4.. A research report or publication illustrating the applicant's = experience in survey research. (A URL is sufficient for reports that = are available on the Web.)

=20

Materials should be sent to:

William Blomquist, POL Search Committee Chair

c/o Department of Political Science

425 University Blvd.

Indianapolis, IN 46202-5140

Fax: 317-278-3280

E-mail: [blomquis@iupui.edu](mailto:blomquis@iupui.edu)

=20

Review of applications will begin May 1, 2003 and continue until the =  
position is filled. Applicants should please indicate if they are =  
planning to attend the American Association for Public Opinion Research =  
(AAPOR) meeting in Nashville, Tennessee, on May 15th, as there may be an =  
opportunity to meet with a member of the search committee at that time.

=20

=20

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Mon, 21 Apr 2003 12:22:22 -0400  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Subject: Paid respondents  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

I recently came across this ad for recruiting and paying respondents for  
surveys. This is typical of others I have come across. Does this conflict  
with AAPOR's Standards Code and, if so, what are we doing about it?  
warren mitofsky

How would you like to earn \$50 for completing a short survey?

What about \$100 for an hour of your time participating in a focus group?

<http://www.cyberforceconsulting.com/ghh/>

Your time and opinions are valuable - you just need to know  
which companies are willing to pay you for them.

Our membership program provides....

- An updated database of hundreds of paid survey, focus group,  
and market research companies
- Unlimited access - 24 hours a day, 7 days a week
- No recurring fees - one-time membership fee provides full  
access

<http://www.cyberforceconsulting.com/ghh/>

This is a great way to boost your income, with minimal effort. Best of  
all, you can participate in as many surveys or focus groups as you  
choose!

NEW ADDRESS AS OF 3/10/03

Warren Mitofsky

\*\*\*\*\*

Mitofsky International

1776 Broadway - Suite 1708

New York, NY 10019

212 980-3031

212 980-3107 FAX

email: mitofsky@mindspring.com

http://www.mitofskyinternational.com

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Date: Mon, 21 Apr 2003 13:04:08 -0400

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

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>

Subject: Re: Paid respondents

Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>

In-Reply-To: <5.2.0.9.2.20030421121013.032405e0@pop.mindspring.com>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

To the best of my knowledge people have been paid for years for participating in focused groups. Except for sampling issues, is there any difference between paid participation in a focused group and participation in an on-line survey? Or, are they both not ok?

Dick Halpern

At 12:22 PM 4/21/2003 -0400, you wrote:

>I recently came across this ad for recruiting and paying respondents for  
>surveys. This is typical of others I have come across. Does this conflict  
>with AAPOR's Standards Code and, if so, what are we doing about it?  
>warren mitofsky

>

>

>How would you like to earn \$50 for completing a short survey?

>

>What about \$100 for an hour of your time participating in a focus group?

>

> <http://www.cyberforceconsulting.com/ghh/>

>

>Your time and opinions are valuable - you just need to know  
>which companies are willing to pay you for them.

>

>

>Our membership program provides....

- >
- >- An updated database of hundreds of paid survey, focus group, and market research companies
- >- Unlimited access - 24 hours a day, 7 days a week
- >- No recurring fees - one-time membership fee provides full access

>  
> <http://www.cyberforceconsulting.com/ghh/>

>This is a great way to boost your income, with minimal effort. Best of all, you can participate in as many surveys or focus groups as you choose!

>NEW ADDRESS AS OF 3/10/03

>Warren Mitofsky  
>\*\*\*\*\*

>Mitofsky International  
>1776 Broadway - Suite 1708  
>New York, NY 10019

>  
>212 980-3031  
>212 980-3107 FAX

>  
>email: [mitofsky@mindspring.com](mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com)  
><http://www.mitofskyinternational.com>

>-----  
>Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
>Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

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

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Mon, 21 Apr 2003 12:55:30 -0500  
Reply-To: Elizabeth Tucker <[Elizabeth.D.Tucker.1@ND.EDU](mailto:Elizabeth.D.Tucker.1@ND.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Elizabeth Tucker <[Elizabeth.D.Tucker.1@ND.EDU](mailto:Elizabeth.D.Tucker.1@ND.EDU)>  
Subject: Vendor Assistance Needed  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

We are in need of a reliable vendor, who has up-to-date household lists for regional areas. Does anyone have a good recommendation?

-----  
Elizabeth DeWeese Tucker  
Survey Services Manager  
University of Notre Dame  
Laboratory for Social Research

(574) 631-3289

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Mon, 21 Apr 2003 14:37:43 -0400  
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Paid respondents  
Comments: To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

When you go to the website, you'll see that this wonderful opportunity to make big bucks for giving your opinion requires that you spend the tiny amount of \$29.95 [just enter your credit card info] and then wait for all the offers to come pouring in.  
In other words, it's one more sorry scheme to make money by fleecing the gullible.

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: dick halpern [mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET]  
Sent: Monday, April 21, 2003 1:04 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Paid respondents

To the best of my knowledge people have been paid for years for participating in focused groups. Except for sampling issues, is there any difference between paid participation in a focused group and participation in an on-line survey? Or, are they both not ok?

Dick Halpern

At 12:22 PM 4/21/2003 -0400, you wrote:

>I recently came across this ad for recruiting and paying respondents for  
>surveys. This is typical of others I have come across. Does this conflict  
>with AAPOR's Standards Code and, if so, what are we doing about it?  
>warren mitofsky  
>  
>  
>How would you like to earn \$50 for completing a short survey?  
>  
>What about \$100 for an hour of your time participating in a focus group?  
>  
> <http://www.cyberforceconsulting.com/ghh/>  
>  
>Your time and opinions are valuable - you just need to know  
>which companies are willing to pay you for them.  
>  
>  
>Our membership program provides....  
>  
>- An updated database of hundreds of paid survey, focus group,  
>and market research companies  
>- Unlimited access - 24 hours a day, 7 days a week  
>- No recurring fees - one-time membership fee provides full  
>access  
>  
> <http://www.cyberforceconsulting.com/ghh/>  
>  
>This is a great way to boost your income, with minimal effort. Best of  
>all, you can participate in as many surveys or focus groups as you  
>choose!  
>  
>  
>  
>NEW ADDRESS AS OF 3/10/03  
>Warren Mitofsky  
>\*\*\*\*\*  
>Mitofsky International  
>1776 Broadway - Suite 1708  
>New York, NY 10019  
>  
>212 980-3031  
>212 980-3107 FAX  
>  
>email: [mitofsky@mindspring.com](mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com)  
><http://www.mitofskyinternational.com>  
>  
>-----  
>Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
>Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

\*\* \*\* \*

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Mon, 21 Apr 2003 18:20:33 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Cell phones and sample  
In-Reply-To: <[004301c305c9\\$0912ac90\\$130a010a@LEO](mailto:004301c305c9$0912ac90$130a010a@LEO)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

First let me thank all those who replied to my question (prompted by my brother who recently cut his land line) - Can someone tell me how RDD polling handles the growth of the segment of the population that just has cell phones?

Most of the responses that I received were requests to share what I found with them or the list as a whole hence this posting.

From what I received the general consensus is: "Not at all, right now." It was noted that, at present, quite small proportions of the population are cell phone only users (~3% was mentioned on several websites). Another reply noted that the exclusion of non-phone households and the exclusion of households in the zero-banks were probably larger problems.

As Paul Lavrakas noted there is a cell phone round table at this year's conference and there are a number of presentations that at least touch on this topic.

--  
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 Leo G. Simonetta  
> Sent: Friday, April 18, 2003 12:39 PM  
> To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
> Subject: Cell phones and sample  
>  
> Can someone tell me how RDD polling handles the growth of the segment of

> the population that just has cell phones?  
>  
>  
> --  
> 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.

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Mon, 21 Apr 2003 17:09:07 -0700  
Reply-To: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG>  
Subject: Has anyone heard of Consumer Research Services??  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Hello,

My husband recently completed a telephone survey given by the Consumer Research Services, located in Arizona. Has anyone ever heard of this group? I was appalled by the amount of financial information he was giving out (basically everything that is on a credit application - fortunately he refused to give account numbers and balances!) and would like to be reassured that this is a legitimate group. They don't seem to be members of CASRO of AAPOR.

thanks,

Lynda Voigt

Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.  
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center  
Seattle, WA  
lvoigt@fhcrc.org

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====



Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 07:09:28 -0700  
Reply-To: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG>  
Subject: cell phones and samples  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Hello,

We use RDD to recruit controls for our population-based case-control studies of cancer. We collect data about land-line residential telephones in our cases and exclude cases that do not have a residential land-line phone (we do not include cellular only prefixes in our sampling frame). One study that has been in the field for two years includes only young men 18-44 years of age in the Seattle area. We were initially concerned about how many cases would be eliminated because this age group/gender is most likely to have only cellular phone service. We have been pleasantly surprised however (and I won a latte in a bet with the study manager over this!) that so far we have only excluded 2/312 cases for this reason. We exclude even fewer cases because of no land-line residential telephone in our studies among predominately middle-aged and older adults. The Frame reported in 2001 that 2% of the U.S. population have only cellular service and no landline telephone (Solely cellular phone usage only 2% The Frame December,2001 [http://www.worldopinion.com/the\\_frame/2001/dec\\_3.html](http://www.worldopinion.com/the_frame/2001/dec_3.html)).  
Lynda Voigt

Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.  
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center  
Seattle, WA  
lvoigt@fhcrc.org

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 10:13:36 -0400  
Reply-To: Eleanor Singer <esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Eleanor Singer <esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU>  
Subject: FW: passive vs active consent  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8BIT

But it should be noted that this is one university's policy, not a federal regulation or law, and maybe it is worth getting into the dialogue that Congress twice considered making an active parental consent requirement into law and on both occasions decided not to do so because of the impact on the quality of the research that would result.

Eleanor Singer

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

From: mary.losch@uni.edu [mailto:mary.losch@UNI.EDU]

Sent: Wednesday, April 09, 2003 3:52 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: passive vs active consent

Dear Linda,

The federal human research participant regulations do not (and have never, to my knowledge) recognized passive consent. A waiver of documentation of consent or a waiver of parental consent can be approved by an IRB but only in very prescribed circumstances. A quick search of the web provided this information (reproduced below) from Wayne State University regarding their policy. I thought it provided a good overview of the regulatory issues and hope it is helpful. Mary Losch

---

### Consent Procedures

Children cannot consent to participate in research themselves, therefore, the written permission (i.e. informed consent) of parents/guardians and the assent of the child must be obtained as stated below. Written assent is recommended for children age 13 and older and oral assent is recommended for children age 8 and older. These ages can be modified at the request of the investigator or at the discretion of the IRB for any individual protocol.

In general, a child's dissent should be respected. Every effort should be made to reach consensus between parent(s) and child, however, when the research offers the child the possibility of direct benefit important to his/her own health and is available only through research, the parent's wishes generally prevail.

For minimal risk research studies, (category 1), the written permission (i.e. informed consent) of one parent/guardian is sufficient. Children should give assent as appropriate.

For research involving greater than minimal risk but with a potential of benefit to the subject, (category 2), the written permission (i.e. informed consent) of one parent/ guardian is, again, sufficient. Children should give assent as appropriate.

For research involving greater than minimal risk and with no prospect of direct benefit to the child, (category 3), both parents must give written permission (i.e. informed consent) unless one parent is deceased, unknown, incompetent, or not reasonably available, or only one parent has the legal responsibility for the care and custody of the child. Children should give assent as appropriate.

In the past when research was conducted with adolescents, the term "passive consent" was often used. For example, a notice may have been sent to the parents that their child would be asked to participate in a research project

conducted in the school setting unless the parent called a certain number or returned a post card. The investigator then assumed that because he/she did not hear from the parent, the parent had given "passive consent" (i.e., waived consent) for their child to participate in the research activity. From an IRB perspective, that term actually referred to a "waiver" of parental permission (assent was still obtained from the child).

Federal regulations do not acknowledge the concept of "passive consent". The use of this term infers that the investigator is unfamiliar with the principles upon which the Federal Regulations are based. Investigators who wish to utilize this concept should request a "waiver" of parental permission.

WSU HIC will not approve the use of the term passive consent. Minimal risk projects involving children may be approved through the use of a "waiver of consent" based upon Federal regulation 45 CFR 46.116. In such instances, the IRB may waive consent by approving the use of an "information sheet" containing all the elements of informed consent for the parent and an assent form for the child.

If the IRB determines that a research protocol is designed for conditions or subject populations for which parental or guardian permission is not a reasonable requirement to protect the child, it may also waive the consent requirement based on Federal regulation 45 CFR 46.408(c).<sup>1</sup> Under such circumstances, the IRB must determine an appropriate substitute mechanism for protecting the child.

Note: For guidelines on drawing blood for research purposes in children, please see WSU HIC general policy " Research Studies Involving the Collection of Blood Samples ".

145 CFR 46.408 (c) In addition to the provisions for waiver contained in § 46.116 of Subpart A, if the IRB determines that a research protocol is designed for conditions or for a subject population for which parental or guardian permission is not a reasonable requirement to protect the subjects (for example, neglected or abused children), it may waive the consent requirements in Subpart A of this part and paragraph (b) of this section, provided an appropriate mechanism for protecting the children who will participate as subjects in the research is substituted, and provided further that the waiver is not inconsistent with Federal State or local law. The choice of an appropriate mechanism would depend upon the nature and purpose of the activities described in the protocol, the risk and anticipated benefit to the research subjects, and their age, maturity, status, and condition.

----- 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.

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 07:30:07 -0700  
Reply-To: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG>  
Subject: Consumer Research Service in Arizona - thanks for the info!  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Thank you for all of the replies! Several members knew of this company and reassured me that they do in fact collect data on all of the respondents' accounts at any financial institution and the amounts in each account plus demographic and income data. One AAPOR member even forwarded my message to the vice-president of the company who kindly responded this morning with more information about the survey and the company - they are part of VNU USA. They aggregate the data and observe industry standards for confidentiality. The survey data are sold under the name "Market Audit" by Claritas, Inc., another VNU company. They collect 100,000 surveys annually through their call centers in Tucson and Ft. Lauderdale.

I am very relieved and happy to be reassured that we are not victims of identity theft!!

Thanks again for your assistance!!

Lynda Voigt

Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.  
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center  
Seattle, WA  
lvoigt@fhcrc.org

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 10:39:16 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Support for Release of Iranian Pollsters  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

<http://www.mrons.com/drno/news2185.htm>

Support for Release of Iranian Pollsters

World research organisations ESOMAR, EFAMRO and WAPOR have this week joined forces in the case of two Iranian survey researchers arrested

earlier this month and have addressed the matter to the EU Government, the United Nations, the Iranian Government and other international bodies in order to release the Iranian pollsters.

At the beginning of February two Iranian pollsters who outraged hard-liners with a survey that found strong public support for contacts with the United States were sentenced to prison on charges of selling secrets to groups linked to the CIA. Prosecutors accused the two of holding secret talks and providing information to institutes and individuals affiliated with American, British and Israeli intelligence services - including the Gallup Organization. Richard Burkholder, Gallup's director of international polling, described the sentencing as 'extremely regrettable', indicating the Iranian pollsters were victims of Iran's ongoing power struggle between hard-liners and reformists, who back President Mohammed Khatami's program of social and political freedoms. According to Burkholder, Gallup paid for and designed a poll to find out opinions of people in the Islamic world toward America following the Sept. 11 attacks and the poll did not quiz Iranians on whether they supported dialogue with the United States.

The ESOMAR statement reiterates the fact that the right to conduct and publish polls freely is part of the modern democratic process which allows citizens to voice their opinions as upheld by Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

ESOMAR, EFAMRO and WAPOR support any initiative which ensures that public opinion polls and market and social research projects are conducted to the highest professional standards. This is in the interest of buyers and suppliers of research and in protecting public welfare.

--

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

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 11:05:27 -0400  
Reply-To: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>  
Subject: Inviting Comments on "Interviewer Falsification" Draft  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Interviewer Falsification in Survey Research: Special Nashville Session, =  
Friday, May 16, 8:15 am

## Draft Statement of Best Practices for Prevention and Detection of Interviewer Falsification

AAPOR is soliciting comments on a draft statement of "current best methods" regarding the prevention, detection and remediation of interviewer falsification. The draft statement was developed by a broad-based committee representing various survey organizations, including AAPOR. The AAPOR Standards Committee would like to receive comments and queries on this draft before or at our Nashville Conference. Please note that the policies outlined in this draft statement may have significant consequences on survey procedure.

The draft statement will be found on the AAPOR web site: [www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)  
A special session to review this document is scheduled for our Nashville Conference, Friday, May 16, at 8:15 a.m. Please address any pre-conference comments or queries to Roger Tourangeau, AAPOR Associate Standards Chair, at: [rtourangeau@survey.umd.edu](mailto:rtourangeau@survey.umd.edu)

## Background on Draft Statement

The Office of Research Integrity (ORI) of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services recently ruled that the falsification of survey data by an interviewer was an act of scientific misconduct subject to the oversight of that office. The responsibilities and authorities of that office can be found at <http://ori.hhs.gov/html/about/aboutori.asp>.

This ruling led to several conversations among survey researchers and ORI, the planning of sessions at upcoming professional meetings (e.g., AAPOR), discussions with the executive bodies of AAPOR and AstatA, and inquiries by university officers overseeing scientific integrity issues.

These conversations suggested that a small meeting of leaders of the survey research field might be helpful to review current practices of the profession in addressing issues of interviewer falsification and to develop a statement of current best methods.

## The Ann Arbor Summit

On April 4-6, 2003, a small group of survey managers, methodologists, and university scientific integrity officers met to develop a draft of current best methods in detecting, diagnosing, and remediating survey interviewer falsification of data.

The draft is available on the AAPOR web site: [www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)

The product of the meeting, the draft statement, is being submitted for comment from the larger profession through AAPORnet, SRMSnet, the executive bodies of the American Statistical Association Survey Research Methods Section, the council of the American Associate for Public Opinion Research, and the Council of American Survey Research Organizations.

## Steering Committee

The following persons served as steering committee members:

Thomas Guterbock, Survey Research Center, University of Virginia  
Timothy Johnson, University of Illinois, Survey Research Laboratory  
Daniel Kasprzyk, representative for ASA Survey Research Methods  
Section, Mathematica Policy Research  
John Kennedy, Indiana University, Survey Research Center  
Richard Kulka, Research Triangle Institute  
Judith Mopsik, Abt Associates  
Judith Nowack, Associate Vice President for Research, University of  
Michigan  
Beth-Ellen Pennell, University of Michigan Survey Research Center  
Renee Slobasky, Westat, Inc.  
John Thompson, National Opinion Research Center  
Roger Tourangeau, Chair, Standards Committee, AAPOR

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 14:17:07 -0400  
Reply-To: Jeanette Janota <JJanota@ASHA.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jeanette Janota <JJanota@ASHA.ORG>  
Subject: Incentive/disincentive?  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

AAPORneters:

The following half-page notice was sent to me by an outside source, so I can't speak to its authenticity. I must say I laughed out loud when I read the second paragraph. Like most, we're having to use creativity in increasing response rates, but has anyone used anything like this? (I've disguised the name of the company, but it's a well-known magazine.)

"IMPORTANT NOTE

"Sending the Annual Questionnaire to some 3,500,000 subscribers costs more than \$700,000 for paper, printing and postage. We feel this annual event is an essential part of our tradition and part of what makes XXXXXX unique. It is also the single most expensive research effort in our reporting program.

"This year we are asking you to enclose a voluntary contribution of \$6 or more to help cover the cost of the questionnaire. Your donation will help us continue this valuable service.

"PLEASE HELP...make your check for \$6 or more payable to XXXX and enclose with your ballot and questionnaire. Contributions to XXXX are tax deductible because we are a nonprofit organization. Remember, however, that your participation in the survey and the election is in no way dependent on making a contribution.

"Thank you."

Jeanette O. Janota, Ph.D.  
Senior Research Associate/Statistician  
American Speech-Language-Hearing Association  
10801 Rockville Pike  
Rockville, MD 20852  
Telephone: 301-897-5700, ext. 4175  
Fax: 301-468-9742  
Email: [jjanota@asha.org](mailto:jjanota@asha.org)  
ASHA website: [www.asha.org](http://www.asha.org)

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 15:19:31 -0400  
Reply-To: [mark@bisconti.com](mailto:mark@bisconti.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mark David Richards <[mark@BISCONTI.COM](mailto:mark@BISCONTI.COM)>  
Subject: Wash Times - Bush has growing support for environmental policy  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

THE WASHINGTON TIMES  
April 22, 2003

Bush has growing support for environmental policy

By Jennifer Harper

One entrenched idea is beginning to weaken: The public does not consider President Bush the archenemy of the environment, according to a Gallup poll released yesterday.

"The environmental movement and sympathetic politicians have painted the administration as anti-environmental. Given the administration's refusal to reverse course, there was reason to expect that its opponents would generate a backlash against its environmental policies similar to the one that hit the early Reagan administration," noted Gallup environmental analyst Riley Dunlap.

But there's "little evidence of a comparable backlash ... despite intense efforts by environmentalists and political supporters," he continued.

The poll of 1,003 adults conducted March 3-5 reported that 53 percent said Mr. Bush had maintained environment-protection policies, up from 48 percent in 2001. The fraction of Americans saying the administration has weakened these policies is almost unchanged - it stands at 35 percent, up just a point from 2001.



Sierra Club spokesman Allen Mattison is not impressed.

"Gallup took this poll when the U.S. was at war, when Americans were rallying behind their commander in chief," he said yesterday. "They're not going to tell a pollster something negative. The timing of the poll has dictated the results."

Mr. Mattison said the Bush administration continues to leave public comment out of its environmental equation, spends too much time "settling lawsuits" rather than upholding environmental law and "sides with industry rather than public health."

He said the Sierra Club was "relieved" that a potential environmental disaster caused by Iraqi oil fires was averted by U.S. military efforts. The hazard was heavily forecast by the United Nations and many pundits in late March.

Meanwhile, the entire environmental debate has changed, according to Mark Pfeifle, spokesman for Interior Secretary Gale A. Norton. He said he is not surprised that public-approval numbers are rising.

"Thirty years ago, there were rivers which caught fire and the bald eagle was dying out. Now that they don't have such issues to cite, some environmental groups are lashing out at anything," Mr. Pfeifle said.

Some groups concentrate on "fund raising and press releases," Mr. Pfeifle said, while others focus on simple but sound results. He said his agency is one of the latter.

"We're focusing on citizen conservation at the local level. We're looking to save one acre at a time," Mr. Pfeifle said. "That doesn't always make big headlines. But it's a success, and part of our effort to promote good stewardship."

The Gallup survey also reported that 37 percent of respondents said the U.S. government is doing "the right amount" of environmental protection, up from 30 percent in 2000 and 26 percent in 1992. The percentage saying it's "too little" of an effort fell to 51 percent in 2003 - down from 58 percent in 2000 and 68 percent in 1992.

Gallup also found that most of the public are not rabid tree-huggers: 80 percent said they were not active in an environmental group, 69 percent have not voted for political candidates based on their environmental policy and 58 percent have not contributed money to an environmental group.

In addition, a Newsweek poll of 1,000 adults released April 14 revealed public-opinion numbers about Bush administration policies. The survey found that 47 percent approved of the its environmental policies, 34 percent disapproved and 19 percent "did not know."

---

Mark David Richards

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 16:23:23 -0400  
Reply-To: Eleanor Singer <[esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Eleanor Singer <[esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>

Subject: a question  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Can anyone refer me to data on trends in the use of answering machines, caller ID, and other "privacy managers" from about 1990 to 2002? Even a shorter period would be helpful.

Many thanks, in advance.

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 16:34:33 -0400  
Reply-To: Scott Keeter <[skeeter@GMU.EDU](mailto:skeeter@GMU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Scott Keeter <[skeeter@GMU.EDU](mailto:skeeter@GMU.EDU)>  
Organization: George Mason University  
Subject: Re: a question  
Comments: To: Eleanor Singer <[esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

And I would love to have a few good survey questions on these topics, so please share your responses with Eleanor and with me (or the list if there is interest). Thanks.

Eleanor Singer wrote:

>  
> Can anyone refer me to data on trends in the use of answering machines,  
> caller ID, and other "privacy managers" from about 1990 to 2002? Even a  
> shorter period would be helpful.  
>  
> Many thanks, in advance.  
>  
> -----  
> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

--  
Scott Keeter  
Pew Research Center for the People and the Press  
1150 18th Street, NW, Suite 975  
Washington, DC 20036  
Voice 202-293-3126 extension 16  
Personal fax 703 832 0209  
E-mail [keeters@people-press.org](mailto:keeters@people-press.org)  
Web site <http://mason.gmu.edu/~skeeter>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 15:44:44 -0500  
Reply-To: Frank\_Newport@GALLUP.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Frank Newport <Frank\_Newport@GALLUP.COM>  
Subject: Re: Incentive/disincentive?  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

Since this went out to 3.5 million subscribers, I don't think it's a secret that this was the Consumer Reports survey. I received one myself, and like Jeanette, was unclear as to whether the request for \$6 would increase or decrease willingness to participate. I assume CR just thought it was an easy way to procure needed additional revenues. These surveys by CR are used as the basis for their product and car reliability ratings, and of course aren't random to begin with, since the universe is their subscriber base. Still, it would be interesting to know more about the impact on response rate and data quality of this interesting request for money to help defray survey costs. It's quite a switch on the mail survey tactic of sending money to prospective respondents in an attempt to increase participation.

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

From: Jeanette Janota [mailto:JJanota@ASHA.ORG]  
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2003 2:17 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Incentive/disincentive?

AAPORneters:

The following half-page notice was sent to me by an outside source, so I can't speak to its authenticity. I must say I laughed out loud when I read the second paragraph. Like most, we're having to use creativity in increasing response rates, but has anyone used anything like this? (I've disguised the name of the company, but it's a well-known magazine.)

"IMPORTANT NOTE

"Sending the Annual Questionnaire to some 3,500,000 subscribers costs more than \$700,000 for paper, printing and postage. We feel this annual event is an essential part of our tradition and part of what makes XXXXXX unique. It is also the single most expensive research effort in our reporting program.

"This year we are asking you to enclose a voluntary contribution of \$6 or more to help cover the cost of the questionnaire. Your donation will help us continue this valuable service.

"PLEASE HELP...make your check for \$6 or more payable to XXXX and enclose with your ballot and questionnaire. Contributions to XXXX are tax deductible because we are a nonprofit organization. Remember, however, that your participation in the survey and the election is in no way dependent on making a contribution.

"Thank you."

Jeanette O. Janota, Ph.D.  
Senior Research Associate/Statistician  
American Speech-Language-Hearing Association  
10801 Rockville Pike  
Rockville, MD 20852  
Telephone: 301-897-5700, ext. 4175  
Fax: 301-468-9742  
Email: [jjanota@asha.org](mailto:jjanota@asha.org)  
ASHA website: [www.asha.org](http://www.asha.org)

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 16:37:28 -0400  
Reply-To: Michael McLaen <[Michael.McLaen@INTERSEARCH.TNSOFRES.COM](mailto:Michael.McLaen@INTERSEARCH.TNSOFRES.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Michael McLaen <[Michael.McLaen@INTERSEARCH.TNSOFRES.COM](mailto:Michael.McLaen@INTERSEARCH.TNSOFRES.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Wash Times - Bush has growing support for environmental polic

y  
Comments: To: "mark@bisconti.com" <[mark@bisconti.com](mailto:mark@bisconti.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

What a wonderful alternative reality the Sierra Club spokesman must live in.  
Did anyone else's war start March 5th?

\*\*\*Sierra Club spokesman Allen Mattison is not impressed. "Gallup took this poll when the U.S. was at war, when Americans were rallying behind their commander in chief," he said yesterday.  
"They're not going to tell a pollster something negative. The timing of the poll has dictated the results."\*\*\*

-----Original Message-----  
From: Mark David Richards [<mailto:mark@BISCONTI.COM>]  
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2003 3:20 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

Subject: Wash Times - Bush has growing support for environmental policy

THE WASHINGTON TIMES

April 22, 2003

Bush has growing support for environmental policy

By Jennifer Harper

One entrenched idea is beginning to weaken: The public does not consider President Bush the archenemy of the environment, according to a Gallup poll released yesterday.

"The environmental movement and sympathetic politicians have painted the administration as anti-environmental. Given the administration's refusal to reverse course, there was reason to expect that its opponents would generate a backlash against its environmental policies similar to the one that hit the early Reagan administration," noted Gallup environmental analyst Riley Dunlap.

But there's "little evidence of a comparable backlash ... despite intense efforts by environmentalists and political supporters," he continued.

The poll of 1,003 adults conducted March 3-5 reported that 53 percent said Mr. Bush had maintained environment-protection policies, up from 48 percent in 2001. The fraction of Americans saying the administration has weakened these policies is almost unchanged - it stands at 35 percent, up just a point from 2001.

Sierra Club spokesman Allen Mattison is not impressed.

"Gallup took this poll when the U.S. was at war, when Americans were rallying behind their commander in chief," he said yesterday. "They're not going to tell a pollster something negative. The timing of the poll has dictated the results."

Mr. Mattison said the Bush administration continues to leave public comment out of its environmental equation, spends too much time "settling lawsuits" rather than upholding environmental law and "sides with industry rather than public health."

He said the Sierra Club was "relieved" that a potential environmental disaster caused by Iraqi oil fires was averted by U.S. military efforts. The hazard was heavily forecast by the United Nations and many pundits in late March.

Meanwhile, the entire environmental debate has changed, according to Mark Pfeifle, spokesman for Interior Secretary Gale A. Norton. He said he is not surprised that public-approval numbers are rising.

"Thirty years ago, there were rivers which caught fire and the bald eagle was dying out. Now that they don't have such issues to cite, some environmental groups are lashing out at anything," Mr. Pfeifle said.

Some groups concentrate on "fund raising and press releases," Mr. Pfeifle said, while others focus on simple but sound results. He said his agency is one of the latter.

"We're focusing on citizen conservation at the local level. We're looking to save one acre at a time," Mr. Pfeifle said. "That doesn't always make big headlines. But it's a success, and part of our effort to promote good stewardship."

The Gallup survey also reported that 37 percent of respondents said the U.S. government is doing "the right amount" of environmental protection, up from 30 percent in 2000 and 26 percent in 1992. The percentage saying it's "too little" of an effort fell to 51 percent in 2003 - down from 58 percent in 2000 and 68 percent in 1992.

Gallup also found that most of the public are not rabid tree-huggers: 80 percent said they were not active in an environmental group, 69 percent have not voted for political candidates based on their environmental policy and 58 percent have not contributed money to an environmental group.

In addition, a Newsweek poll of 1,000 adults released April 14 revealed public-opinion numbers about Bush administration policies. The survey found that 47 percent approved of the its environmental policies, 34 percent disapproved and 19 percent "did not know."

-----  
Mark David Richards

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 16:52:36 -0400  
Reply-To: Julie Ingels <JIngels@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Julie Ingels <JIngels@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM>  
Subject: Re: a question  
Comments: To: Eleanor Singer <esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

At the Montreal AAPOR (2001), Peter Tuckel (Hunter College) and Harry O'Neill (Roper Starch Worldwide, Inc.) presented a paper called "The Vanishing Respondent in Telephone Surveys." It may be helpful to you.

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

From: Eleanor Singer [mailto:[esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU)]  
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2003 4:23 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: a question

Can anyone refer me to data on trends in the use of answering machines, caller ID, and other "privacy managers" from about 1990 to 2002? Even a shorter period would be helpful.

Many thanks, in advance.

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 17:26:40 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Re: a question  
In-Reply-To: <3D883144FFDA8E41A02853BFB8CF672902E968E1@MATH3d>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

"The Vanishing Respondent in Telephone Surveys." is available on line  
at

<http://www.worldopinion.com/reference.taf?f=refi&id=1477>

this paper on the same site has some interesting data from 1999

<http://www.worldopinion.com/news?cmd=item&id=3966>

--  
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 Julie Ingels

> Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2003 4:53 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: a question

>

> At the Montreal AAPOR (2001), Peter Tuckel (Hunter College) and Harry

> O'Neill (Roper Starch Worldwide, Inc.) presented a paper called "The

> Vanishing Respondent in Telephone Surveys." It may be helpful to you.

>

>

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

> From: Eleanor Singer [mailto:esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU]

> Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2003 4:23 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: a question

>

>

> Can anyone refer me to data on trends in the use of answering machines,

> caller ID, and other "privacy managers" from about 1990 to 2002? Even a

> shorter period would be helpful.

>

> Many thanks, in advance.

>

> -----

> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

>

> -----

> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

-----  
Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 22:46:57 -0400

Reply-To: lindeman@bard.edu

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>

Subject: Re: Wash Times - Bush has growing support for environmental polic

y  
In-Reply-To:

<45EC685A35A0F44CB8EC249630A3B06C0AE87CD4@mercury.intersearch.us.tnsolfres.com>

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Sure enough, when the Sierra Club spokesman was interviewed about a Gallup survey that was only released on April 21, he probably missed the fact (and perhaps wasn't even told) that the field dates were from early March. But speaking of alternative reality, what's going on with the Washington Times lead?

> One entrenched idea is beginning to weaken: The public does not  
> consider President Bush the archenemy of the environment, according to a  
> Gallup poll released yesterday.

What entrenched idea are they talking about, exactly? The belief that Bush is the archenemy of the environment? The belief that the public considers him the



archenemy of the environment? Perhaps the belief that Bush is \_vulnerable\_ on environmental issues?

> The poll of 1,003 adults conducted March 3-5 reported that 53  
> percent said Mr. Bush had maintained environment-protection policies, up  
> from 48 percent in 2001. The fraction of Americans saying the  
> administration has weakened these policies is almost unchanged - it  
> stands at 35 percent, up just a point from 2001.

In other words, the percentage of folks who think Bush is \_strengthening\_ environmental protection policies is down 4 points. Not much of a change, but again, what entrenched idea are they talking about?

Also, one probably wouldn't guess from the story that the Gallup survey showed 44% of respondents saying that Bush had done a "good job" of "protecting the nation's environment," down from 50% in 2002, while 43% said he had done a poor job (up from 38%). Judging from the Newsweek result cited at the end of the story, Bush's environmental approval rating probably is up since the war. So, environmental issues don't seem to be hurting him right now. The Gallup release is at <http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr030421.asp>

Mark Lindeman  
Bard College

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Wed, 23 Apr 2003 09:19:39 -0400  
Reply-To: John Hall <JHall@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: John Hall <JHall@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM>  
Subject: Re: AAPORNET Digest - 21 Apr 2003 to 22 Apr 2003 (#2003-92)  
Comments: To: \*Sampling Statisticians <Stats@Mathematica-Mpr.com>  
Comments: cc: Janice Ballou <JBallou@mathematica-mpr.com>,  
Richard Heman-Ackah <RHeman-Ackah@mathematica-mpr.com>,  
Larry Snell <LSnell@mathematica-mpr.com>

I only get the digest, so if others have already addressed this issue, my apologies.

As a statistician who designs many RDD samples for surveys I am concerned (but not worried) about the issue of cell phone usage and its impact on telephone surveys, especially those that use RDD methods. I didn't recall reading the article that Lynda Voigt referred to (The Frame December,2001 [http://www.worldopinion.com/the\\_frame/2001/dec\\_3.html](http://www.worldopinion.com/the_frame/2001/dec_3.html)), so I read it, and I think that Dr. Voigt misquotes. The article states:" USA Today quoted a Yankee Group survey on July 28, 2001 that showed 2% of wireless customers use their wireless phone as their only phone. This and similar data can be misleading since the base (wireless customers) is people and not households and not all people are wireless customers..." This is not the same as saying (as Voigt states) that "2% of the U.S.

population have only cellular service and no landline telephone." I would start to worry if I thought that 2% of the total population (all persons or all households) relied on cell phones as their only telephone service. As it is, what I am worried about is the lack of good estimates of the prevalence of this phenomenon. I hope that this will be addressed in the near future. MPR will be examining the prevalence of cell phone usage among households that lack (land-line) telephone service or have recently had substantial interruptions in service. As the article in the Frame points out, the issue should be addressed in a national survey that uses probability sampling and does not rely on telephone data collection methods.

John Hall  
Senior Sampling Statistician  
Mathematica Policy Research  
600 Alexander Park  
Princeton, NJ 08540  
phone (609) 275-2357  
fax (609) 799-0005  
email jhall@mathematica-mpr.com

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

From: Automatic digest processor [mailto:LISTSERV@lists.asu.edu]  
Sent: Wednesday, April 23, 2003 1:00 AM  
To: Recipients of AAPORNET digests  
Subject: AAPORNET Digest - 21 Apr 2003 to 22 Apr 2003 (#2003-92)

There are 14 messages totalling 810 lines in this issue.

Topics of the day:

1. cell phones and samples
2. FW: passive vs active consent
3. Consumer Research Service in Arizona - thanks for the info!
4. Support for Release of Iranian Pollsters
5. Inviting Comments on "Interviewer Falsification" Draft
6. Incentive/disincentive? (2)
7. Wash Times - Bush has growing support for environmental policy
8. a question (4)
9. Wash Times - Bush has growing support for environmental polic y (2)

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 07:09:28 -0700  
From: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHRCRC.ORG>  
Subject: cell phones and samples

Hello,

We use RDD to recruit controls for our population-based case-control studies of cancer. We collect data about land-line residential telephones in our cases and exclude cases that do not have a residential land-line phone (we do not include cellular only prefixes in our sampling frame). One study that has been in the field for two years includes only young men 18-44 years of age in the Seattle area. We were initially concerned about how many cases would be eliminated because this age group/gender is most likely to have only cellular phone service. We have been pleasantly surprised however (and I won a latte in a bet with the study manager over this!) that so far we have only excluded 2/312 cases for this reason. We exclude even fewer cases because of no land-line residential telephone in our studies among predominately middle-aged and older adults. The Frame reported in 2001 that 2% of the U.S. population have only cellular service and no landline telephone (Solely cellular phone usage only 2% The Frame December,2001 [http://www.worldopinion.com/the\\_frame/2001/dec\\_3.html](http://www.worldopinion.com/the_frame/2001/dec_3.html)).  
Lynda Voigt

Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.  
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center  
Seattle, WA  
lvoigt@fhcrc.org

-----  
Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 10:13:36 -0400  
From: Eleanor Singer <esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU>  
Subject: FW: passive vs active consent

But it should be noted that this is one university's policy, not a federal regulation or law, and maybe it is worth getting into the dialogue that Congress twice considered making an active parental consent requirement into law and on both occasions decided not to do so because of the impact on the quality of the research that would result.

Eleanor Singer

-----Original Message-----  
From: mary.losch@uni.edu [mailto:mary.losch@UNI.EDU]  
Sent: Wednesday, April 09, 2003 3:52 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: passive vs active consent

Dear Linda,

The federal human research participant regulations do not (and have never, to my knowledge) recognized passive consent. A waiver of documentation of consent or a waiver of parental consent can be approved by an IRB but only in very prescribed circumstances. A quick search of the web provided this information (reproduced below) from Wayne State University regarding their policy. I thought it provided a good overview of the regulatory issues and hope it is helpful. Mary Losch

---

## Consent Procedures

Children cannot consent to participate in research themselves, therefore, the written permission (i.e. informed consent) of parents/guardians and the assent of the child must be obtained as stated below. Written assent is recommended for children age 13 and older and oral assent is recommended for children age 8 and older. These ages can be modified at the request of the investigator or at the discretion of the IRB for any individual protocol.

In general, a child's dissent should be respected. Every effort should be made to reach consensus between parent(s) and child, however, when the research offers the child the possibility of direct benefit important to his/her own health and is available only through research, the parent's wishes generally prevail.

For minimal risk research studies, (category 1), the written permission (i.e. informed consent) of one parent/guardian is sufficient. Children should give assent as appropriate.

For research involving greater than minimal risk but with a potential of benefit to the subject, (category 2), the written permission (i.e. informed consent) of one parent/ guardian is, again, sufficient. Children should give assent as appropriate.

For research involving greater than minimal risk and with no prospect of direct benefit to the child, (category 3), both parents must give written permission (i.e. informed consent) unless one parent is deceased, unknown, incompetent, or not reasonably available, or only one parent has the legal responsibility for the care and custody of the child. Children should give assent as appropriate.

In the past when research was conducted with adolescents, the term "passive consent" was often used. For example, a notice may have been sent to the parents that their child would be asked to participate in a research project conducted in the school setting unless the parent called a certain number or returned a post card. The investigator then assumed that because he/she did not hear from the parent, the parent had given "passive consent" (i.e., waived consent) for their child to participate in the research activity. From an IRB perspective, that term actually referred to a "waiver" of parental permission (assent was still obtained from the child).

Federal regulations do not acknowledge the concept of "passive consent". The use of this term infers that the investigator is unfamiliar with the principles upon which the Federal Regulations are based. Investigators who wish to utilize this concept should request a "waiver" of parental permission.

WSU HIC will not approve the use of the term passive consent. Minimal risk projects involving children may be approved through the use of a "waiver of consent" based upon Federal regulation 45 CFR 46.116. In such instances, the IRB may waive consent by approving the use of an "information sheet"

containing all the elements of informed consent for the parent and an assent form for the child.

If the IRB determines that a research protocol is designed for conditions or subject populations for which parental or guardian permission is not a reasonable requirement to protect the child, it may also waive the consent requirement based on Federal regulation 45 CFR 46.408(c).<sup>1</sup> Under such circumstances, the IRB must determine an appropriate substitute mechanism for protecting the child.

Note: For guidelines on drawing blood for research purposes in children, please see WSU HIC general policy " Research Studies Involving the Collection of Blood Samples ".

145 CFR 46.408 (c) In addition to the provisions for waiver contained in ? 46.116 of Subpart A, if the IRB determines that a research protocol is designed for conditions or for a subject population for which parental or guardian permission is not a reasonable requirement to protect the subjects (for example, neglected or abused children), it may waive the consent requirements in Subpart A of this part and paragraph (b) of this section, provided an appropriate mechanism for protecting the children who will participate as subjects in the research is substituted, and provided further that the waiver is not inconsistent with Federal State or local law. The choice of an appropriate mechanism would depend upon the nature and purpose of the activities described in the protocol, the risk and anticipated benefit to the research subjects, and their age, maturity, status, and condition.

----- 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, 22 Apr 2003 07:30:07 -0700  
From: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG>  
Subject: Consumer Research Service in Arizona - thanks for the info!

Thank you for all of the replies! Several members knew of this company and reassured me that they do in fact collect data on all of the respondents' accounts at any financial institution and the amounts in each account plus demographic and income data. One AAPOR member even forwarded my message to the vice-president of the company who kindly responded this morning with more information about the survey and the company - they are part of VNU USA. They aggregate the data and observe industry standards for confidentiality. The survey data are sold under the name "Market Audit" by Claritas, Inc., another VNU company. They collect 100,000 surveys annually through their call centers in Tucson and Ft. Lauderdale.

I am very relieved and happy to be reassured that we are not victims of identity theft!!

Thanks again for your assistance!!

Lynda Voigt

Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.  
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center  
Seattle, WA  
lvoigt@fhcrc.org

-----  
Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 10:39:16 -0400  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Support for Release of Iranian Pollsters

<http://www.mrons.com/drno/news2185.htm>

### Support for Release of Iranian Pollsters

World research organisations ESOMAR, EFAMRO and WAPOR have this week joined forces in the case of two Iranian survey researchers arrested earlier this month and have addressed the matter to the EU Government, the United Nations, the Iranian Government and other international bodies in order to release the Iranian pollsters.

At the beginning of February two Iranian pollsters who outraged hard-liners with a survey that found strong public support for contacts with the United States were sentenced to prison on charges of selling secrets to groups linked to the CIA. Prosecutors accused the two of holding secret talks and providing information to institutes and individuals affiliated with American, British and Israeli intelligence services - including the Gallup Organization. Richard Burkholder, Gallup's director of international polling, described the sentencing as 'extremely regrettable', indicating the Iranian pollsters were victims of Iran's ongoing power struggle between hard-liners and reformists, who back President Mohammed Khatami's program of social and political freedoms. According to Burkholder, Gallup paid for and designed a poll to find out opinions of people in the Islamic world toward America following the Sept. 11 attacks and the poll did not quiz Iranians on whether they supported dialogue with the United States.

The ESOMAR statement reiterates the fact that the right to conduct and publish polls freely is part of the modern democratic process which allows citizens to voice their opinions as upheld by Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

ESOMAR, EFAMRO and WAPOR support any initiative which ensures that public opinion polls and market and social research projects are conducted to the highest professional standards. This is in the interest of buyers and suppliers of research and in protecting public welfare.

--  
Leo G. Simonetta

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

-----  
Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 11:05:27 -0400  
From: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>  
Subject: Inviting Comments on "Interviewer Falsification" Draft

Interviewer Falsification in Survey Research: Special Nashville Session, =  
Friday, May 16, 8:15 am  
Draft Statement of Best Practices for Prevention and Detection of =  
Interviewer Falsification

AAPOR is soliciting comments on a draft statement of "current best =  
methods" regarding the prevention, detection and remediation of interviewer=  
falsification. The draft statement was developed by a broad-based =  
committee representing various survey organizations, including AAPOR. The =  
AAPOR Standards Committee would like to receive comments and queries on =  
this draft before or at our Nashville Conference. Please note that the =  
policies outlined in this draft statement may have significant consequences=  
on survey procedure.=20

The draft statement will be found on the AAPOR web site: [www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)  
A special session to review this document is scheduled for our Nashville =  
Conference, Friday, May 16, at 8:15 a.m. Please address any pre-conference =  
comments or queries to Roger Tourangeau, AAPOR Associate Standards Chair, =  
at: [rtourangeau@survey.umd.edu](mailto:rtourangeau@survey.umd.edu)=20  
=20

Background on Draft Statement

The Office of Research Integrity (ORI) of the U.S. Department of Health =  
and  
Human Services recently ruled that the falsification of survey data by an  
interviewer was an act of scientific misconduct subject to the oversight  
of that office. The responsibilities and authorities of that office can  
be found at <<http://ori.hhs.gov/html/about/aboutori.asp>>.

This ruling led to several conversations among survey researchers and ORI,  
the planning of sessions at upcoming professional meetings (e.g., AAPOR),  
discussions with the executive bodies of AAPOR and AstatA, and inquiries  
by university officers overseeing scientific integrity issues.

These conversations suggested that a small meeting of leaders of the  
survey research field might be helpful to review current practices of the  
profession in addressing issues of interviewer falsification and to  
develop a statement of current best methods.

The Ann Arbor Summit

On April 4-6, 2003, a small group of survey managers, methodologists, and  
university scientific integrity officers met to develop a draft of  
current best methods in detecting, diagnosing, and remediating survey

interviewer falsification of data.=20

The draft is available on the AAPOR web site: [www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)

The product of the meeting, the draft statement, is being submitted for comment from the larger profession through AAPORnet, SRMSnet, the executive bodies of the American Statistical Association Survey Research Methods Section, the council of the American Associate for Public Opinion Research, and the Council of American Survey Research Organizations.

Steering Committee

The following persons served as steering committee members:

Thomas Guterbock, Survey Research Center, University of Virginia  
Timothy Johnson, University of Illinois, Survey Research Laboratory  
Daniel Kasprzyk, representative for ASA Survey Research Methods  
Section, Mathematica Policy Research  
John Kennedy, Indiana University, Survey Research Center  
Richard Kulka, Research Triangle Institute  
Judith Mopsik, Abt Associates  
Judith Nowack, Associate Vice President for Research, University of  
Michigan  
Beth-Ellen Pennell, University of Michigan Survey Research Center  
Renee Slobasky, Westat, Inc.  
John Thompson, National Opinion Research Center  
Roger Tourangeau, Chair, Standards Committee, AAPOR

-----  
Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 14:17:07 -0400  
From: Jeanette Janota <[JJanota@ASHA.ORG](mailto:JJanota@ASHA.ORG)>  
Subject: Incentive/disincentive?

AAPORneters:

The following half-page notice was sent to me by an outside source, so I can't speak to its authenticity. I must say I laughed out loud when I read the second paragraph. Like most, we're having to use creativity in increasing response rates, but has anyone used anything like this? (I've disguised the name of the company, but it's a well-known magazine.)

"IMPORTANT NOTE

"Sending the Annual Questionnaire to some 3,500,000 subscribers costs more than \$700,000 for paper, printing and postage. We feel this annual event is an essential part of our tradition and part of what makes XXXXXX unique. It is also the single most expensive research effort in our reporting program.

"This year we are asking you to enclose a voluntary contribution of \$6 or more to help cover the cost of the questionnaire. Your donation will help us continue this valuable service.



"PLEASE HELP...make your check for \$6 or more payable to XXXX and enclose with your ballot and questionnaire. Contributions to XXXX are tax deductible because we are a nonprofit organization. Remember, however, that your participation in the survey and the election is in no way dependent on making a contribution.

"Thank you."

Jeanette O. Janota, Ph.D.  
Senior Research Associate/Statistician  
American Speech-Language-Hearing Association  
10801 Rockville Pike  
Rockville, MD 20852  
Telephone: 301-897-5700, ext. 4175  
Fax: 301-468-9742  
Email: [jjanota@asha.org](mailto:jjanota@asha.org)  
ASHA website: [www.asha.org](http://www.asha.org)

-----  
Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 15:19:31 -0400  
From: Mark David Richards <[mark@BISCONTI.COM](mailto:mark@BISCONTI.COM)>  
Subject: Wash Times - Bush has growing support for environmental policy

THE WASHINGTON TIMES  
April 22, 2003

Bush has growing support for environmental policy

By Jennifer Harper

One entrenched idea is beginning to weaken: The public does not consider President Bush the archenemy of the environment, according to a Gallup poll released yesterday.

"The environmental movement and sympathetic politicians have painted the administration as anti-environmental. Given the administration's refusal to reverse course, there was reason to expect that its opponents would generate a backlash against its environmental policies similar to the one that hit the early Reagan administration," noted Gallup environmental analyst Riley Dunlap.

But there's "little evidence of a comparable backlash ... despite intense efforts by environmentalists and political supporters," he continued.

The poll of 1,003 adults conducted March 3-5 reported that 53 percent said Mr. Bush had maintained environment-protection policies, up from 48 percent in 2001. The fraction of Americans saying the administration has weakened these policies is almost unchanged - it stands at 35 percent, up just a point from 2001.

Sierra Club spokesman Allen Mattison is not impressed.

"Gallup took this poll when the U.S. was at war, when Americans

were rallying behind their commander in chief," he said yesterday. "They're not going to tell a pollster something negative. The timing of the poll has dictated the results."

Mr. Mattison said the Bush administration continues to leave public comment out of its environmental equation, spends too much time "settling lawsuits" rather than upholding environmental law and "sides with industry rather than public health."

He said the Sierra Club was "relieved" that a potential environmental disaster caused by Iraqi oil fires was averted by U.S. military efforts. The hazard was heavily forecast by the United Nations and many pundits in late March.

Meanwhile, the entire environmental debate has changed, according to Mark Pfeifle, spokesman for Interior Secretary Gale A. Norton. He said he is not surprised that public-approval numbers are rising.

"Thirty years ago, there were rivers which caught fire and the bald eagle was dying out. Now that they don't have such issues to cite, some environmental groups are lashing out at anything," Mr. Pfeifle said.

Some groups concentrate on "fund raising and press releases," Mr. Pfeifle said, while others focus on simple but sound results. He said his agency is one of the latter.

"We're focusing on citizen conservation at the local level. We're looking to save one acre at a time," Mr. Pfeifle said. "That doesn't always make big headlines. But it's a success, and part of our effort to promote good stewardship."

The Gallup survey also reported that 37 percent of respondents said the U.S. government is doing "the right amount" of environmental protection, up from 30 percent in 2000 and 26 percent in 1992. The percentage saying it's "too little" of an effort fell to 51 percent in 2003 - down from 58 percent in 2000 and 68 percent in 1992.

Gallup also found that most of the public are not rabid tree-huggers: 80 percent said they were not active in an environmental group, 69 percent have not voted for political candidates based on their environmental policy and 58 percent have not contributed money to an environmental group.

In addition, a Newsweek poll of 1,000 adults released April 14 revealed public-opinion numbers about Bush administration policies. The survey found that 47 percent approved of the its environmental policies, 34 percent disapproved and 19 percent "did not know."

-----  
Mark David Richards  
-----

Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 16:23:23 -0400  
From: Eleanor Singer <esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU>  
Subject: a question

Can anyone refer me to data on trends in the use of answering machines, caller ID, and other "privacy managers" from about 1990 to 2002? Even a shorter period would be helpful.

Many thanks, in advance.

-----  
Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 16:34:33 -0400  
From: Scott Keeter <skeeter@GMU.EDU>  
Subject: Re: a question

And I would love to have a few good survey questions on these topics, so please share your responses with Eleanor and with me (or the list if there is interest). Thanks.

Eleanor Singer wrote:

>  
> Can anyone refer me to data on trends in the use of answering machines,  
> caller ID, and other "privacy managers" from about 1990 to 2002? Even a  
> shorter period would be helpful.  
>  
> Many thanks, in advance.  
>  
> -----  
> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

--  
Scott Keeter  
Pew Research Center for the People and the Press  
1150 18th Street, NW, Suite 975  
Washington, DC 20036  
Voice 202-293-3126 extension 16  
Personal fax 703 832 0209  
E-mail [keeters@people-press.org](mailto:keeters@people-press.org)  
Web site <http://mason.gmu.edu/~skeeter>

-----  
Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 15:44:44 -0500  
From: Frank Newport <Frank\_Newport@GALLUP.COM>  
Subject: Re: Incentive/disincentive?

Since this went out to 3.5 million subscribers, I don't think it's a secret that this was the Consumer Reports survey. I received one myself, and like Jeanette, was unclear as to whether the request for \$6 would increase or decrease willingness to participate. I assume CR just thought it was an easy way to procure needed additional revenues. These surveys by CR are used as the basis for their product and car reliability ratings, and of course aren't random to begin with, since the universe is their subscriber base. Still, it would be interesting to know more about the impact on response rate and data quality of this interesting request for money to help defray survey costs. It's quite a switch on the mail survey tactic of sending money to prospective respondents in an attempt to increase participation.

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

From: Jeanette Janota [mailto:JJanota@ASHA.ORG]

Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2003 2:17 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Incentive/disincentive?

AAPORneters:

The following half-page notice was sent to me by an outside source, so I can't speak to its authenticity. I must say I laughed out loud when I read the second paragraph. Like most, we're having to use creativity in increasing response rates, but has anyone used anything like this? (I've disguised the name of the company, but it's a well-known magazine.)

"IMPORTANT NOTE

"Sending the Annual Questionnaire to some 3,500,000 subscribers costs more than \$700,000 for paper, printing and postage. We feel this annual event is an essential part of our tradition and part of what makes XXXXXX unique. It is also the single most expensive research effort in our reporting program.

"This year we are asking you to enclose a voluntary contribution of \$6 or more to help cover the cost of the questionnaire. Your donation will help us continue this valuable service.

"PLEASE HELP...make your check for \$6 or more payable to XXXX and enclose with your ballot and questionnaire. Contributions to XXXX are tax deductible because we are a nonprofit organization. Remember, however, that your participation in the survey and the election is in no way dependent on making a contribution.

"Thank you."

Jeanette O. Janota, Ph.D.  
Senior Research Associate/Statistician  
American Speech-Language-Hearing Association  
10801 Rockville Pike  
Rockville, MD 20852  
Telephone: 301-897-5700, ext. 4175  
Fax: 301-468-9742  
Email: [jjanota@asha.org](mailto:jjanota@asha.org)  
ASHA website: [www.asha.org](http://www.asha.org)

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapor.net.html>  
-----

Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 16:37:28 -0400  
From: Michael McLaen <Michael.McLaen@INTERSEARCH.TNSOFRES.COM>  
Subject: Re: Wash Times - Bush has growing support for environmental policy

What a wonderful alternative reality the Sierra Club spokesman must live in.  
Did anyone else's war start March 5th?

\*\*\*Sierra Club spokesman Allen Mattison is not impressed. "Gallup took this poll when the U.S. was at war, when Americans were rallying behind their commander in chief," he said yesterday.  
"They're not going to tell a pollster something negative. The timing of the poll has dictated the results."\*\*\*

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

From: Mark David Richards [mailto:mark@BISCONTI.COM]  
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2003 3:20 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Wash Times - Bush has growing support for environmental policy

THE WASHINGTON TIMES  
April 22, 2003

Bush has growing support for environmental policy

By Jennifer Harper

One entrenched idea is beginning to weaken: The public does not consider President Bush the archenemy of the environment, according to a Gallup poll released yesterday.

"The environmental movement and sympathetic politicians have painted the administration as anti-environmental. Given the administration's refusal to reverse course, there was reason to expect that its opponents would generate a backlash against its environmental policies similar to the one that hit the early Reagan administration," noted Gallup environmental analyst Riley Dunlap.

But there's "little evidence of a comparable backlash ... despite intense efforts by environmentalists and political supporters," he continued.

The poll of 1,003 adults conducted March 3-5 reported that 53 percent said Mr. Bush had maintained environment-protection policies, up from 48 percent in 2001. The fraction of Americans saying the administration has weakened these policies is almost unchanged - it stands at 35 percent, up just a point from 2001.

Sierra Club spokesman Allen Mattison is not impressed.

"Gallup took this poll when the U.S. was at war, when Americans were rallying behind their commander in chief," he said yesterday.  
"They're not going to tell a pollster something negative. The timing of the poll has dictated the results."

Mr. Mattison said the Bush administration continues to leave public comment out of its environmental equation, spends too much time "settling lawsuits" rather than upholding environmental law and "sides

with industry rather than public health."

He said the Sierra Club was "relieved" that a potential environmental disaster caused by Iraqi oil fires was averted by U.S. military efforts. The hazard was heavily forecast by the United Nations and many pundits in late March.

Meanwhile, the entire environmental debate has changed, according to Mark Pfeifle, spokesman for Interior Secretary Gale A. Norton. He said he is not surprised that public-approval numbers are rising.

"Thirty years ago, there were rivers which caught fire and the bald eagle was dying out. Now that they don't have such issues to cite, some environmental groups are lashing out at anything," Mr. Pfeifle said.

Some groups concentrate on "fund raising and press releases," Mr. Pfeifle said, while others focus on simple but sound results. He said his agency is one of the latter.

"We're focusing on citizen conservation at the local level. We're looking to save one acre at a time," Mr. Pfeifle said. "That doesn't always make big headlines. But it's a success, and part of our effort to promote good stewardship."

The Gallup survey also reported that 37 percent of respondents said the U.S. government is doing "the right amount" of environmental protection, up from 30 percent in 2000 and 26 percent in 1992. The percentage saying it's "too little" of an effort fell to 51 percent in 2003 - down from 58 percent in 2000 and 68 percent in 1992.

Gallup also found that most of the public are not rabid tree-huggers: 80 percent said they were not active in an environmental group, 69 percent have not voted for political candidates based on their environmental policy and 58 percent have not contributed money to an environmental group.

In addition, a Newsweek poll of 1,000 adults released April 14 revealed public-opinion numbers about Bush administration policies. The survey found that 47 percent approved of the its environmental policies, 34 percent disapproved and 19 percent "did not know."

-----  
Mark David Richards

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 16:52:36 -0400  
From: Julie Ingels <JIngels@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM>  
Subject: Re: a question

At the Montreal AAPOR (2001), Peter Tuckel (Hunter College) and Harry O'Neill (Roper Starch Worldwide, Inc.) presented a paper called "The Vanishing Respondent in Telephone Surveys." It may be helpful to you.

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

From: Eleanor Singer [mailto:esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU]  
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2003 4:23 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: a question

Can anyone refer me to data on trends in the use of answering machines, caller ID, and other "privacy managers" from about 1990 to 2002? Even a shorter period would be helpful.

Many thanks, in advance.

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 17:26:40 -0400  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Re: a question

"The Vanishing Respondent in Telephone Surveys." is available on line at

<http://www.worldopinion.com/reference.taf?f=refi&id=1477>

this paper on the same site has some interesting data from 1999

<http://www.worldopinion.com/news?cmd=item&id=3966>

--  
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 Julie Ingels  
> Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2003 4:53 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: a question

>  
> At the Montreal AAPOR (2001), Peter Tuckel (Hunter College) and Harry  
> O'Neill (Roper Starch Worldwide, Inc.) presented a paper called "The  
> Vanishing Respondent in Telephone Surveys." It may be helpful to you.

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

> From: Eleanor Singer [mailto:esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU]  
> Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2003 4:23 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: a question  
>  
>  
> Can anyone refer me to data on trends in the use of answering  
machines,  
> caller ID, and other "privacy managers" from about 1990 to 2002? Even  
a  
> shorter period would be helpful.  
>  
> Many thanks, in advance.  
>

> -----  
> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapor.net.html>  
>  
> -----  
> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapor.net.html>

-----  
Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 22:46:57 -0400  
From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Wash Times - Bush has growing support for environmental polic y

Sure enough, when the Sierra Club spokesman was interviewed about a Gallup survey that was only released on April 21, he probably missed the fact (and perhaps wasn't even told) that the field dates were from early March. But speaking of alternative reality, what's going on with the Washington Times lead?

> One entrenched idea is beginning to weaken: The public does not  
> consider President Bush the archenemy of the environment, according to a  
> Gallup poll released yesterday.

What entrenched idea are they talking about, exactly? The belief that Bush is the archenemy of the environment? The belief that the public considers him the archenemy of the environment? Perhaps the belief that Bush is vulnerable on environmental issues?

> The poll of 1,003 adults conducted March 3-5 reported that 53  
> percent said Mr. Bush had maintained environment-protection policies, up  
> from 48 percent in 2001. The fraction of Americans saying the  
> administration has weakened these policies is almost unchanged - it  
> stands at 35 percent, up just a point from 2001.



In other words, the percentage of folks who think Bush is strengthening environmental protection policies is down 4 points. Not much of a change, but again, what entrenched idea are they talking about?

Also, one probably wouldn't guess from the story that the Gallup survey showed 44% of respondents saying that Bush had done a "good job" of "protecting the nation's environment," down from 50% in 2002, while 43% said he had done a poor job (up from 38%). Judging from the Newsweek result cited at the end of the story, Bush's environmental approval rating probably is up since the war. So, environmental issues don't seem to be hurting him right now. The Gallup release is at <http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr030421.asp>

Mark Lindeman  
Bard College

-----  
End of AAPORNET Digest - 21 Apr 2003 to 22 Apr 2003 (#2003-92)

\*\*\*\*\*

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====

Date: Wed, 23 Apr 2003 13:42:51 -0400  
Reply-To: Andy White <[awhite@NAS.EDU](mailto:awhite@NAS.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Andy White <[awhite@NAS.EDU](mailto:awhite@NAS.EDU)>  
Subject: The Committee on National Statistics cordially welcomes you to attend its Spring Seminar:

MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: multipart/mixed; boundary="Boundary\_(ID\_ovnC/JcOqhogL19WiDiEJg)"

--Boundary\_(ID\_ovnC/JcOqhogL19WiDiEJg)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-disposition: inline

Ninety-First Meeting of the Committee on National Statistics of the National Academies

The Committee on National Statistics cordially welcomes you to attend its Spring Seminar:

A Presentation of the Report of the Committee to Review the Scientific Evidence on the Polygraph  
by Emmett Keeler, The RAND Corporation

3:00 PM Friday, May 9, 2003  
Lecture Room (Room 100)  
Keck Center of the National Academies  
500 Fifth Street, NW  
Washington , DC 20001

Coffee & Tea available at 2:30 PM  
Reception to follow seminar at 4:30 PM

Abstract:

Since its creation by the same man who introduced Wonder Woman in comic books, the polygraph has in popular lore been thought to possess the same truth-discerning ability as the fictional heroine's magic lasso. But the real-world applications of the polygraph have become increasingly controversial, particularly as it has been used for mass screening of employees in sensitive national security facilities - a use representative of a group of fallible classification problems facing the federal statistical community today. This seminar reviews the results of a National Academies

--Boundary\_(ID\_ovnC/JcOqhogL19WiDiEJg)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-disposition: inline

' panel study of the scientific evidence that underlies the use of the polygraph, including analysis of the fundamental accuracy of the test and the possible effect of deceptive countermeasures.

About Emmett Keeler:

Panel member Emmett Keeler is a senior mathematician at RAND, with extensive experience in health economics and policy analysis. He is the principal investigator of the Improving Chronic Illness Care Evaluation. For many years, he has taught cost-effectiveness and decision analysis at the RAND Graduate School and the University of California at Los Angeles.

Directions:

The Keck Center is located on the block bounded by Fifth, Sixth, E, and F Streets, NW. It is located diagonally opposite the MCI Center and the National Building Museum. The pedestrian entrance is on the Fifth Street side of the building, near the north end. The garage entrance is on the Sixth Street side; visitor parking is on the first level, and the elevator to the lobby level is marked. The building is conveniently located on Metrorail. From the Gallery Place/Chinatown station (Red/Yellow/Green), use the 7th Street/Arena exit and walk two blocks east. From Judiciary Square (Red), use the Law All are welcome to attend the seminar, but for security purposes, you must RSVP by May 6, 2003. To RSVP, or if you need further information, please contact Danelle Dessaint at (202) 334-3096 or e-mail [ddessain@nas.edu](mailto:ddessain@nas.edu).

Committee on National Statistics  
Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education  
National Research Council of the National Academies

--Boundary\_(ID\_ovnC/JcOqhogL19WiDiEJg)--

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Wed, 23 Apr 2003 14:17:14 -0400  
Reply-To: [mark@bisconti.com](mailto:mark@bisconti.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mark David Richards <[mark@BISCONTI.COM](mailto:mark@BISCONTI.COM)>  
Subject: Field Poll - CA ballot initiative would ban classification of people by race and ethnicity  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

A Field Poll conducted among 548 CA English- and Spanish-speaking likely voters April 1-6, 2003 (released today and available to subscribers at <http://www.field.com/fieldpollonline/subscribers/RIs2071.pdf>) shows that 48% would vote YES for a statewide "Classification by Race,

Ethnicity, Color or National Origin (Racial Privacy) Initiative" that will be on the ballot in the next statewide election (March 2004 or sooner if there is a gubernatorial recall petition). Only 11 percent were aware of the Initiative.

According to The Field Poll press release, the initiative is sponsored by Ward Connerly, a UC Regent who was chief backer of Proposition 209 (approved by CA voters in Nov. 1996).

Here is the question, which is based on the summary of the initiative's official ballot wording:

"An initiative has been proposed that would prohibit state and local governments from using race, ethnicity, color or national origin to classify current or prospective students, contractors, or employees in public education, contracting and employment operations. Exemptions include law enforcement descriptions, prisoner and undercover assignments, and actions taken to maintain federal funding. Potential savings to the state range from several million to 10 million dollars per year. If the election were being held today, and this initiative were on the ballot, would you vote yes or no?"

Would vote yes: 48%

Would vote no: 33%

Undecided: 19%

These numbers are unchanged since April 2002. In April 2002, awareness about the Initiative was higher (26%) due to media publicity.

There are subgroup differences:

Percent Would Vote Yes

TOTAL CA - 48%

Republicans - 60%

Conservatives - 57%

Under 40 years old - 54%

Men - 53%

40-59 - 52%

Non-partisan - 50%

Non-Hispanics - 49%

Women - 43%

Latinos (80 interviews) - 42%

Democrats - 37%

Liberals - 35%

Age 60 or older - 35%

---

See article in The Sacramento Bee  
48% in poll back racial data measure

<http://www.sacbee.com/content/politics/story/6502696p-7453711c.html>

-----  
Mark David Richards

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Thu, 24 Apr 2003 09:50:50 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Accusations of Push-polling in Kentucky  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

It appears to me that this reporter understands what a push poll is but the campaign spokesperson either does not or thinks he will get political mileage out of mischaracterizing the research. Of course, it might be possible to conduct enough in-person interviews at \$10 a person plus the cost of the set up to affect an election but it seems unlikely to me.

<http://www.kentucky.com/mld/heraldleader/news/local/5703010.htm>

Lunsford accused of bogus polling  
RESPONDENTS SAY THEY WERE PAID TO WATCH ADS  
By Jack Brammer  
HERALD-LEADER FRANKFORT BUREAU

FRANKFORT -Democrat Ben Chandler's campaign for governor accused rival Bruce Lunsford's campaign yesterday of conducting a kind of "push poll" in Chandler's hometown of Versailles by showing shoppers TV ads that criticized Chandler and then paying the shoppers \$10 for their opinions.

Push polls are designed to shape, rather than measure, public opinion. They usually do not identify the campaign they represent.

"We think what they did is way out of bounds," said Chandler campaign manager Mark Riddle.

Maria Partlow, a spokeswoman for the Lunsford campaign, said the poll was "a legitimate research technique that was purely voluntary for the participants."

Sarah Jackson, executive director of the state Registry for Election Finance, said it does not appear that Lunsford's poll violated any state law on vote buying.

Tammy Magness, a volunteer worker in the Chandler campaign, said she was

at the Kmart shopping center in Versailles last Saturday morning when she was offered \$10 to look at two possible TV ads for the Lunsford campaign.

"This man told me he was an independent pollster from New York," said Magness, 33, a part-time elementary special education teacher in Woodford County. "He asked me to look at some videos, and he never identified that he was with the Lunsford campaign."

The ads, Magness said, showed "little monkeys in suits running around, and said it was paid by for Bruce Lunsford" to imply that government is being run by monkeys. Another featured former Gov. A.B. "Happy" Chandler, Ben Chandler's grandfather, in a clip and indicated that the grandson "couldn't run government," she said.

Magness said she told the pollster that she was "tired of all the mudslinging" in the race and then received her \$10. She added that her mother also got \$10 for watching ads critical of Chandler.

Partlow, with the Lunsford campaign, said such surveys are not that unusual. She said the pollster did not identify himself so as not to influence the views of the respondents. She also said the ad with the monkey started airing across the state yesterday.

"Bruce Lunsford will stop the monkey business. He'll end no-bid contracts and use the savings to help seniors pay for prescription drugs," the ad says.

Riddle, with the Chandler campaign, said campaign surveys usually are conducted with a random sampling of participants.

"We do pay for such focus groups, but I've never heard of any campaign ever paying random shoppers to get their opinions," Riddle said. "This was a malicious push poll instead of scientific research."

Mark Nickolas, chief of staff for Democrat Jody Richards' campaign for governor, said this "brouhaha is part of the pattern of negative campaigning by Lunsford and Chandler. We've never paid people on the street for their views. What is disgusting is how these two campaigns are going at each other."

--

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

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Thu, 24 Apr 2003 10:31:53 -0400  
Reply-To: Ken Winneg <kwinneg@ASC.UPENN.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Ken Winneg <kwinneg@ASC.UPENN.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Accusations of Push-polling in Kentucky  
Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

The technique used by the Lunsford campaign is a mall intercept to test the effectiveness of potential spots. It is not a push poll. Campaigns and ad agencies regularly employ this methodology. It appears the campaign spokesperson is unfamiliar with the variety of methods campaigns use to test messages.

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

From: Leo G. Simonetta [mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM]  
Sent: Thursday, April 24, 2003 9:51 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Accusations of Push-polling in Kentucky

It appears to me that this reporter understands what a push poll is but the campaign spokesperson either does not or thinks he will get political mileage out of mischaracterizing the research. Of course, it might be possible to conduct enough in-person interviews at \$10 a person plus the cost of the set up to affect an election but it seems unlikely to me.

<http://www.kentucky.com/mld/heraldleader/news/local/5703010.htm>

Lunsford accused of bogus polling  
RESPONDENTS SAY THEY WERE PAID TO WATCH ADS  
By Jack Brammer  
HERALD-LEADER FRANKFORT BUREAU

FRANKFORT -Democrat Ben Chandler's campaign for governor accused rival Bruce Lunsford's campaign yesterday of conducting a kind of "push poll" in Chandler's hometown of Versailles by showing shoppers TV ads that criticized Chandler and then paying the shoppers \$10 for their opinions.

Push polls are designed to shape, rather than measure, public opinion. They usually do not identify the campaign they represent.

"We think what they did is way out of bounds," said Chandler campaign

manager Mark Riddle.

Maria Partlow, a spokeswoman for the Lunsford campaign, said the poll was "a legitimate research technique that was purely voluntary for the participants."

Sarah Jackson, executive director of the state Registry for Election Finance, said it does not appear that Lunsford's poll violated any state law on vote buying.

Tammy Magness, a volunteer worker in the Chandler campaign, said she was at the Kmart shopping center in Versailles last Saturday morning when she was offered \$10 to look at two possible TV ads for the Lunsford campaign.

"This man told me he was an independent pollster from New York," said Magness, 33, a part-time elementary special education teacher in Woodford County. "He asked me to look at some videos, and he never identified that he was with the Lunsford campaign."

The ads, Magness said, showed "little monkeys in suits running around, and said it was paid by for Bruce Lunsford" to imply that government is being run by monkeys. Another featured former Gov. A.B. "Happy" Chandler, Ben Chandler's grandfather, in a clip and indicated that the grandson "couldn't run government," she said.

Magness said she told the pollster that she was "tired of all the mudslinging" in the race and then received her \$10. She added that her mother also got \$10 for watching ads critical of Chandler.

Partlow, with the Lunsford campaign, said such surveys are not that unusual. She said the pollster did not identify himself so as not to influence the views of the respondents. She also said the ad with the monkey started airing across the state yesterday.

"Bruce Lunsford will stop the monkey business. He'll end no-bid contracts and use the savings to help seniors pay for prescription drugs," the ad says.

Riddle, with the Chandler campaign, said campaign surveys usually are conducted with a random sampling of participants.

"We do pay for such focus groups, but I've never heard of any campaign ever paying random shoppers to get their opinions," Riddle said. "This was a malicious push poll instead of scientific research."

Mark Nickolas, chief of staff for Democrat Jody Richards' campaign for governor, said this "brouhaha is part of the pattern of negative campaigning by Lunsford and Chandler. We've never paid people on the street for their views. What is disgusting is how these two campaigns are going at each other."

--



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

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Thu, 24 Apr 2003 10:34:15 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: A Virginia Law of interest  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Sheriff's Reelection Poll Allegedly Violated Law  
Pr. William Official's Aide Ordered Study

By Steven Ginsberg  
Washington Post Staff Writer  
Thursday, April 24, 2003; Page B01

The campaign of Prince William Sheriff E. Lee Stoffregen III, a heavily financed Democrat with ambitions to remake the Republican-led Board of County Supervisors, has been conducting a poll that appears to be in violation of state law, state authorities said yesterday.

Pollsters, who contacted hundreds of county residents over the last 10 days with questions about Stoffregen, his opponents, board members and other politicians, did not tell people who commissioned the poll, a violation of state law, authorities said. The law, passed in Richmond three years ago, requires those who make calls on behalf of a political campaign to identify the campaign.

SNIP

© 2003 The Washington Post Company

Full story at  
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A27167-2003Apr23.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

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Thu, 24 Apr 2003 13:39:49 -0400  
Reply-To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <[tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu](mailto:tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <[tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU)>  
Subject: Fairfax County Student Sex Survey Cancelled (fwd)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The following story from yesterday's Washington Post will be of interest in light of the recent discussions here regarding parental consent.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A17585-2003Apr22.html>

Excerpt:  
SNIP:

A controversial survey asking Fairfax County students about their experiences with alcohol, drugs and sex has been canceled because the company hired to administer it feared that parents might sue.

The wide-ranging survey was to be distributed next week to 10,000 randomly chosen students in sixth, eighth, 10th and 12th grades to gauge levels of risky behavior among Fairfax County youth.

But Channing Bete Co., a Massachusetts-based publishing and survey company, asked the county to absolve it of any potential legal risk -- and county attorneys say Virginia law makes that impossible.

The survey, hotly protested by many parents, included more than 100 questions on such topics as smoking, suicide, weight loss and family relationships. Participation was to be voluntary, and the questions about sexual behavior were to be asked only of sophomores and seniors.

The questions about sex included, "How old were you when you first had sex?" and "Have you ever had oral sex?" SNIP

As far as I could see, the story did not mention the method by which parental consent was to be obtained (i.e., active or passive). Anybody know?

Tom



> in  
> light of the recent discussions here regarding parental consent.  
>  
> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A17585-2003Apr22.html>

> Excerpt:

> SNIP:

> A controversial survey asking Fairfax County students about their  
> experiences with alcohol, drugs and sex has been canceled because the  
> company hired to administer it feared that parents might sue.

>  
> The wide-ranging survey was to be distributed next week to 10,000  
randomly

> chosen students in sixth, eighth, 10th and 12th grades to gauge  
levels of

> risky behavior among Fairfax County youth.

>  
> But Channing Bete Co., a Massachusetts-based publishing and survey  
> company,

> asked the county to absolve it of any potential legal risk -- and  
> county attorneys say Virginia law makes that impossible.

>  
> The survey, hotly protested by many parents, included more than 100  
> questions on such topics as smoking, suicide, weight loss and family  
> relationships. Participation was to be voluntary, and the questions  
about

> sexual behavior were to be asked only of sophomores and seniors.

>  
> The questions about sex included, "How old were you when you first had  
> sex?" and "Have you ever had oral sex?" SNIP

>  
> As far as I could see, the story did not mention the method by which  
> parental consent was to be obtained (i.e., active or passive).

Anybody

> know?

>  
>  
> Tom

> 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 e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

>  
> -----  
> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

---

Date: Thu, 24 Apr 2003 17:25:17 -0400  
Reply-To: Alan Bayer <yogi@VT.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Alan Bayer <yogi@VT.EDU>  
Subject: Fwd: a question (re. caller ID & answering machines)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

The annual Virginia Quality of Life survey has asked about the presence of these for several years. This is a RDD sample of Virginia households (more details at our Survey Center website -- see signature info below for address).

In 1994, 60.2% reported having an answering machine in their home (and of those with answering machines, 45.7 percent said they use it to screen calls).

In 1998, we added a question about whether they had caller ID. At that time 76.8% reported having an answering machine, and 38.8% had caller ID.

Both of these questions were last asked in 2001, when 81.1% had an answering machine and 47.1% had caller ID.

This are results only for Virginia.

Alan Bayer  
Virginia Tech Center for Survey Research

>Date: Tue, 22 Apr 2003 16:23:23 -0400  
>From: Eleanor Singer <esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU>  
>Subject: a question  
>Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
>To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
>Reply-to: Eleanor Singer <esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU>  
>X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2656.59)

>  
>Can anyone refer me to data on trends in the use of answering machines, caller ID, and other "privacy managers" from about 1990 to 2002? Even a shorter period would be helpful.

>  
>Many thanks, in advance.

>  
>-----  
>Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
>Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

\\//  
(@ @)

---

Alan E. Bayer, Ph.D, Director           e-mail: [yogi@vt.edu](mailto:yogi@vt.edu)  
Center for Survey Research           phone: (540)231-3676  
207 W. Roanoke St.                   fax: (540)231-3678  
Virginia Tech

Blacksburg, VA 24061-0543 USA

<http://filebox.vt.edu/centers/survey/>

---

---

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

---

Date: Thu, 24 Apr 2003 23:15:29 +0000  
Reply-To: [wendy.landiers@TALK21.COM](mailto:wendy.landiers@TALK21.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: [wendy.landiers@TALK21.COM](mailto:wendy.landiers@TALK21.COM)  
Subject: market research - movies

Hello,

Who is the expert on market research for movies? Theater surveys versus focus groups, that sort of thing.

Thanks,

Wendy Landiers

-----  
talk21 your FREE portable and private address on the net at  
<http://www.talk21.com>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

---

Date: Thu, 24 Apr 2003 20:22:39 -0400  
Reply-To: [mark@bisconti.com](mailto:mark@bisconti.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mark David Richards <[mark@BISCONTI.COM](mailto:mark@BISCONTI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: A Virginia Law of interest  
In-Reply-To: <[001701c30a6e\\$94e40e40\\$130a010a@LEO](mailto:001701c30a6e$94e40e40$130a010a@LEO)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

According to the article, VA state law is that a pollster must tell respondents (potential respondents?) who commissioned a poll of more than 25 people contacted less than 180 days before a general election or 90 days before a primary election. Penalty: \$2,500.

Which other states have this or a similar law?

Mark

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo G. Simonetta  
Sent: Thursday, April 24, 2003 10:34 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: A Virginia Law of interest

Sheriff's Reelection Poll Allegedly Violated Law  
Pr. William Official's Aide Ordered Study

By Steven Ginsberg  
Washington Post Staff Writer  
Thursday, April 24, 2003; Page B01

The campaign of Prince William Sheriff E. Lee Stoffregen III, a heavily financed Democrat with ambitions to remake the Republican-led Board of County Supervisors, has been conducting a poll that appears to be in violation of state law, state authorities said yesterday.

Pollsters, who contacted hundreds of county residents over the last 10 days with questions about Stoffregen, his opponents, board members and other politicians, did not tell people who commissioned the poll, a violation of state law, authorities said. The law, passed in Richmond three years ago, requires those who make calls on behalf of a political campaign to identify the campaign.

SNIP

© 2003 The Washington Post Company

Full story at  
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A27167-2003Apr23.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

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Fri, 25 Apr 2003 09:20:08 -0400  
Reply-To: "Holz, Jo" <jholz@INDEMAND.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Holz, Jo" <jholz@INDEMAND.COM>

Subject: Re: market research - movies  
Comments: To: "wendy.landiers@TALK21.COM" <wendy.landiers@TALK21.COM>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

A division of Nielsen does regular exit polling at movies to track and predict performance, but results of those surveys are not available except to their clients.

Jo Holz  
Vice President, Research  
iN DEMAND  
phone: (646) 638-8214  
fax: (646) 486-0857  
jholz@indemand.com

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

From: wendy.landiers@TALK21.COM [mailto:wendy.landiers@TALK21.COM]  
Sent: Thursday, April 24, 2003 7:15 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: market research - movies

Hello,

Who is the expert on market research for movies? Theater surveys versus focus groups, that sort of thing.

Thanks,

Wendy Landiers

-----  
talk21 your FREE portable and private address on the net at  
<http://www.talk21.com>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Fri, 25 Apr 2003 08:26:47 -0500  
Reply-To: "Smith, David W." <SmithD2@UTHSCSA.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Smith, David W." <SmithD2@UTHSCSA.EDU>  
Subject: Re: A Virginia Law of interest  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1



Is that \$2,500 total or \$2,500 per violation, eg, per interview?

David Smith

David W. Smith, Ph.D., M.P.H.  
Associate Professor, Biometry  
The University of Texas  
School of Public Health  
voice: (210) 567-3560  
e-mail: david.w.smith@uth.tmc.edu  
or smithd2@uthscscsa.edu

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

From: Mark David Richards [mailto:mark@BISCONTI.COM]  
Sent: Thursday, April 24, 2003 7:23 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: A Virginia Law of interest

According to the article, VA state law is that a pollster must tell respondents (potential respondents?) who commissioned a poll of more than 25 people contacted less than 180 days before a general election or 90 days before a primary election. Penalty: \$2,500.

Which other states have this or a similar law?

Mark

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Fri, 25 Apr 2003 10:34:01 -0400  
Reply-To: Jane Sheppard <[jsheppard@CMOR.ORG](mailto:jsheppard@CMOR.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jane Sheppard <[jsheppard@CMOR.ORG](mailto:jsheppard@CMOR.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: A Virginia Law of interest  
Comments: To: [mark@BISCONTI.COM](mailto:mark@BISCONTI.COM)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

CMOR's Director Government Affairs, Donna Gillin, provided this more detailed information on this law and other states affected and CMOR has been doing:

A Virginia law was passed in 2000. Effective July of 2000, researchers who:

- conduct political polls
- to twenty-five or more Virginia residents
- during the 180 days prior to an election or 90 days prior to a primary
- that convey or solicit information relating to any candidate, potential candidate or political party participating in the election or primary

- that is made under an agreement to compensate the telephone callers are required to provide the following disclosure before the conclusion of the call:

- The name of the candidate if the calls are authorized by the candidate, his campaign committee or an agent of the candidate or his campaign committee;
- The name of the political party committee if the calls are authorized by that committee or an agent of that committee; or
- If authorized by a person other than the candidate, his campaign committee or a political party committee or an agent thereof, either
- In the case of a committee that has filed a statement of organization under Virginia law 24.2-908, the full name of the committee and a registration number provided by the state board, or
- In any other case, the full name and residential address of the individual responsible for the call

For further information on this law contact the Virginia State Board of Elections at 804-786-6551.

#### Background on the bill:

In early 2000, around the time of the presidential primaries, a bill was introduced in Virginia to impose disclosure requirements on political polls. Specifically, the bill sought to impose disclosure requirements on political polls:

- made to twenty-five or more Virginia residents
- during the 180 days prior to an election or 90 days prior to a primary
- that convey or solicit information relating to any candidate, potential candidate or political party participating in the election or primary
- that are made under an agreement to compensate the telephone callers

CMOR contacted the sponsor of the bill and numerous state lawmakers to express the industry's concerns over the implications of this measure.

According to legislative staff, the bill was introduced and received tremendous support among lawmakers as a result of the allegations and publicity of the issue of political telemarketing (campaign advocacy calls conducted under the guise of a legitimate political poll or survey) during the primaries. CMOR has long supported measures to regulate political telemarketing and has assisted lawmakers in differentiating such activities from legitimate polls and surveys.

To promote the interests of the research industry, CMOR worked in conjunction with the University of Virginia and several Virginia pollsters, to have the bill amended to remove the implication on legitimate research activities or to "kill" the bill (i.e., have it defeated in the Legislature). With the enormous support for the bill and the intense media attention to the issue of political polls during the presidential primaries, the support for the measure was bipartisan and in both legislative houses. Although lawmakers expressed their understanding of the bill's impact on the research industry, Virginia lawmakers held to the position that:

- No bias would in fact be inserted in the interview since the disclosure requirement of the law does not mandate disclosure until the end of the call
- That the scope of the law encompasses all calls over a certain number, made during a certain period and furthermore that the bill did not label such calls as "political telemarketing," "push-polls" or the like, therefore

there was no negative connotation on research

Other laws:

As far as other similar disclosure laws, CMOR is aware of several other states (including Florida, Nevada and Maine) that enacted laws which impose disclosure requirements on "push polling" calls (political telemarketing under the guise of legitimate survey research - see [http://www.cmor.org/govt\\_affairs\\_trr3.htm](http://www.cmor.org/govt_affairs_trr3.htm)).

Jane Sheppard  
CMOR  
Director Respondent Cooperation  
330-244-8616

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

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

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Thursday, April 24, 2003 8:22 PM

Subject: Re: A Virginia Law of interest

> According to the article, VA state law is that a pollster must tell  
> respondents (potential respondents?) who commissioned a poll of more  
> than 25 people contacted less than 180 days before a general election or  
> 90 days before a primary election. Penalty: \$2,500.

>  
> Which other states have this or a similar law?

>  
> Mark

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo G. Simonetta

> Sent: Thursday, April 24, 2003 10:34 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: A Virginia Law of interest

>  
> Sheriff's Reelection Poll Allegedly Violated Law  
> Pr. William Official's Aide Ordered Study

>  
> By Steven Ginsberg  
> Washington Post Staff Writer  
> Thursday, April 24, 2003; Page B01

>  
>  
> The campaign of Prince William Sheriff E. Lee Stoffregen III, a heavily  
> financed Democrat with ambitions to remake the Republican-led Board of  
> County Supervisors, has been conducting a poll that appears to be in  
> violation of state law, state authorities said yesterday.

>  
> Pollsters, who contacted hundreds of county residents over the last 10  
> days with questions about Stoffregen, his opponents, board members and  
> other politicians, did not tell people who commissioned the poll, a  
> violation of state law, authorities said. The law, passed in Richmond  
> three years ago, requires those who make calls on behalf of a political

> campaign to identify the campaign.  
>  
> SNIP  
>  
> C 2003 The Washington Post Company  
>  
> Full story at  
> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A27167-2003Apr23.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  
>

> -----  
> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>

> -----  
> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Fri, 25 Apr 2003 10:35:46 -0400  
Reply-To: Howard Schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Howard Schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>  
Subject: Query  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I am looking for information about the approximate proportion of U.S. households that had a personal computer in 2000, give or take a year. It would also be helpful to know the proportion at that point that had access to the internet. Thanks, Howard

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Fri, 25 Apr 2003 10:48:20 -0400  
Reply-To: Steven Kull <[skull@PIPA.ORG](mailto:skull@PIPA.ORG)>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Steven Kull <skull@PIPA.ORG>  
Subject: Re: Query  
Comments: To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Check the Pew Center on the Internet and Society (sic). They have done a lot of surveying on these types of questions.

Howard Schuman wrote:

> I am looking for information about the approximate proportion of U.S.  
> households that had a personal computer in 2000, give or take a year.  
> It would also be helpful to know the proportion at that point that had  
> access to the internet. Thanks, Howard

>  
> -----  
> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Fri, 25 Apr 2003 10:42:35 -0400  
Reply-To: Mark Lamias <Mark.Lamias@GRIZZARD.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark Lamias <Mark.Lamias@GRIZZARD.COM>  
Subject: Re: Query  
Comments: To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Howard,

You can find this information on the Current Population Survey's website.

Here is a report you will find of interest, which answers the questions you have.

<http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/p23-207.pdf>

I hope this helps.

Sincerely yours,

Mark J. Lamias

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

From: Howard Schuman [mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU]  
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2003 10:36 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Query

I am looking for information about the approximate proportion of U.S. households that had a personal computer in 2000, give or take a year. It would also be helpful to know the proportion at that point that had access to the internet. Thanks, Howard

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Fri, 25 Apr 2003 10:51:28 -0400  
Reply-To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
Subject: Many thanks...  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

to the several AAPOR members who responded to my query about the proportion of households with computers and with the internet in 2000. I knew the information existed and that help would be forthcoming, but the speed with which I obtained the needed information was impressive, immediately useful, and much appreciated. Howard

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Fri, 25 Apr 2003 11:06:28 -0400  
Reply-To: Jane Sheppard <jsheppard@CMOR.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jane Sheppard <jsheppard@CMOR.ORG>  
Subject: Re: A Virginia Law of interest  
Comments: To: "Smith, David W." <SmithD2@UTHSCSA.EDU>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Per Donna Gillin:

The law states that violation of the law results in civil penalty not to exceed twenty-five hundred dollars and, in the case of a willful violation, guilty of a Class 1 misdemeanor. The law regulates "campaign telephone calls" defined as a "series of telephone calls..." It would therefore seem that the law imposes the fine per study.

Jane Sheppard

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

From: "Smith, David W." <SmithD2@UTHSCSA.EDU>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Friday, April 25, 2003 9:26 AM

Subject: Re: A Virginia Law of interest

> Is that \$2,500 total or \$2,500 per violation, eg, per interview?

>

> David Smith

>

> David W. Smith, Ph.D., M.P.H.

> Associate Professor, Biometry

> The University of Texas

> School of Public Health

> voice: (210) 567-3560

> e-mail: david.w.smith@uth.tmc.edu

> or smithd2@uthscscsa.edu

>

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

> From: Mark David Richards [mailto:mark@BISCONTI.COM]

> Sent: Thursday, April 24, 2003 7:23 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: A Virginia Law of interest

>

>

> According to the article, VA state law is that a pollster must tell

> respondents (potential respondents?) who commissioned a poll of more

> than 25 people contacted less than 180 days before a general election or

> 90 days before a primary election. Penalty: \$2,500.

>

> Which other states have this or a similar law?

>

> Mark

>

> -----

> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

---

Date: Fri, 25 Apr 2003 10:56:24 -0400  
Reply-To: Patrick Murray <pkmurray@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Patrick Murray <pkmurray@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU>  
Subject: Address Sample Sources  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I'm looking for a source to obtain a comprehensive list of residential = addresses for a particular census block group. The usual sample = supplier tells me they are only using the white pages now - so the = address list is not comprehensive. I haven't had luck getting the = actual list used by the Census (although I haven't tried that hard yet). = I don't need names, I just need household addresses (including = apartments).  
Thanks.

---

Patrick Murray  
Center for Public Interest Polling  
Eagleton Institute of Politics  
185 Ryders Lane, New Brunswick, NJ 08901  
732-932-9384 x-243; 732-932-1551 (fax)

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Fri, 25 Apr 2003 11:10:20 -0400  
Reply-To: Mark Lamias <Mark.Lamias@GRIZZARD.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark Lamias <Mark.Lamias@GRIZZARD.COM>  
Subject: Re: Address Sample Sources  
Comments: To: Patrick Murray <pkmurray@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Patrick,

Have you tried calling the register of deeds in that county? They may have that information, and if they do, it is public record -- including the home owners.

Sincerely yours,

Mark J. Lamias

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

From: Patrick Murray [mailto:[pkmurray@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU](mailto:pkmurray@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU)]  
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2003 10:56 AM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)



Subject: Address Sample Sources

I'm looking for a source to obtain a comprehensive list of residential addresses for a particular census block group. The usual sample supplier tells me they are only using the white pages now - so the address list is not comprehensive. I haven't had luck getting the actual list used by the Census (although I haven't tried that hard yet). I don't need names, I just need household addresses (including apartments).

Thanks.

---

Patrick Murray  
Center for Public Interest Polling  
Eagleton Institute of Politics  
185 Ryders Lane, New Brunswick, NJ 08901  
732-932-9384 x-243; 732-932-1551 (fax)

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Fri, 25 Apr 2003 10:17:27 -0500  
Reply-To: "Brienne (Breezy) O'Brien" <[bgobrien@IUPUI.EDU](mailto:bgobrien@IUPUI.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Brienne (Breezy) O'Brien" <[bgobrien@IUPUI.EDU](mailto:bgobrien@IUPUI.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Address Sample Sources  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Patrick,

What about the Haines Directory? I know they have it online somewhere, but it will probably cost you.

Breezy O'Brien  
Field Coordinator  
Indiana University Public Opinion Laboratory  
(317) 274-4104

Mark Lamias wrote:

>Patrick,  
>  
>Have you tried calling the register of deeds in that county? They may have  
>that information, and if they do, it is public record -- including the home  
>owners.  
>

>Sincerely yours,

>

>Mark J. Lamias

>

>

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

>From: Patrick Murray [mailto:pkmurray@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU]

>Sent: Friday, April 25, 2003 10:56 AM

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Address Sample Sources

>

>

>I'm looking for a source to obtain a comprehensive list of residential  
>addresses for a particular census block group. The usual sample supplier  
>tells me they are only using the white pages now - so the address list is  
>not comprehensive. I haven't had luck getting the actual list used by the  
>Census (although I haven't tried that hard yet). I don't need names, I just  
>need household addresses (including apartments).

>Thanks.

>

---

>Patrick Murray

>Center for Public Interest Polling

>Eagleton Institute of Politics

>185 Ryders Lane, New Brunswick, NJ 08901

>732-932-9384 x-243; 732-932-1551 (fax)

>

>-----

>Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

>Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

>

>-----

>Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

>Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

>

>

>

>

-----  
>Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

>Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

---

Date: Fri, 25 Apr 2003 11:49:59 -0400

Reply-To: Jeanette Janota <JJanota@ASHA.ORG>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Jeanette Janota <JJanota@ASHA.ORG>

Subject: Next challenge

Comments: To: hschuman@UMICH.EDU

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Since you folks were so speedy in responding to Howard's query, here's another challenge.

I'm looking for (census? BLS?) demographics on the age distribution of the US work force. Anyone have that source at your fingertips?

Jeanette

>>> Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU> 04/25/03 10:51AM >>>  
to the several AAPOR members who responded to my query about the proportion of households with computers and with the internet in 2000.

I knew the information existed and that help would be forthcoming, but the speed with which I obtained the needed information was impressive, immediately useful, and much appreciated. Howard

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Fri, 25 Apr 2003 11:59:00 -0400  
Reply-To: Mark Lamias <Mark.Lamias@GRIZZARD.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark Lamias <Mark.Lamias@GRIZZARD.COM>  
Subject: Re: Next challenge  
Comments: To: Jeanette Janota <JJanota@ASHA.ORG>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Jeanette,

You can find historical and projected number of the U.S. civilian work force by age on the Census Bureau's web site.

The following document breaks down the numbers by age (see page 5).

<http://www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/01statab/labor.pdf>

I hope this helps.

Sincerely yours,

Mark J. Lamias

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

From: Jeanette Janota [mailto:JJanota@ASHA.ORG]  
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2003 11:50 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Next challenge

Since you folks were so speedy in responding to Howard's query, here's another challenge.

I'm looking for (census? BLS?) demographics on the age distribution of the US work force. Anyone have that source at your fingertips?

Jeanette

>>> Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU> 04/25/03 10:51AM >>>

to the several AAPOR members who responded to my query about the proportion of households with computers and with the internet in 2000.

I knew the information existed and that help would be forthcoming, but

the speed with which I obtained the needed information was impressive, immediately useful, and much appreciated. Howard

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Fri, 25 Apr 2003 11:57:07 -0400  
Reply-To: Meekins\_B <Meekins\_B@BLS.GOV>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Meekins\_B <Meekins\_B@BLS.GOV>  
Subject: Re: Next challenge  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

The following page is reachable off the main BLS webpage (<http://www.bls.gov/>) and if you scroll down has a number of tables of workforce characteristics:

<http://www.bls.gov/cps/home.htm#data>

Brian J. Meekins  
Research Statistician  
Office of Survey Methods Research, Bureau of Labor Statistics  
2 Massachusetts Avenue NE, Rm. 1950  
Washington, D.C. 20212

(202) 691-7594 Fax: (202) 691-7426

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

From: Jeanette Janota [mailto:JJanota@ASHA.ORG]  
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2003 11:50 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Next challenge

Since you folks were so speedy in responding to Howard's query, here's another challenge.

I'm looking for (census? BLS?) demographics on the age distribution of the US work force. Anyone have that source at your fingertips?

Jeanette

>>> Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU> 04/25/03 10:51AM >>>  
to the several AAPOR members who responded to my query about the proportion of households with computers and with the internet in 2000. I knew the information existed and that help would be forthcoming, but the speed with which I obtained the needed information was impressive, immediately useful, and much appreciated. Howard

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Fri, 25 Apr 2003 16:40:56 -0500  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: [Fwd: FW: REVISED media advisory]  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Got a question from one of the Tribune reporters.

From below: "The governor also will announce the results of a voter poll

on the budget." This is clearly not a campaign poll.

Can anyone comment on how often Governors or others in similar positions conduct a poll such as this for public release to guide policy. This seems pretty rare to me.

Would appreciate your thoughts.

Nick

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR                      NEWS  
ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH - GOVERNOR

For Immediate Release:      Contact:  
April 25, 2003      Cheryle Jackson      312-814-3158  
Abby Ottenhoff      312-814-3158  
Tom Schafer      217-782-7355

#### MEDIA ADVISORY

Gov. Blagojevich to hold airport press conferences

On Sunday, April 27, Gov. Rod R. Blagojevich will hold press conferences at five airports to call on the legislature to pass his Fiscal Year 2004 budget. The governor also will announce the results of a voter poll on the budget, present an open letter to Illinoisans asking for their support of the budget plan and to provide a state-by-state comparison of how other states are addressing budget problems.

WHO:      Gov. Blagojevich

WHAT:      Press Conferences

WHEN/

WHERE:      10 a.m. 'Äi Chicago  
Midway International Airport  
Signature Air Lobby  
5821 S. Central

11:15 a.m. -- Rockford  
Greater Rockford Airport  
Emery Air Lobby  
2 Airport Circle Drive

12:15 p.m. -- Moline  
Quad City International Airport  
Elliott Aviation Lobby  
2200 69th Ave.

1:30 p.m. 'Äi Peoria  
Greater Peoria Regional Airport  
Byerly Aviation Lobby  
6100 W. Everett M. Dirksen Parkway

2:30 p.m. 'Äi Decatur

Decatur Airport  
Decatur Aviation Lobby  
910 S. Airport Road

-30-

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Sat, 26 Apr 2003 11:45:36 -0400  
Reply-To: Kbjugan@AOL.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Ketil Bjugan <Kbjugan@AOL.COM>  
Subject: Re: market research - movies  
Comments: To: wendy.landiers@TALK21.COM  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The Nielsen company's name is NRG, they are based in LA. There are some alternatives, but NRG is the authority.

Ketil Bjugan

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Sat, 26 Apr 2003 13:25:34 -0400  
Reply-To: Johnhuffmanjr@CS.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Johnhuffmanjr@CS.COM  
Subject: Re: market research - movies  
Comments: To: wendy.landiers@TALK21.COM  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Wendy:

You may also want to check with LA based MarketCast. It's a Reed Elsevier company (formerly owned by RBI I believe), which is the parent company of Daily Variety.

JH

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Sat, 26 Apr 2003 13:59:44 -0400  
Reply-To: "Commiskey, Patricia" <PCommiskey@SOM.UMARYLAND.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Commiskey, Patricia" <PCommiskey@SOM.UMARYLAND.EDU>  
Subject: Question regarding Interviewers...  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Hello! Does anyone have information / experience / feedback on training select members of your Interviewing staff to serve as higher level supervisors? I envision this position functioning almost like a shift leader, including some call monitoring, but I am curious as to others experiences (good/bad and pros/cons) and suggestions for structuring this. Although the position would be at a higher level, it would have to remain as temporary and part-time.

Thanks in advance! Patricia

Patricia Commiskey, MA  
Research Director - CATI Facility  
Center for Health Policy / Health Services Research  
University of Maryland School of Medicine  
(410) 706-6753 / Fax: (410) 706-4702  
pcommiskey@som.umaryland.edu

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 11:04:39 -0400  
Reply-To: sgreyser <sgreyser@HBS.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: sgreyser <sgreyser@HBS.EDU>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

test

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 11:29:29 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Testing the pretensions of market research and polling.  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT



<http://www.reason.com/0305/cr.bd.measuring.shtml>

## Measuring Up

Testing the pretensions of market research and polling.

By Brian Doherty

Finding Out: Personal Adventures in Social Research -- Discovering What People Think, Say, and Do, by Leo Bogart, Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 306 pages, \$27.50

Polling, Policy, and Public Opinion: The Case Against Heeding the "Voice of the People," by Robert Weissberg, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 232 pages, \$39.95

On a warm, bright winter's day in Southern California recently, I was caught up in an "explosion of research."

That's how a skeptical Leo Bogart -- recipient of prestigious awards from the American Marketing Association and the American Association for Public Opinion Research and one of the first two men (with George Gallup) inducted into the Market Research Council's Hall of Fame -- describes the current market research trend of "focus groups." These are, in Bogart's apt description, "collective interviews with small groups of people unsystematically selected without reference to any randomized sampling plan."

SNIP

--

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

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 11:46:43 -0500  
Reply-To: Cynthia Nelson <[cnelson@NIU.EDU](mailto:cnelson@NIU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Cynthia Nelson <[cnelson@NIU.EDU](mailto:cnelson@NIU.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Testing the pretensions of market research and polling.  
In-Reply-To: <004a01c30d9a\$f6427120\$130a010a@LEO>  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Thank you for these citations. I have been increasingly dismayed by the use of focus groups as a presumed cheap way of collecting public opinion data. I have picked up a newspaper from a nearby urban center with headlines

indicating residents were in support of a particular effort. On reading the

article I found the data was from focus groups.

Does AAPOR have standards on the appropriate use of information from focus groups?

\*\*\*\*\* REPLY SEPARATOR \*\*\*\*\*

On 4/28/2003 at 11:29 AM Leo G. Simonetta wrote:

><http://www.reason.com/0305/cr.bd.measuring.shtml>

>

>Measuring Up

>

>Testing the pretensions of market research and polling.

>

>By Brian Doherty

>

>Finding Out: Personal Adventures in Social Research -- Discovering What

>People Think, Say, and Do, by Leo Bogart, Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 306

>pages, \$27.50

>

>Polling, Policy, and Public Opinion: The Case Against Heeding the "Voice

>of the People," by Robert Weissberg, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 232

>pages, \$39.95

>

>On a warm, bright winter's day in Southern California recently, I was

>caught up in an "explosion of research."

>

>That's how a skeptical Leo Bogart -- recipient of prestigious awards

>from the American Marketing Association and the American Association for

>Public Opinion Research and one of the first two men (with George

>Gallup) inducted into the Market Research Council's Hall of Fame --

>describes the current market research trend of "focus groups." These

>are, in Bogart's apt description, "collective interviews with small

>groups of people unsystematically selected without reference to any

>randomized sampling plan."

>

>SNIP

>--

>Leo G. Simonetta

>Art & Science Group, LLC

>6115 Falls Road Suite 101

>Baltimore, MD 21209

>410-377-7880 ext. 14

>410-377-7955 fax

>

>-----

>Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

>Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

>-----

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 14:56:16 -0400  
Reply-To: Sid Groeneman <sid.grc@VERIZON.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Sid Groeneman <sid.grc@VERIZON.NET>  
Subject: Distribution of interviews by call number (contact attempt)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear AAPORNET members,

I am searching for information on the approximate proportion of interviews that tend to be completed on the first dialing, the second dialing, . etc., (or dialings 1-3, 4-6, 6-9, etc.) in well-executed RDD surveys where all adults are eligible to the the respondent. Can anyone supply (or direct me to) such data? I'm sure this varies by topic, sponsor, selection procedure, average interview length, and other factors; nevertheless, I'd be very interested in learning what the overall norms might be.

Sid Groeneman

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

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 15:37:07 -0400  
Reply-To: HOneill536@AOL.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Harry O'Neill <HOneill536@AOL.COM>  
Subject: conference comments  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I feel compelled to comment on two aspects of the upcoming AAPOR Conference. The first is the invitation given to Arianna Huffington to be a plenary speaker. She is a person who will do anything for media attention and a persistent critic of our profession. Her appearance certainly will in no way change her mind about us nor mute her unfounded criticisms.

Second, this year our profession lost Bud Roper - a man of the highest professionalism, honesty, and integrity and a faithful and valuable contributor to AAPOR. While giving Arianna Huffington a prime time on the

conference program, the memorial for Bud Roper is relegated to the inauspicious time of 8:15 Sunday morning - a time not noted for peak attendance.

In my opinion, there is something wrong with this picture and it does not speak well of those responsible for the decision.

Harry O'Neill

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 15:59:15 -0400  
Reply-To: Lee Miringoff <Lee.Miringoff@MARIST.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Lee Miringoff <Lee.Miringoff@MARIST.EDU>  
Subject: Harry O'Neill comments on plenary speaker  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Right on! Harry O'Neill

Lee M. Miringoff, Ph.D.  
Director, Marist Institute for Public Opinion  
Marist College  
845.575.5050

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 16:10:24 -0400  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
Comments: To: [HOneill536@AOL.COM](mailto:HOneill536@AOL.COM)  
In-Reply-To: <[e.2fb1751a.2bdedce3@aol.com](mailto:e.2fb1751a.2bdedce3@aol.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Why should Arianna Huffington change her mind or mute her criticisms when her shrill repetition of them has induced AAPOR to pay her a \$5,000 fee to speak at the conference?

That money could have been far better spent as the seed of an annual AAPOR award in Bud's name.

Jan Werner

---

Harry O'Neill wrote:

> I feel compelled to comment on two aspects of the upcoming AAPOR Conference.

> The first is the invitation given to Arianna Huffington to be a plenary  
> speaker. She is a person who will do anything for media attention and a  
> persistent critic of our profession. Her appearance certainly will in no  
way

> change her mind about us nor mute her unfounded criticisms.

>  
> Second, this year our profession lost Bud Roper - a man of the highest  
> professionalism, honesty, and integrity and a faithful and valuable  
> contributor to AAPOR. While giving Arianna Huffington a prime time on the  
> conference program, the memorial for Bud Roper is relegated to the  
> inauspicious time of 8:15 Sunday morning - a time not noted for peak  
> attendance.

>  
> In my opinion, there is something wrong with this picture and it does not  
> speak well of those responsible for the decision.

>  
> Harry O'Neill

>  
> -----  
> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>  
>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 16:18:52 -0400  
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <[nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <[nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
Comments: To: "[jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)" <[jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Instead of whining about the decisions that our elected representatives have made, let's see if we can come up with some rational plan for increasing Ms. Huffington's knowledge about the workings of our profession. We might as well proceed on the assumption that this is an opportunity for us to engage her in a meaningful, intelligent dialogue, and treat her with respect and civility.

What do we have to lose? And if we show up and protest her appearance, what do we expect to gain?

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: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM]  
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:10 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: conference comments

Why should Arianna Huffington change her mind or mute her criticisms when her shrill repetition of them has induced AAPOR to pay her a \$5,000 fee to speak at the conference?

That money could have been far better spent as the seed of an annual AAPOR award in Bud's name.

Jan Werner

---

Harry O'Neill wrote:

- > I feel compelled to comment on two aspects of the upcoming AAPOR Conference.
- > The first is the invitation given to Arianna Huffington to be a plenary > speaker. She is a person who will do anything for media attention and a > persistent critic of our profession. Her appearance certainly will in no way > change her mind about us nor mute her unfounded criticisms.
- >
- > Second, this year our profession lost Bud Roper - a man of the highest > professionalism, honesty, and integrity and a faithful and valuable > contributor to AAPOR. While giving Arianna Huffington a prime time on the > conference program, the memorial for Bud Roper is relegated to the > inauspicious time of 8:15 Sunday morning - a time not noted for peak > attendance.
- >
- > In my opinion. there is something wrong with this picture and it does not > speak well of those responsible for the decision.
- >
- > Harry O'Neill
- >
- > -----
- > Conference early registration deadline: April 28!
- > Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>
- > Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
- >
- >

-----

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 15:29:29 -0500  
Reply-To: Lydia\_Saad@GALLUP.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Lydia Saad <Lydia\_Saad@GALLUP.COM>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
Comments: To: nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

I guess the question implicit in the criticism of the choice to invite Huffington is "what did we expect to gain FROM her appearance?" Given how unlikely it is AAPOR will soften or change her anti-poll position, I don't think that's an unreasonable question to pose to our elected representatives.

My apologies if that has already been detailed on these airwaves, but now might be a good time to repeat it.

Lydia Saad

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

From: Nathaniel Ehrlich [mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU]  
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:19 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: conference comments

Instead of whining about the decisions that our elected representatives have made, let's see if we can come up with some rational plan for increasing Ms. Huffington's knowledge about the workings of our profession. We might as well proceed on the assumption that this is an opportunity for us to engage her in a meaningful, intelligent dialogue, and treat her with respect and civility.

What do we have to lose? And if we show up and protest her appearance, what do we expect to gain?

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: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM]

Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:10 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: conference comments

Why should Arianna Huffington change her mind or mute her criticisms when her shrill repetition of them has induced AAPOR to pay her a \$5,000 fee to speak at the conference?

That money could have been far better spent as the seed of an annual AAPOR award in Bud's name.

Jan Werner

---

Harry O'Neill wrote:

- > I feel compelled to comment on two aspects of the upcoming AAPOR Conference.
- > The first is the invitation given to Arianna Huffington to be a plenary > speaker. She is a person who will do anything for media attention and a > persistent critic of our profession. Her appearance certainly will in no way > change her mind about us nor mute her unfounded criticisms.
- >
- > Second, this year our profession lost Bud Roper - a man of the highest > professionalism, honesty, and integrity and a faithful and valuable > contributor to AAPOR. While giving Arianna Huffington a prime time on the > conference program, the memorial for Bud Roper is relegated to the > inauspicious time of 8:15 Sunday morning - a time not noted for peak > attendance.
- >
- > In my opinion. there is something wrong with this picture and it does not > speak well of those responsible for the decision.
- >
- > Harry O'Neill
- >
- > -----
- > Conference early registration deadline: April 28!
- > Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>
- > Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
- >
- >

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>



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

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 16:36:47 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
In-Reply-To: <5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E0EC39530@isr.umich.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

I've got to say it's not very inspiring for someone who's a consumer rather than a producer of public opinion research to see this closing of ranks. Why not have a high-profile critic of the enterprise address the meeting, and then give her a piece of your mind? Doing so would suggest a high degree of self-confidence and eagerness to listen. Complaining about it suggests a defensive narrow-mindedness. Journalists who frequently use polling data, as I do, would prefer that the producers of the data not crawl into a shell when criticized. If Huffington's so off-base, you've got nothing to lose. And she might learn something too.

--

Doug Henwood  
Left Business Observer  
38 Greene St - 4th fl.  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
voice +1-212-219-0010  
fax +1-212-219-0098  
cell +1-917-865-2813  
email <<mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>>  
web <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 15:37:43 -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: conference comments  
In-Reply-To: <3EAD8AB0.5030108@jwdp.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Before this groundswell of anger grows any further, I feel it is only fair to the program committee to point out that we've all known for quite awhile

that Huffington was being paid to speak at this year's conference. Two weeks before said conference is not the time to break out the torches and pitchforks.

I remember Shere Hite's appearance to discuss her controversial "Hite Report on Women and Love". I didn't learn very much from the exchange she had with our panel of experts (nor, I suspect, did she) but it was entertaining and perfectly appropriate for an AAPOR conference. I suspect Huffington's appearance will fall into the same category.

Jim Wolf

At 04:10 PM 4/28/03 -0400, Jan Werner wrote:

>Why should Arianna Huffington change her mind or mute her criticisms  
>when her shrill repetition of them has induced AAPOR to pay her a \$5,000  
>fee to speak at the conference?

>  
>That money could have been far better spent as the seed of an annual  
>AAPOR award in Bud's name.

>  
>Jan Werner

> \_\_\_\_\_  
>

>Harry O'Neill wrote:

>> I feel compelled to comment on two aspects of the upcoming AAPOR  
Conference.

>> The first is the invitation given to Arianna Huffington to be a plenary  
>> speaker. She is a person who will do anything for media attention and a  
>> persistent critic of our profession. Her appearance certainly will in  
no way

>> change her mind about us nor mute her unfounded criticisms.  
>>

>> Second, this year our profession lost Bud Roper - a man of the highest  
>> professionalism, honesty, and integrity and a faithful and valuable  
>> contributor to AAPOR. While giving Arianna Huffington a prime time on the  
>> conference program, the memorial for Bud Roper is relegated to the  
>> inauspicious time of 8:15 Sunday morning - a time not noted for peak  
>> attendance.

>>  
>> In my opinion. there is something wrong with this picture and it does not  
>> speak well of those responsible for the decision.

>>  
>> Harry O'Neill

>>  
>> -----  
>> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
>> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>>  
>>  
>  
>-----  
>Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
>Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

>

-----  
Jim Wolf

Jim-Wolf@att.net

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 16:44:26 -0400

Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>

Subject: Re: conference comments

In-Reply-To: <BFC17A2EB27CD411A9E30000D1ECEFE413F55C4F@Exchng7.gallup.co m>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

I find it appalling that we are paying any plenary speaker. For years all we paid was room and transportation, if that. We have better uses for our money! A prize in Bud Roper's name would have been a much better way to spend our money.

How's this for a suggestion: withhold any contribution to the AAPOR endowment fund you might have made this year as a way to show your displeasure at the way Council chose to spend money. This is a topic for the Business Meeting.

warren

At 04:29 PM 4/28/2003, you wrote:

>I guess the question implicit in the criticism of the choice to invite  
>Huffington is "what did we expect to gain FROM her appearance?" Given how  
>unlikely it is AAPOR will soften or change her anti-poll position, I don't  
>think that's an unreasonable question to pose to our elected  
>representatives.

>

>My apologies if that has already been detailed on these airwaves, but now  
>might be a good time to repeat it.

>

>Lydia Saad

>

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

>From: Nathaniel Ehrlich [mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU]

>Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:19 PM

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Re: conference comments

>

>

>Instead of whining about the decisions that our elected representatives have  
>made, let's see if we can come up with some rational plan for increasing Ms.  
>Huffington's knowledge about the workings of our profession. We might as

>well proceed on the assumption that this is an opportunity for us to engage  
>her in a meaningful, intelligent dialogue, and treat her with respect and  
>civility.  
>What do we have to lose? And if we show up and protest her appearance, what  
>do we expect to gain?

>  
>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: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM]  
>Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:10 PM  
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>Subject: Re: conference comments

>  
>  
>Why should Arianna Huffington change her mind or mute her criticisms  
>when her shrill repetition of them has induced AAPOR to pay her a \$5,000  
>fee to speak at the conference?

>  
>That money could have been far better spent as the seed of an annual  
>AAPOR award in Bud's name.

>  
>Jan Werner

> \_\_\_\_\_  
>

>Harry O'Neill wrote:

>> I feel compelled to comment on two aspects of the upcoming AAPOR  
>Conference.

>> The first is the invitation given to Arianna Huffington to be a plenary  
>> speaker. She is a person who will do anything for media attention and a  
>> persistent critic of our profession. Her appearance certainly will in no  
>way

>> change her mind about us nor mute her unfounded criticisms.

>>  
>> Second, this year our profession lost Bud Roper - a man of the highest  
>> professionalism, honesty, and integrity and a faithful and valuable  
>> contributor to AAPOR. While giving Arianna Huffington a prime time on the  
>> conference program, the memorial for Bud Roper is relegated to the  
>> inauspicious time of 8:15 Sunday morning - a time not noted for peak  
>> attendance.

>>  
>> In my opinion. there is something wrong with this picture and it does not  
>> speak well of those responsible for the decision.

>>  
>> Harry O'Neill

>>

>> -----  
>> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
>> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>>  
>>  
>

>-----  
>Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
>Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>  
>-----  
>Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
>Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>  
>-----  
>Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
>Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 16:46:32 -0400  
Reply-To: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
Comments: To: HOneill536@AOL.COM  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Bud's passing was a terrible loss to our profession. Harry describes Bud = admirably: "a man of the highest professionalism, honesty, and integrity = and a faithful and valuable contributor to AAPOR."

To honor Bud's memory, we've dedicated the entire AAPOR conference to him. = His picture and an inscription appear on the inside front cover of the = conference recognizing his contributions to our profession and to AAPOR. = The memorial service was not meant to be the only remembrance of Bud. We = have also arranged for Bud's Heritage Interview to be played multiple = times during the conference. He is greatly missed.

Mark

>>> Harry O'Neill <HOneill536@AOL.COM> 04/28 3:37 PM >>>  
I feel compelled to comment on two aspects of the upcoming AAPOR Conference=

.  
The first is the invitation given to Arianna Huffington to be a plenary

speaker. She is a person who will do anything for media attention and a persistent critic of our profession. Her appearance certainly will in no way change her mind about us nor mute her unfounded criticisms.

Second, this year our profession lost Bud Roper - a man of the highest professionalism, honesty, and integrity and a faithful and valuable contributor to AAPOR. While giving Arianna Huffington a prime time on the conference program, the memorial for Bud Roper is relegated to the inauspicious time of 8:15 Sunday morning - a time not noted for peak attendance.

In my opinion, there is something wrong with this picture and it does not speak well of those responsible for the decision.

Harry O'Neill

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 16:40:59 -0400  
Reply-To: Stephanie Berg <[stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET](mailto:stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Stephanie Berg <[stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET](mailto:stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET)>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Regardless of our respective feelings about the decision to invite Ms. Huffington as a guest speaker, I believe the opportunity to lodge a complaint has long past. Ms. Huffington's invitation was announced quite some time ago along with AAPOR's reasons for inviting her. I think we are better off following Mr. Ehrlich's previous suggestion about a game plan.

=====  
Stephanie Berg  
Network Solutions  
Research Manager  
[stephanie.berg@verizon.net](mailto:stephanie.berg@verizon.net)

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

From: Lydia Saad  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:29 PM  
Subject: Re: conference comments

I guess the question implicit in the criticism of the choice to invite Huffington is "what did we expect to gain FROM her appearance?" Given how unlikely it is AAPOR will soften or change her anti-poll position, I don't think that's an unreasonable question to pose to our elected representatives.

My apologies if that has already been detailed on these airwaves, but now might be a good time to repeat it.

Lydia Saad

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

From: Nathaniel Ehrlich [mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU]

Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:19 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: conference comments

Instead of whining about the decisions that our elected representatives have made, let's see if we can come up with some rational plan for increasing Ms.

Huffington's knowledge about the workings of our profession. We might as well proceed on the assumption that this is an opportunity for us to engage

her in a meaningful, intelligent dialogue, and treat her with respect and civility.

What do we have to lose? And if we show up and protest her appearance, what do we expect to gain?

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: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM]

Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:10 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: conference comments

Why should Arianna Huffington change her mind or mute her criticisms when her shrill repetition of them has induced AAPOR to pay her a \$5,000 fee to speak at the conference?

That money could have been far better spent as the seed of an annual

AAPOR award in Bud's name.

Jan Werner

---

Harry O'Neill wrote:

> I feel compelled to comment on two aspects of the upcoming AAPOR Conference.

> The first is the invitation given to Arianna Huffington to be a plenary speaker. She is a person who will do anything for media attention and a persistent critic of our profession. Her appearance certainly will in

no

way

> change her mind about us nor mute her unfounded criticisms.

>

> Second, this year our profession lost Bud Roper - a man of the highest

> professionalism, honesty, and integrity and a faithful and valuable

> contributor to AAPOR. While giving Arianna Huffington a prime time on

the

> conference program, the memorial for Bud Roper is relegated to the

> inauspicious time of 8:15 Sunday morning - a time not noted for peak

> attendance.

>

> In my opinion. there is something wrong with this picture and it does

not

> speak well of those responsible for the decision.

>

> Harry O'Neill

>

> -----

> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

>

>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>



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

---

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 16:51:16 -0400  
Reply-To: PAHARDING7@AOL.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Philip Harding <PAHARDING7@AOL.COM>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Just a general question, not aimed at anyone in particular. Why, oh why, has the issue of Ms. Huffington, not a new one in at least one other AAPOR conference, awaited the eleventh hour and fifty-seventh minute before its confrontation?

Phil Harding

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 17:01:30 -0400  
Reply-To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
Comments: cc: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>  
In-Reply-To: <5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E0EC39530@isr.umich.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Nathaniel Ehrlich is right. Complaining about the decision now can only be counterproductive. The issue now is how best to handle her visit to everyone's benefit.

Dick Halpern

At 04:18 PM 4/28/2003 -0400, you wrote:

>Instead of whining about the decisions that our elected representatives have  
>made, let's see if we can come up with some rational plan for increasing Ms.  
>Huffington's knowledge about the workings of our profession. We might as  
>well proceed on the assumption that this is an opportunity for us to engage  
>her in a meaningful, intelligent dialogue, and treat her with respect and  
>civility.  
>What do we have to lose? And if we show up and protest her appearance, what  
>do we expect to gain?  
>  
>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: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM]

>Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:10 PM

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Re: conference comments

>  
>

>Why should Arianna Huffington change her mind or mute her criticisms  
>when her shrill repetition of them has induced AAPOR to pay her a \$5,000  
>fee to speak at the conference?

>

>That money could have been far better spent as the seed of an annual  
>AAPOR award in Bud's name.

>

>Jan Werner

>\_\_\_\_\_  
>

>Harry O'Neill wrote:

>> I feel compelled to comment on two aspects of the upcoming AAPOR  
>Conference.

>> The first is the invitation given to Arianna Huffington to be a plenary  
>> speaker. She is a person who will do anything for media attention and a  
>> persistent critic of our profession. Her appearance certainly will in no  
>way

>> change her mind about us nor mute her unfounded criticisms.

>>

>> Second, this year our profession lost Bud Roper - a man of the highest  
>> professionalism, honesty, and integrity and a faithful and valuable  
>> contributor to AAPOR. While giving Arianna Huffington a prime time on the  
>> conference program, the memorial for Bud Roper is relegated to the  
>> inauspicious time of 8:15 Sunday morning - a time not noted for peak  
>> attendance.

>>

>> In my opinion. there is something wrong with this picture and it does not  
>> speak well of those responsible for the decision.

>>

>> Harry O'Neill

>>

>> -----

>> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

>> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

>>

>>

>

>-----

>Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

>Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>  
>-----  
>Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
>Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

\*\* \*\*

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 17:10:15 -0400  
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <[nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <[nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
Comments: To: dick halpern <[dhalpern@bellsouth.net](mailto:dhalpern@bellsouth.net)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Exactly. It's no longer about her; it's about us. Clearly, we are not of one mind. Perhaps those of us who would rather not protest the decision to invite and pay her, but see this as an opportunity, can schedule a meeting before the conference to come up with a constructive activity? Those who protest will protest, deligitimize, etc.

And, by the way, perhaps we could do an email web survey of AAPOR members, with a set of alternatives ranging from  
1. Cancel my membership. I will not belong to an organization that wastes money this way to

11. Next year, let's see if we can invite someone even more controversial.

NO, I'm not serious about the responses. But we could -- make that should -- try to survey the membership on this issue.

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: dick halpern [<mailto:dhalpern@bellsouth.net>]  
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 5:02 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Cc: Nathaniel Ehrlich  
Subject: Re: conference comments

Nathaniel Ehrlich is right. Complaining about the decision now can only be counterproductive. The issue now is how best to handle her visit to everyone's benefit.

Dick Halpern

At 04:18 PM 4/28/2003 -0400, you wrote:

>Instead of whining about the decisions that our elected representatives have made, let's see if we can come up with some rational plan for increasing Ms. Huffington's knowledge about the workings of our profession. We might as well proceed on the assumption that this is an opportunity for us to engage her in a meaningful, intelligent dialogue, and treat her with respect and civility.  
>What do we have to lose? And if we show up and protest her appearance, what do we expect to gain?

>  
>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: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM]  
>Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:10 PM  
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>Subject: Re: conference comments

>  
>  
>Why should Arianna Huffington change her mind or mute her criticisms when her shrill repetition of them has induced AAPOR to pay her a \$5,000 fee to speak at the conference?

>  
>That money could have been far better spent as the seed of an annual AAPOR award in Bud's name.

>  
>Jan Werner

>  
>\_\_\_\_\_

>Harry O'Neill wrote:  
>> I feel compelled to comment on two aspects of the upcoming AAPOR Conference.  
>> The first is the invitation given to Arianna Huffington to be a plenary speaker. She is a person who will do anything for media attention and a persistent critic of our profession. Her appearance certainly will in

no  
>way  
>> change her mind about us nor mute her unfounded criticisms.  
>>  
>> Second, this year our profession lost Bud Roper - a man of the highest  
>> professionalism, honesty, and integrity and a faithful and valuable  
>> contributor to AAPOR. While giving Arianna Huffington a prime time on  
the  
>> conference program, the memorial for Bud Roper is relegated to the  
>> inauspicious time of 8:15 Sunday morning - a time not noted for peak  
>> attendance.

>>  
>> In my opinion. there is something wrong with this picture and it does  
not  
>> speak well of those responsible for the decision.

>>  
>> Harry O'Neill

>>  
>> -----  
>> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
>> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>>  
>>  
>  
>-----  
>Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
>Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>  
>-----  
>Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
>Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

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

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 17:10:58 -0400  
Reply-To: Scott Keeter <[skeeter@GMU.EDU](mailto:skeeter@GMU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Scott Keeter <[skeeter@GMU.EDU](mailto:skeeter@GMU.EDU)>  
Organization: George Mason University  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Arianna Huffington has a rather spectacular record of changing her mind  
about things, so I would not automatically conclude that she can't be

persuaded that much of what she writes about polls is wrong. The willingness to change one's mind is a quality often berated in public figures but one that I hope could be encouraged in some people.

The program committee has assembled an excellent set of discussants who can represent the positive qualities of survey research and maybe start the process of changing Ms. Huffington's mind.

Jim Wolf wrote:

>  
> Before this groundswell of anger grows any further, I feel it is only fair  
> to the program committee to point out that we've all known for quite awhile  
> that Huffington was being paid to speak at this year's conference. Two  
> weeks before said conference is not the time to break out the torches and  
> pitchforks.  
>  
> I remember Shere Hite's appearance to discuss her controversial "Hite  
> Report on Women and Love". I didn't learn very much from the exchange she  
> had with our panel of experts (nor, I suspect, did she) but it was  
> entertaining and perfectly appropriate for an AAPOR conference. I suspect  
> Huffington's appearance will fall into the same category.

> Jim Wolf

>  
> At 04:10 PM 4/28/03 -0400, Jan Werner wrote:  
>> Why should Arianna Huffington change her mind or mute her criticisms  
>> when her shrill repetition of them has induced AAPOR to pay her a \$5,000  
>> fee to speak at the conference?

>>  
>> That money could have been far better spent as the seed of an annual  
>> AAPOR award in Bud's name.

>> Jan Werner

>> Harry O'Neill wrote:

>>> I feel compelled to comment on two aspects of the upcoming AAPOR  
> Conference.

>>> The first is the invitation given to Arianna Huffington to be a plenary  
>>> speaker. She is a person who will do anything for media attention and a  
>>> persistent critic of our profession. Her appearance certainly will in  
> no way

>>> change her mind about us nor mute her unfounded criticisms.

>>> Second, this year our profession lost Bud Roper - a man of the highest  
>>> professionalism, honesty, and integrity and a faithful and valuable  
>>> contributor to AAPOR. While giving Arianna Huffington a prime time on the  
>>> conference program, the memorial for Bud Roper is relegated to the  
>>> inauspicious time of 8:15 Sunday morning - a time not noted for peak  
>>> attendance.

>>> In my opinion. there is something wrong with this picture and it does not  
>>> speak well of those responsible for the decision.

>>>  
>>> Harry O'Neill  
>>>  
>>> -----  
>>> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
>>> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>>-----  
>>Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
>>Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>>  
>  
>=====

> Jim Wolf                      Jim-Wolf@att.net  
>  
>-----  
> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

--  
Scott Keeter  
Pew Research Center for the People and the Press  
1150 18th Street, NW, Suite 975  
Washington, DC 20036  
Voice 202-293-3126 extension 16  
Personal fax 703 832 0209  
E-mail [keeters@people-press.org](mailto:keeters@people-press.org)  
Web site <http://mason.gmu.edu/~skeeter>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
-----  
Date:        Mon, 28 Apr 2003 17:11:43 -0400  
Reply-To:    "Langer, Gary E" <[Gary.E.Langer@ABC.COM](mailto:Gary.E.Langer@ABC.COM)>  
Sender:      AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From:        "Langer, Gary E" <[Gary.E.Langer@ABC.COM](mailto:Gary.E.Langer@ABC.COM)>  
Subject:     Re: conference comments  
Comments: To: Stephanie Berg <[stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET](mailto:stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I think AAPOR gains much by opening its doors to Huffington. The =  
association shows maturity, self-confidence and a willingness to engage =  
its critics in constructive debate. With open minds, we may learn more =  
about where she's coming from. With an open mind of her own, she may be =  
educable. And if minds are closed - hers or ours - then at minimum we'll =





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

From: Nathaniel Ehrlich [mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU]

Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:19 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: conference comments

Instead of whining about the decisions that our elected =  
representatives

have

made, let's see if we can come up with some rational plan for =  
increasing

Ms.

Huffington's knowledge about the workings of our profession. We might =  
as

well proceed on the assumption that this is an opportunity for us to  
engage

her in a meaningful, intelligent dialogue, and treat her with respect =  
and

civility.

What do we have to lose? And if we show up and protest her appearance,  
what

do we expect to gain?

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: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM]

Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:10 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: conference comments

Why should Arianna Huffington change her mind or mute her criticisms  
when her shrill repetition of them has induced AAPOR to pay her a =  
\$5,000

fee to speak at the conference?

That money could have been far better spent as the seed of an annual  
AAPOR award in Bud's name.

Jan Werner

---

Harry O'Neill wrote:

> I feel compelled to comment on two aspects of the upcoming AAPOR

Conference.

- > The first is the invitation given to Arianna Huffington to be a =  
plenary
- > speaker. She is a person who will do anything for media attention =  
and a
- > persistent critic of our profession. Her appearance certainly will =  
in  
no  
way
- > change her mind about us nor mute her unfounded criticisms.
- >
- > Second, this year our profession lost Bud Roper - a man of the =  
highest
- > professionalism, honesty, and integrity and a faithful and valuable
- > contributor to AAPOR. While giving Arianna Huffington a prime time =  
on  
the
- > conference program, the memorial for Bud Roper is relegated to the
- > inauspicious time of 8:15 Sunday morning - a time not noted for peak
- > attendance.
- >
- > In my opinion. there is something wrong with this picture and it =  
does  
not
- > speak well of those responsible for the decision.
- >
- > Harry O'Neill
- >
- > -----
- > Conference early registration deadline: April 28!
- > Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>
- > Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
- >
- >

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 17:12:18 -0400  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
Comments: To: PAHARDING7@AOL.COM  
In-Reply-To: <f3.2b466040.2bdeee44@aol.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

I don't object to her speaking. I think the invitation was inspired. It is PAYING her that I object to. Yes, we knew she was coming, but I for one never knew she was being paid. That's my objection, last minute or not. That is not the way to spend our money.

I repeat boycott the endowment fund this year! That will send a message someone will get.  
warren mitofsky

At 04:51 PM 4/28/2003, Philip Harding wrote:

>Just a general question, not aimed at anyone in particular. Why, oh why, has  
>the issue of Ms. Huffington, not a new one in at least one other AAPOR  
>conference,  
>awaited the eleventh hour and fifty-seventh minute before its confrontation?  
>  
>Phil Harding  
>

>-----  
>Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
>Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
-----

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 17:13:55 -0400  
Reply-To: Scott McBride <smcbride@HCMRESEARCH.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Scott McBride <smcbride@HCMRESEARCH.COM>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

As a past and upcoming repeat president of our areas American Marketing Association in on the planning of many meetings, I appreciate the marketing implications of inviting Ms. Huffington to speak. This should attract new and perhaps younger members to attend who did not attend in the past from a variety of disciplines. It makes me think that AAPOR is comfortable with controversy and more on the cutting edge. Once they attend, they become repeat patrons as they become a part of the greater diversity AAPOR can become. Isn't the focus on getting greater attendance at the meeting and building a longer term and stronger relationship with more of its members? If you do this, APPOR makes money on the \$5,000 fee and the publicity could be priceless or at least as fun as these discussions.

Scott McBride  
Hollander Cohen & McBride

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

From: "Stephanie Berg" <stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET>  
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:40 PM  
Subject: Re: conference comments

> Regardless of our respective feelings about the decision to invite Ms.  
> Huffington as a guest speaker, I believe the opportunity to lodge a  
> complaint has long past. Ms. Huffington's invitation was announced quite  
> some time ago along with AAPOR's reasons for inviting her. I think we are  
> better off following Mr. Ehrlich's previous suggestion about a game plan.

>

> =====

> Stephanie Berg  
> Network Solutions  
> Research Manager  
> stephanie.berg@verizon.net

>

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

> From: Lydia Saad  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:29 PM  
> Subject: Re: conference comments

>

>

> I guess the question implicit in the criticism of the choice to invite  
> Huffington is "what did we expect to gain FROM her appearance?" Given  
how

> unlikely it is AAPOR will soften or change her anti-poll position, I  
don't

> think that's an unreasonable question to pose to our elected  
> representatives.

>

> My apologies if that has already been detailed on these airwaves, but  
now

> might be a good time to repeat it.

>

> Lydia Saad

>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Nathaniel Ehrlich [mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU]  
> Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:19 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: conference comments  
>  
>  
> Instead of whining about the decisions that our elected representatives  
> have  
> made, let's see if we can come up with some rational plan for increasing  
> Ms.  
> Huffington's knowledge about the workings of our profession. We might as  
> well proceed on the assumption that this is an opportunity for us to  
> engage  
> her in a meaningful, intelligent dialogue, and treat her with respect  
> and  
> civility.  
> What do we have to lose? And if we show up and protest her appearance,  
> what  
> do we expect to gain?  
>  
> 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: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM]  
> Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:10 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: conference comments  
>  
>  
> Why should Arianna Huffington change her mind or mute her criticisms  
> when her shrill repetition of them has induced AAPOR to pay her a \$5,000  
> fee to speak at the conference?  
>  
> That money could have been far better spent as the seed of an annual  
> AAPOR award in Bud's name.  
>  
> Jan Werner  
> \_\_\_\_\_  
>  
> Harry O'Neill wrote:  
> > I feel compelled to comment on two aspects of the upcoming AAPOR  
> Conference.  
> > The first is the invitation given to Arianna Huffington to be a  
> plenary

> > speaker. She is a person who will do anything for media attention and  
a  
> > persistent critic of our profession. Her appearance certainly will in  
> no  
> way  
> > change her mind about us nor mute her unfounded criticisms.  
> >  
> > Second, this year our profession lost Bud Roper - a man of the highest  
> > professionalism, honesty, and integrity and a faithful and valuable  
> > contributor to AAPOR. While giving Arianna Huffington a prime time on  
> the  
> > conference program, the memorial for Bud Roper is relegated to the  
> > inauspicious time of 8:15 Sunday morning - a time not noted for peak  
> > attendance.  
> >  
> > In my opinion. there is something wrong with this picture and it does  
> not  
> > speak well of those responsible for the decision.  
> >  
> > Harry O'Neill  
> >  
> > -----  
> > Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> > Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> > Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> > -----  
> > Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> > Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> > Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> >  
> > -----  
> > Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> > Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> > Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> >  
> > -----  
> > Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> > Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> > Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> >  
> > -----  
> > Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> > Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> > Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> >  
> >

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 17:23:55 -0400  
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
In-Reply-To: <p05200f22bad3409b27f2@[192.168.0.196]>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Other issues aside, reporters at AAPOR meetings are always in search of stories ... what is new?!!! What's new is that the woman leading the "No Poll Pledge" is going to speak to the nation's pollsters. I wonder how well her anti-polling campaign is going--has she convinced more people to hang up when pollsters call?!

The story in the making with Ms. Huffington offers an element of controversy and probably surprise, elements that increase the likelihood of media coverage. Telling Ms. Huffington off in a public forum would certainly make entertaining quotes for writers, but would probably not be the kind of press AAPOR seeks.

AAPOR needs a media strategy and to be clearly focused about what points it wants to make. This could be a nice opportunity educate and inform the public.

Resources:

Arianna Online: <http://www.ariannaonline.com/columns/>

Follow Arianna and friends as they try to convince America that tax shelters, polling, gas guzzling SUVs and mood-altering drugs for kids are wrong. Sign up for the SUV Ad campaign and the No Poll Pledge. <http://www.ariannaonline.com/crusades/ppfa.html>

The Pollsters Can't Hear The Silent Majority, Nov. 2002  
<http://www.ariannaonline.com/columns/files/111402.html>

"For years now, the accuracy of political polls has been -- in the parlance of the trade -- "trending downward." Last week it hit bottom. The Voter News Service admitted on Election Night that due to "technical difficulties" its exit polls weren't to be trusted, forcing the networks to rely on actual votes. And in race after race, pre-election polls proved as reliable as the iceberg spotter on the Titanic."

Mark David Richards

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Doug Henwood  
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:37 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: conference comments

I've got to say it's not very inspiring for someone who's a consumer rather than a producer of public opinion research to see this closing of ranks. Why not have a high-profile critic of the enterprise address the meeting, and then give her a piece of your mind? Doing so would suggest a high degree of self-confidence and eagerness to listen. Complaining about it suggests a defensive narrow-mindedness. Journalists who frequently use polling data, as I do, would prefer that the producers of the data not crawl into a shell when criticized. If Huffington's so off-base, you've got nothing to lose. And she might learn something too.

--

Doug Henwood  
Left Business Observer  
38 Greene St - 4th fl.  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
voice +1-212-219-0010  
fax +1-212-219-0098  
cell +1-917-865-2813  
email <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>  
web <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 14:44:19 -0700  
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
Comments: To: mark@bisconti.com  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Is there someone in AAPOR who is the official liaison between the = organization and the Press? That person should work with the media who = will be covering her talk (before the talk itself) and make sure that = the aapor side gets properly represented.=20

leora

Leora Lawton, Ph.D.  
Director of Consumer & Demographic Research  
Population Research Systems, LLC  
A Member of the FSC Group



100 Spear, Suite 1700  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
v: 415 777-0707, ex. 117; f: 415 777-2420;  
m: 510 928-7572  
www.populationresearchsystems.com

This information is intended solely for the individual or entity named =  
as  
the recipient hereof and may be, or contain privileged (i.e.  
attorney-client), confidential and/or proprietary information. If you =  
are  
not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying,  
distribution, or use of the contents of this transmission is prohibited. =  
If  
you have received this communication in error, please notify us =  
immediately  
by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and =  
destroy  
this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

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

> From: Mark David Richards [mailto:mark@BISCONTI.COM]

> Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 2:24 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: conference comments

>=20

>=20

> Other issues aside, reporters at AAPOR meetings are always in=20

> search of

> stories ... what is new?!!! What's new is that the woman leading the

> "No Poll Pledge" is going to speak to the nation's pollsters.=20

> I wonder

> how well her anti-polling campaign is going--has she convinced more

> people to hang up when pollsters call?!

>=20

> The story in the making with Ms. Huffington offers an element of

> controversy and probably surprise, elements that increase the=20

> likelihood

> of media coverage. Telling Ms. Huffington off in a public forum would

> certainly make entertaining quotes for writers, but would probably not

> be the kind of press AAPOR seeks.

>=20

> AAPOR needs a media strategy and to be clearly focused about=20

> what points

> it wants to make. This could be a nice opportunity educate and inform

> the public.

>=20

> Resources:

>=20

> Arianna Online: <http://www.ariannaonline.com/columns/>

>=20

> Follow Arianna and friends as they try to convince America that tax

> shelters, polling, gas guzzling SUVs and mood-altering drugs for kids

> are wrong. Sign up for the SUV Ad campaign and the No Poll Pledge.

> <http://www.ariannaonline.com/crusades/ppfa.html>

>=20

> The Pollsters Can't Hear The Silent Majority, Nov. 2002

> <http://www.ariannaonline.com/columns/files/111402.html>

>=20

> "For years now, the accuracy of political polls has been -- in the  
> parlance of the trade -- "trending downward." Last week it hit bottom.

> The Voter News Service admitted on Election Night that due to=20

> "technical

> difficulties" its exit polls weren't to be trusted, forcing=20

> the networks

> to rely on actual votes. And in race after race, pre-election polls

> proved as reliable as the iceberg spotter on the Titanic."

>=20

> Mark David Richards

>=20

>=20

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Doug Henwood

> Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:37 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: conference comments

>=20

> I've got to say it's not very inspiring for someone who's a consumer

> rather than a producer of public opinion research to see this closing

> of ranks. Why not have a high-profile critic of the enterprise

> address the meeting, and then give her a piece of your mind? Doing so

> would suggest a high degree of self-confidence and eagerness to

> listen. Complaining about it suggests a defensive narrow-mindedness.

> Journalists who frequently use polling data, as I do, would prefer

> that the producers of the data not crawl into a shell when

> criticized. If Huffington's so off-base, you've got nothing to lose.

> And she might learn something too.

> --

>=20

> Doug Henwood

> Left Business Observer

> 38 Greene St - 4th fl.

> New York NY 10013-2505 USA

> voice +1-212-219-0010

> fax +1-212-219-0098

> cell +1-917-865-2813

> email <<mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>>

> web <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>

>=20

> -----

> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

>=20

> -----

> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

>=20

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapor.net.html>  
-----

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 16:49:33 -0500  
Reply-To: ALLAN L MCCUTCHEON <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: ALLAN L MCCUTCHEON <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
In-Reply-To: <5.2.1.1.2.20030428170956.00b782b8@mail.mindspring.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Hi Warren (and others),

As a member of the Endowment Committee, I ask that you please find some other way to voice your concerns. The AAPOR endowment funds are not used to fund plenary speakers, nor are there any plans to use them for such purposes.

The Endowment Committee chair--Brad Edwards--has worked hard to re-energize this committee and to build the Association's three endowment funds. Surely there must be some other way to voice our concerns.

Best,  
Allan

On Mon, 28 Apr 2003, Warren Mitofsky wrote:

> I don't object to her speaking. I think the invitation was inspired. It is  
> PAYING her that I object to. Yes, we knew she was coming, but I for one  
> never knew she was being paid. That's my objection, last minute or not.  
> That is not the way to spend our money.

>  
> I repeat boycott the endowment fund this year! That will send a message  
> someone will get.  
> warren mitofsky

>  
>  
>  
> At 04:51 PM 4/28/2003, Philip Harding wrote:  
>>Just a general question, not aimed at anyone in particular. Why, oh why,  
has  
>>the issue of Ms. Huffington, not a new one in at least one other AAPOR  
>>conference,  
>>awaited the eleventh hour and fifty-seventh minute before its  
confrontation?  
>>  
>>Phil Harding  
>>

>>-----  
>>Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
>>Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>-----  
> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

--  
,  
-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 14:49:01 -0700  
Reply-To: Paul Goodwin <[paul@GOODWINSIMON.COM](mailto:paul@GOODWINSIMON.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Paul Goodwin <[paul@GOODWINSIMON.COM](mailto:paul@GOODWINSIMON.COM)>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
Comments: To: [mark@bisconti.com](mailto:mark@bisconti.com)  
In-Reply-To: <[008701c30dcc\\$7d882630\\$6701a8c0@mark](mailto:008701c30dcc$7d882630$6701a8c0@mark)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

As probably the only AAPOR member who has actually pitched Ms. Huffington to pay for a poll (it had to do with a cause that one of her organizations was funding), I can tell you that she was charming, witty, and very polite as we discussed the idea. She asked good questions, and made me feel welcome. Only after I was finished did she hand me a copy of her book and suggest I read it. Putting aside the question of whether or not AAPOR should be paying her, my experience suggests that her presentation will be thoughtful as well as challenging. I think you will all be very pleasantly surprised by her.

Paul Goodwin  
Goodwin Simon Strategic Research  
10951 W. Pico Blvd. #329  
Los Angeles, CA 90064  
310/446-7752 (office)  
310/446-7728 (fax)  
310/210-8984 (cell)

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Mark David Richards  
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 2:24 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: conference comments

Other issues aside, reporters at AAPOR meetings are always in search of stories ... what is new?!!! What's new is that the woman leading the "No Poll Pledge" is going to speak to the nation's pollsters. I wonder how well her anti-polling campaign is going--has she convinced more people to hang up when pollsters call?!

The story in the making with Ms. Huffington offers an element of controversy and probably surprise, elements that increase the likelihood of media coverage. Telling Ms. Huffington off in a public forum would certainly make entertaining quotes for writers, but would probably not be the kind of press AAPOR seeks.

AAPOR needs a media strategy and to be clearly focused about what points it wants to make. This could be a nice opportunity educate and inform the public.

Resources:

Arianna Online: <http://www.ariannaonline.com/columns/>

Follow Arianna and friends as they try to convince America that tax shelters, polling, gas guzzling SUVs and mood-altering drugs for kids are wrong. Sign up for the SUV Ad campaign and the No Poll Pledge. <http://www.ariannaonline.com/crusades/ppfa.html>

The Pollsters Can't Hear The Silent Majority, Nov. 2002  
<http://www.ariannaonline.com/columns/files/111402.html>

"For years now, the accuracy of political polls has been -- in the parlance of the trade -- "trending downward." Last week it hit bottom. The Voter News Service admitted on Election Night that due to "technical difficulties" its exit polls weren't to be trusted, forcing the networks to rely on actual votes. And in race after race, pre-election polls proved as reliable as the iceberg spotter on the Titanic."

Mark David Richards

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Doug Henwood

Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:37 PM

To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

Subject: Re: conference comments

I've got to say it's not very inspiring for someone who's a consumer rather than a producer of public opinion research to see this closing of ranks. Why not have a high-profile critic of the enterprise address the meeting, and then give her a piece of your mind? Doing so would suggest a high degree of self-confidence and eagerness to listen. Complaining about it suggests a defensive narrow-mindedness. Journalists who frequently use polling data, as I do, would prefer that the producers of the data not crawl into a shell when

criticized. If Huffington's so off-base, you've got nothing to lose.  
And she might learn something too.

--

Doug Henwood  
Left Business Observer  
38 Greene St - 4th fl.  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
voice +1-212-219-0010  
fax +1-212-219-0098  
cell +1-917-865-2813  
email <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>  
web <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 16:57:20 -0500  
Reply-To: Becky West <Becky.West@USM.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Becky West <Becky.West@USM.EDU>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
Comments: To: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I would like to be removed from this list. Can anyone tell me how to do this??

Thanks!!

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

From: "Leora Lawton" <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>  
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:44 PM  
Subject: Re: conference comments

> Is there someone in AAPOR who is the official liaison between the organization and the Press? That person should work with the media who will be covering her talk (before the talk itself) and make sure that the aapor side gets properly represented.

>  
> leora  
>  
> Leora Lawton, Ph.D.  
> Director of Consumer & Demographic Research  
> Population Research Systems, LLC  
> A Member of the FSC Group  
> 100 Spear, Suite 1700  
> San Francisco, CA 94105  
> v: 415 777-0707, ex. 117; f: 415 777-2420;  
> m: 510 928-7572  
> www.populationresearchsystems.com

>  
> This information is intended solely for the individual or entity named as  
> the recipient hereof and may be, or contain privileged (i.e.  
> attorney-client), confidential and/or proprietary information. If you are  
> not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying,  
> distribution, or use of the contents of this transmission is prohibited.

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

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

>> From: Mark David Richards [mailto:mark@BISCONTI.COM]

>> Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 2:24 PM

>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>> Subject: Re: conference comments

>>

>>

>> Other issues aside, reporters at AAPOR meetings are always in  
>> search of

>> stories ... what is new?!!! What's new is that the woman leading the

>> "No Poll Pledge" is going to speak to the nation's pollsters.

>> I wonder

>> how well her anti-polling campaign is going--has she convinced more

>> people to hang up when pollsters call?!

>>

>> The story in the making with Ms. Huffington offers an element of

>> controversy and probably surprise, elements that increase the

>> likelihood

>> of media coverage. Telling Ms. Huffington off in a public forum would

>> certainly make entertaining quotes for writers, but would probably not

>> be the kind of press AAPOR seeks.

>>

>> AAPOR needs a media strategy and to be clearly focused about

>> what points

>> it wants to make. This could be a nice opportunity educate and inform

>> the public.

>>

>> Resources:

>>

>> Arianna Online: <http://www.ariannaonline.com/columns/>

>>  
>> Follow Arianna and friends as they try to convince America that tax  
>> shelters, polling, gas guzzling SUVs and mood-altering drugs for kids  
>> are wrong. Sign up for the SUV Ad campaign and the No Poll Pledge.  
>> <http://www.ariannaonline.com/crusades/ppfa.html>  
>>  
>> The Pollsters Can't Hear The Silent Majority, Nov. 2002  
>> <http://www.ariannaonline.com/columns/files/111402.html>  
>>  
>> "For years now, the accuracy of political polls has been -- in the  
>> parlance of the trade -- "trending downward." Last week it hit bottom.  
>> The Voter News Service admitted on Election Night that due to  
>> "technical  
>> difficulties" its exit polls weren't to be trusted, forcing  
>> the networks  
>> to rely on actual votes. And in race after race, pre-election polls  
>> proved as reliable as the iceberg spotter on the Titanic."  
>>  
>> Mark David Richards  
>>  
>>  
>> -----Original Message-----  
>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Doug Henwood  
>> Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:37 PM  
>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>> Subject: Re: conference comments  
>>  
>> I've got to say it's not very inspiring for someone who's a consumer  
>> rather than a producer of public opinion research to see this closing  
>> of ranks. Why not have a high-profile critic of the enterprise  
>> address the meeting, and then give her a piece of your mind? Doing so  
>> would suggest a high degree of self-confidence and eagerness to  
>> listen. Complaining about it suggests a defensive narrow-mindedness.  
>> Journalists who frequently use polling data, as I do, would prefer  
>> that the producers of the data not crawl into a shell when  
>> criticized. If Huffington's so off-base, you've got nothing to lose.  
>> And she might learn something too.  
>> --  
>>  
>> Doug Henwood  
>> Left Business Observer  
>> 38 Greene St - 4th fl.  
>> New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
>> voice +1-212-219-0010  
>> fax +1-212-219-0098  
>> cell +1-917-865-2813  
>> email <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>  
>> web <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>  
>>  
>> -----  
>> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
>> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>>



>> -----  
>> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
>> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>>  
>  
> -----  
> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 18:23:53 -0400  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
Comments: To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <[nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>  
In-Reply-To: <[5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E0EC39530@isr.umich.edu](mailto:5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E0EC39530@isr.umich.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I am absolutely in favor of AAPOR inviting Ms. Huffington to speak at the conference, and were I attending, would certainly listen to her, even though I consider her to be little more than a mountebank.

On the other hand, I consider it an appalling breach of faith for AAPOR Executive Council to offer pay Ms. Huffington a substantial speaking fee, even if it is at a great discount from what she normally commands.

I personally first found out about Ms. Huffington's fee through Rich Morin's column in the Washington Post, and immediately expressed my outrage on AAPORNET.

While I have the greatest respect for the members of the Executive Council, many of whom I also consider to be friends, I feel it is the duty of all members of this organization to speak up and protest when they make decisions that misplace our trust in them.

As far as I recall, plenary session speakers have always been reimbursed for travel and incidental expenses, which is appropriate, but AAPOR has never been in the business of hiring high-priced performers to entertain attendees at the annual conference.

If Dr. Ehrlich considers this "whining about the decisions that our elected representatives have made," I feel sorry for his students.

Jan Werner

---

Nathaniel Ehrlich wrote:

> Instead of whining about the decisions that our elected representatives have  
> made, let's see if we can come up with some rational plan for increasing Ms.  
> Huffington's knowledge about the workings of our profession. We might as  
> well proceed on the assumption that this is an opportunity for us to engage  
> her in a meaningful, intelligent dialogue, and treat her with respect and  
> civility.  
> What do we have to lose? And if we show up and protest her appearance, what  
> do we expect to gain?

>  
> 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: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM]  
> Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:10 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: conference comments

>  
>  
> Why should Arianna Huffington change her mind or mute her criticisms  
> when her shrill repetition of them has induced AAPOR to pay her a \$5,000  
> fee to speak at the conference?

>  
> That money could have been far better spent as the seed of an annual  
> AAPOR award in Bud's name.

> Jan Werner

> \_\_\_\_\_  
>  
> Harry O'Neill wrote:

>>I feel compelled to comment on two aspects of the upcoming AAPOR

> Conference.

>>The first is the invitation given to Arianna Huffington to be a plenary  
>>speaker. She is a person who will do anything for media attention and a  
>>persistent critic of our profession. Her appearance certainly will in no

> way

>>change her mind about us nor mute her unfounded criticisms.

>>Second, this year our profession lost Bud Roper - a man of the highest

>>professionalism, honesty, and integrity and a faithful and valuable  
>>contributor to AAPOR. While giving Arianna Huffington a prime time on the  
>>conference program, the memorial for Bud Roper is relegated to the  
>>inauspicious time of 8:15 Sunday morning - a time not noted for peak  
>>attendance.

>>  
>>In my opinion. there is something wrong with this picture and it does not  
>>speak well of those responsible for the decision.

>>  
>>Harry O'Neill

>>  
>>-----  
>>Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
>>Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>>  
>>  
>  
>  
> -----  
> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>  
> -----  
> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>  
>  
-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 15:49:28 -0700  
Reply-To: Richard <[rmaullin@FMMA.ORG](mailto:rmaullin@FMMA.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Richard <[rmaullin@FMMA.ORG](mailto:rmaullin@FMMA.ORG)>  
Subject: FW: conference comments  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

The fact Adrianna Huffing ton would get paid by AAPOR will in itself be a point the press will pick up on, and in my opinion compromise her "pure" status as a polling critic. Imagine this: "Anti-polling critic not above accepting a fee from pollsters to push her attack on polls, SUV's, etc. It's all showbiz. Of course, positioning the story before it happens would help assure that someone does a take on it that way.

Richard Maullin  
Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates  
2425 Colorado Ave. Suite 180

Santa Monica, CA 90404  
310-828-1183

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

From: Langer, Gary E [mailto:Gary.E.Langer@ABC.COM]  
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 1:12 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: conference comments

I think AAPOR gains much by opening its doors to Huffington. The association shows maturity, self-confidence and a willingness to engage its critics in constructive debate. With open minds, we may learn more about where she's coming from. With an open mind of her own, she may be educable. And if minds are closed - hers or ours - then at minimum we'll still have the opportunity to take each other's measure at close quarters. The quality of the exchange will depend on the contribution of the panelists. But there's nothing to lose - and much potentially to gain - from a respectful discussion with this prominent critic.

It's clear, too that AAPOR loses much with the passing of Bud Roper. An AAPOR fund in his honor dedicated to the principles he upheld would be a fine and lasting tribute. Tell me where to send the check; and let it be a challenge to all of us to fund a Bud Roper endowment that surpasses Huffington's fee before the conference ends.

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

From: Stephanie Berg [mailto:stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET]  
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:41 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: conference comments

Regardless of our respective feelings about the decision to invite Ms. Huffington as a guest speaker, I believe the opportunity to lodge a complaint has long past. Ms. Huffington's invitation was announced quite some time ago along with AAPOR's reasons for inviting her. I think we are better off following Mr. Ehrlich's previous suggestion about a game plan.

=====  
Stephanie Berg  
Network Solutions  
Research Manager  
stephanie.berg@verizon.net

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

From: Lydia Saad  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:29 PM  
Subject: Re: conference comments

I guess the question implicit in the criticism of the choice to invite

Huffington is "what did we expect to gain FROM her appearance?" Given how unlikely it is AAPOR will soften or change her anti-poll position, I don't think that's an unreasonable question to pose to our elected representatives.

My apologies if that has already been detailed on these airwaves, but now might be a good time to repeat it.

Lydia Saad

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

From: Nathaniel Ehrlich [mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU]  
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:19 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: conference comments

Instead of whining about the decisions that our elected representatives have made, let's see if we can come up with some rational plan for increasing Ms.

Huffington's knowledge about the workings of our profession. We might as well proceed on the assumption that this is an opportunity for us to engage her in a meaningful, intelligent dialogue, and treat her with respect and civility.

What do we have to lose? And if we show up and protest her appearance, what do we expect to gain?

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: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM]  
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:10 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: conference comments

Why should Arianna Huffington change her mind or mute her criticisms when her shrill repetition of them has induced AAPOR to pay her a \$5,000 fee to speak at the conference?

That money could have been far better spent as the seed of an annual AAPOR award in Bud's name.

Jan Werner

---

Harry O'Neill wrote:

> I feel compelled to comment on two aspects of the upcoming AAPOR Conference.

> The first is the invitation given to Arianna Huffington to be a plenary speaker. She is a person who will do anything for media attention and a persistent critic of our profession. Her appearance certainly will in

no way  
> change her mind about us nor mute her unfounded criticisms.

>  
> Second, this year our profession lost Bud Roper - a man of the highest professionalism, honesty, and integrity and a faithful and valuable contributor to AAPOR. While giving Arianna Huffington a prime time on

the  
> conference program, the memorial for Bud Roper is relegated to the inauspicious time of 8:15 Sunday morning - a time not noted for peak attendance.

>  
> In my opinion, there is something wrong with this picture and it does

not  
> speak well of those responsible for the decision.

>  
> Harry O'Neill

>  
> -----  
> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>  
>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 19:45:36 -0400  
Reply-To: "Carolyn A. Eldred" <celdred@SPRYNET.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Carolyn A. Eldred" <celdred@SPRYNET.COM>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
Comments: To: HOneill536@AOL.COM  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I wholeheartedly agree with others that Huffington should not be paid out of AAPOR coffers.

Carolyn Eldred

Carolyn A. Eldred  
Research Consultation  
celdred@sprynet.com  
Voice/fax: 252-255-3243  
21 Widgeon Court  
Southern Shores, NC 27949-3843

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

From: "Harry O'Neill" <HOneill536@AOL.COM>  
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 3:37 PM  
Subject: conference comments

> I feel compelled to comment on two aspects of the upcoming AAPOR Conference.  
> The first is the invitation given to Arianna Huffington to be a plenary speaker. She is a person who will do anything for media attention and a persistent critic of our profession. Her appearance certainly will in no way  
> change her mind about us nor mute her unfounded criticisms.  
>  
> Second, this year our profession lost Bud Roper - a man of the highest professionalism, honesty, and integrity and a faithful and valuable contributor to AAPOR. While giving Arianna Huffington a prime time on the conference program, the memorial for Bud Roper is relegated to the inauspicious time of 8:15 Sunday morning - a time not noted for peak attendance.  
>

> In my opinion. there is something wrong with this picture and it does not  
> speak well of those responsible for the decision.  
>  
> Harry O'Neill  
>  
> -----  
> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 19:57:08 -0400  
Reply-To: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>  
Subject: Clarification  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Dear AAPOR members:=20

I want to clarify a point which is being misunderstood in this AAPORNET =  
dialogue. Ms.=20  
Huffington is receiving no speaker fee from AAPOR. She asked that we make =  
a contribution in her name to a small, non-profit environment organization.=  
As far as I know, she has been very gracious in her dealings with the =  
AAPOR Conference Committee as well.=20

You may agree or disagree with the decision to invite her, but I do want =  
us to be focused on the right issues here. My own feeling is that we've =  
lined up some of AAPOR's best and brightest to dialogue with her. She does =  
command a great deal of=20  
media attention. I believe that this is a wonderful opportunity to present =  
our views as forcefully and articulately as possible. I'm looking forward =  
to the dialogue and the potential opportunity to turn her away from her =  
anti-polling crusade. I'd much rather she focus on SUVs.

Mark

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 20:17:19 -0400  
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: Clarification



Comments: To: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>  
In-Reply-To: <sead879e.064@srbi.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear All:

As a fellow travelling pollster, I find the concern about Huffington overblown at the least. She is a first rate media star, has shifted from the right (Compassionate Conservatism and Newt backer) to a populist (I suppose it is leftist) position. She is iconoclastic, to say the least.

She will be challenging and interesting. She is a leading critic of polling, but I suspect that it is no longer her number one concern.

Remember she came to national prominence doing "Strange Bedfellows" during the 1996 election on Comedy Central with Al Franken (author of Rush Limbaugh is a Big Fat Idiot and Other Observations).

She helped get on TV the adds that parody the drug war, about driving an SUV and supporting terrorism. Of course, Michael Huffington did turn out to be gay, but she was speaker of the Cambridge Union.

But I could be biased, since I get all my news from the Daily Show (on Comedy Central), as well as from the BBC and Al-Jazeera.

Andy Beveridge  
Queens College Sociology

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of Mark Schulman  
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 7:57 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Clarification

Dear AAPOR members:

I want to clarify a point which is being misunderstood in this AAPORNET dialogue. Ms.

Huffington is receiving no speaker fee from AAPOR. She asked that we make a contribution in her name to a small, non-profit environment organization. As far as I know, she has been very gracious in her dealings with the AAPOR Conference Committee as well.

You may agree or disagree with the decision to invite her, but I do want us to be focused on the right issues here. My own feeling is that we've lined up some of AAPOR's best and brightest to dialogue with her. She does command a great deal of media attention. I believe that this is a wonderful opportunity to present our views as forcefully and articulately as possible. I'm looking forward to the dialogue and the potential opportunity to turn her away from her

anti-polling crusade. I'd much rather she focus on SUVs.

Mark

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 17:24:53 -0700  
Reply-To: Richard <[rmaullin@FMMA.ORG](mailto:rmaullin@FMMA.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Richard <[rmaullin@FMMA.ORG](mailto:rmaullin@FMMA.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: Clarification  
Comments: To: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

In light of the clarification, AAPOR would like terribly self-righteous and thin-skinned if it made an issue regarding her appearance at the AAPOR conference. In my opinion, understanding that Huffington is as much about entertainment as she is about social criticism, AAPOR and polling in general would benefit from the exposure, particularly if there were some sharp-witted interaction with AAPOR pollsters a part of her show.

Richard Maullin  
Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates  
2425 Colorado Ave. Suite 180  
Santa Monica, CA 90404  
310-828-1183

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

From: Andrew A. Beveridge [<mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>]  
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:17 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Re: Clarification

Dear All:

As a fellow travelling pollster, I find the concern about Huffington overblown at the least. She is a first rate media star, has shifted from the right (Compassionate Conservatism and Newt backer) to a populist (I suppose it is leftist) position. She is iconoclastic, to say the least.

She will be challenging and interesting. She is a leading critic of polling, but I suspect that it is no longer her number one concern.

Remember she came to national prominence doing "Strange Bedfellows" during

the 1996 election on Comedy Central with Al Franken (author of Rush Limbaugh is a Big Fat Idiot and Other Observations).

She helped get on TV the adds that parody the drug war, about driving an SUV and supporting terrorism. Of course, Michael Huffington did turn out to be gay, but she was speaker of the Cambridge Union.

But I could be biased, since I get all my news from the Daily Show (on Comedy Central), as well as from the BBC and Al-Jazeera.

Andy Beveridge  
Queens College Sociology

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of Mark Schulman  
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 7:57 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Clarification

Dear AAPOR members:

I want to clarify a point which is being misunderstood in this AAPORNET dialogue. Ms.

Huffington is receiving no speaker fee from AAPOR. She asked that we make a contribution in her name to a small, non-profit environment organization. As far as I know, she has been very gracious in her dealings with the AAPOR Conference Committee as well.

You may agree or disagree with the decision to invite her, but I do want us to be focused on the right issues here. My own feeling is that we've lined up some of AAPOR's best and brightest to dialogue with her. She does command a great deal of media attention. I believe that this is a wonderful opportunity to present our views as forcefully and articulately as possible. I'm looking forward to the dialogue and the potential opportunity to turn her away from her anti-polling crusade. I'd much rather she focus on SUVs.

Mark

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 19:53:07 -0500  
Reply-To: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Susan Carol Losh <slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Clarification  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain  
Content-transfer-encoding: binary

As someone who trolled the NET about A. Huffington at the time the feathers first flew, I noted then that a major reason for Huffington's complaints and her recommendation to just say no to survey interviewers occurred because she felt "leaders should lead not follow."

Apart from an abysmal (but typical) layperson knowledge of group dynamics, it seems like her rancor is misplaced. Rather than being aimed at the innocent interviewer, why is it not directed at those namby pamby politicians, who like kings of old consulting the court astrologer, now consult the court pollster instead?

Huffington is probably unaware of the many uses of survey research that have nothing to do, except obliquely, with politics. This is our chance to educate her.

We read Huffington's column on a regular basis in The Tallahassee Democrat (that's our local paper down here). I agree with the list comments that she is lively, interesting, and thoughtful. I did not initially expect to enjoy her columns but typically I do. Worse yet, I often find myself agreeing with her!

As for the fee (or donation), if this is a GENERAL issue, and not one addressed to the Huffington issue in particular, it should be addressed at our business meeting.

Susan

On Mon, 28 Apr 2003 20:17:19 -0400 "Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote:

- > Dear All:
- >
- > As a fellow travelling pollster, I find the concern about Huffington
- > overblown at the least. She is a first rate media star, has shifted from
- > the right (Compassionate Conservatism and Newt backer) to a populist (I
- > suppose it is leftist) position. She is iconoclastic, to say the least.
- >
- > She will be challenging and interesting. She is a leading critic of
- > polling, but I suspect that it is no longer her number one concern.
- >
- > Remember she came to national prominence doing "Strange Bedfellows" during
- > the 1996 election on Comedy Central with Al Franken (author of Rush
- > Limbaugh

> is a Big Fat Idiot and Other Observations).  
>  
> She helped get on TV the adds that parody the drug war, about driving  
> an SUV  
> and supporting terrorism. Of course, Michael Huffington did turn out  
> to be  
> gay, but she was speaker of the Cambridge Union.  
>  
> But I could be biased, since I get all my news from the Daily Show (on  
> Comedy Central), as well as from the BBC and Al-Jazeera.  
>  
> Andy Beveridge  
> Queens College Sociology  
>  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of Mark Schulman  
> Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 7:57 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Clarification  
>  
>  
> Dear AAPOR members:  
>  
> I want to clarify a point which is being misunderstood in this AAPORNET  
> dialogue. Ms.  
> Huffington is receiving no speaker fee from AAPOR. She asked that we  
> make a  
> contribution in her name to a small, non-profit environment  
> organization. As  
> far as I know, she has been very gracious in her dealings with the AAPOR  
> Conference Committee as well.  
>  
> You may agree or disagree with the decision to invite her, but I do  
> want us  
> to be focused on the right issues here. My own feeling is that we've lined  
> up some of AAPOR's best and brightest to dialogue with her. She does  
> command  
> a great deal of  
> media attention. I believe that this is a wonderful opportunity to present  
> our views as forcefully and articulately as possible. I'm looking  
> forward to  
> the dialogue and the potential opportunity to turn her away from her  
> anti-polling crusade. I'd much rather she focus on SUVs.  
>  
> Mark  
>  
> -----  
> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>  
> -----  
> Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

> Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

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>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 21:25:42 -0400  
Reply-To: Joseph Polka <polkaj2@SOUTHERNCT.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Joseph Polka <polkaj2@SOUTHERNCT.EDU>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
Comments: To: HOneill536@AOL.COM  
In-Reply-To: <e.2fb1751a.2bdedce3@aol.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Our future is not in the hands of Adrianna Huffington. Whether she is the plenary speaker or not is irrelevant to the welfare of AAPOR. The scientific study of public opinion with a code of ethics is important. Bud Roper gave a lifetime to advance our profession. We owe him the respect of not confounding the selection of a plenary speaker with Bud Roper's legacy. The plenary address will be forgotten the following week, and Bud Roper will be remembered forever in the annals of survey research.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Harry O'Neill  
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 3:37 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: conference comments

I feel compelled to comment on two aspects of the upcoming AAPOR Conference.

The first is the invitation given to Arianna Huffington to be a plenary speaker. She is a person who will do anything for media attention and a persistent critic of our profession. Her appearance certainly will in no way change her mind about us nor mute her unfounded criticisms.

Second, this year our profession lost Bud Roper - a man of the highest professionalism, honesty, and integrity and a faithful and valuable contributor to AAPOR. While giving Arianna Huffington a prime time on the conference program, the memorial for Bud Roper is relegated to the inauspicious time of 8:15 Sunday morning - a time not noted for peak attendance.

In my opinion, there is something wrong with this picture and it does not speak well of those responsible for the decision.

Harry O'Neill

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 19:31:23 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Subject: Re: FW: conference comments  
In-Reply-To: <F0D37B169259D311A1B40060082080FEA26DBF@WEBSERVER>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Richard wrote:

>The fact Adrianna Huffing ton would get paid by AAPOR will in itself be a  
>point the press will pick up on, and in my opinion compromise her "pure"  
>status as a polling critic. Imagine this: "Anti-polling critic not above  
>accepting a fee from pollsters to push her attack on polls, SUV's, etc.  
>It's all showbiz. Of course, positioning the story before it happens would  
>help assure that someone does a take on it that way.

What's so unusual about a high-profile speaker getting a fee? The man-bites-dog story would be if she didn't get paid - and \$5,000 isn't outlandish. Laura Ingraham, who's nowhere near as smart or interesting as AH, gets two or three times that  
<<http://www.washingtonspeakers.com/speaker.cfm/2244>>.

--

Doug Henwood  
Left Business Observer  
38 Greene St - 4th fl.  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA

voice +1-212-219-0010  
fax +1-212-219-0098  
cell +1-917-865-2813  
email <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>  
web <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Mon, 28 Apr 2003 21:27:12 -0700  
Reply-To: Richard <rmaullin@FMMA.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Richard <rmaullin@FMMA.ORG>  
Subject: Re: FW: conference comments  
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

Your right about the fee, it's not much by celebrity fee standards. Bu the whole issue is changed in my opinion by the fact that it is not really a fee but a donation to a charitable group in lieu of a fee. She wins in that case and protests about her five grand seem either mean spirited or uptight. My basic point is that Huffington's criticism of polls is taken too seriously by too many in this business. She is merely giving voice to an attitude that is surely "out there," that pollsters and other viziers are dictating policy that more appropriately ought to well up from the values held by leaders and debated in the open. At least she is entertaining, and professional pollsters can play off of her celebrity status to gain some attention for the arguments that polling is a lot more subtle than its caricature would suggest and that in the real world of policy-making, opinion polling is but one of many types of information that influence policy.

Richard Maullin  
Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates  
2425 Colorado Ave. Suite 180  
Santa Monica, CA 90404  
310-828-1183

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

From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM]  
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 3:31 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: FW: conference comments

Richard wrote:

>The fact Adrianna Huffing ton would get paid by AAPOR will in itself be a  
>point the press will pick up on, and in my opinion compromise her "pure"  
>status as a polling critic. Imagine this: "Anti-polling critic not above  
>accepting a fee from pollsters to push her attack on polls, SUV's, etc.



>It's all showbiz. Of course, positioning the story before it happens would  
>help assure that someone does a take on it that way.

What's so unusual about a high-profile speaker getting a fee? The  
man-bites-dog story would be if she didn't get paid - and \$5,000  
isn't outlandish. Laura Ingraham, who's nowhere near as smart or  
interesting as AH, gets two or three times that  
<<http://www.washingtonspeakers.com/speaker.cfm/2244>>.

--

Doug Henwood  
Left Business Observer  
38 Greene St - 4th fl.  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
voice +1-212-219-0010  
fax +1-212-219-0098  
cell +1-917-865-2813  
email <<mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>>  
web <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Tue, 29 Apr 2003 09:40:43 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Gallup Poll on 2004 election  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

## POLL ANALYSES

April 29, 2003

Lieberman Leads Field of Nine  
Bush not seen as invincible

by Lydia Saad  
GALLUP NEWS SERVICE

PRINCETON, NJ -- A new CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll on the 2004  
presidential election, based on a national survey conducted April 22-23,  
finds Connecticut Senator Joe Lieberman holding a slight edge over the  
field of nine Democratic candidates that will meet in South Carolina  
this weekend in the season's first nationally televised debate.  
Massachusetts Senator John Kerry and Missouri Congressman Dick Gephardt

follow close behind. In March, Lieberman had tied Kerry for second place, with Gephardt in the lead.

The same poll shows George W. Bush in a relatively strong position against the Democrats in the general election, but without the sense of invincibility that surrounded his father after the 1991 Persian Gulf War.

Full Press release at:

<http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr030429.asp>

--

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

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Tue, 29 Apr 2003 11:20:58 -0400  
Reply-To: [rusciano@rider.edu](mailto:rusciano@rider.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Subject: NYTimes.com Article: Matters of Emphasis  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

This article from NYTimes.com  
has been sent to you by [rusciano@rider.edu](mailto:rusciano@rider.edu).

Some time ago, there was a discussion on the AAPORnet about whether support for going to war with Iraq was dependent upon a false belief that Saddam Hussein was somehow responsible for the attacks on September 11. Although our general emphasis is usually on methodology, I believe Paul Krugman's column gives us food for thought. We don't seem to ask this question as much as in the past, but what is the appropriate link between democracy and the polls? Are we somehow obligated to find out if false or misleading information is at the basis of citizens' decisions about policy issues, and if so, what do we do with the information if we find it is?

[rusciano@rider.edu](mailto:rusciano@rider.edu)

/----- advertisement -----\  
/

Explore more of Starbucks at Starbucks.com.  
<http://www.starbucks.com/default.asp?ci=1015>  
\  
/

## Matters of Emphasis

April 29, 2003

By PAUL KRUGMAN

"We were not lying," a Bush administration official told ABC News. "But it was just a matter of emphasis." The official was referring to the way the administration hyped the threat that Saddam Hussein posed to the United States. According to the ABC report, the real reason for the war was that the administration "wanted to make a statement." And why Iraq? "Officials acknowledge that Saddam had all the requirements to make him, from their standpoint, the perfect target."

A British newspaper, The Independent, reports that "intelligence agencies on both sides of the Atlantic were furious that briefings they gave political leaders were distorted in the rush to war." One "high-level source" told the paper that "they ignored intelligence assessments which said Iraq was not a threat."

Sure enough, we have yet to find any weapons of mass destruction. It's hard to believe that we won't eventually find some poison gas or crude biological weapons. But those aren't true W.M.D.'s, the sort of weapons that can make a small, poor country a threat to the greatest power the world has ever known. Remember that President Bush made his case for war by warning of a "mushroom cloud." Clearly, Iraq didn't have anything like that - and Mr. Bush must have known that it didn't.

Does it matter that we were misled into war? Some people say that it doesn't: we won, and the Iraqi people have been freed. But we ought to ask some hard questions - not just about Iraq, but about ourselves.

First, why is our compassion so selective? In 2001 the World Health Organization - the same organization we now count on to protect us from SARS - called for a program to fight infectious diseases in poor countries, arguing that it would save the lives of millions of people every year. The U.S. share of the expenses would have been about \$10 billion per year - a small fraction of what we will spend on war and occupation. Yet the Bush administration contemptuously dismissed the proposal.

Or consider one of America's first major postwar acts of

diplomacy: blocking a plan to send U.N. peacekeepers to Ivory Coast (a former French colony) to enforce a truce in a vicious civil war. The U.S. complains that it will cost too much. And that must be true - we wouldn't let innocent people die just to spite the French, would we?

So it seems that our deep concern for the Iraqi people doesn't extend to suffering people elsewhere. I guess it's just a matter of emphasis. A cynic might point out, however, that saving lives peacefully doesn't offer any occasion to stage a victory parade.

Meanwhile, aren't the leaders of a democratic nation supposed to tell their citizens the truth?

One wonders whether most of the public will ever learn that the original case for war has turned out to be false. In fact, my guess is that most Americans believe that we have found W.M.D.'s. Each potential find gets blaring coverage on TV; how many people catch the later announcement - if it is ever announced - that it was a false alarm? It's a pattern of misinformation that recapitulates the way the war was sold in the first place. Each administration charge against Iraq received prominent coverage; the subsequent debunking did not.

Did the news media feel that it was unpatriotic to question the administration's credibility? Some strange things certainly happened. For example, in September Mr. Bush cited an International Atomic Energy Agency report that he said showed that Saddam was only months from having nuclear weapons. "I don't know what more evidence we need," he said. In fact, the report said no such thing - and for a few hours the lead story on MSNBC's Web site bore the headline "White House: Bush Misstated Report on Iraq." Then the story vanished - not just from the top of the page, but from the site.

Thanks to this pattern of loud assertions and muted or suppressed retractions, the American public probably believes that we went to war to avert an immediate threat - just as it believes that Saddam had something to do with Sept. 11.

Now it's true that the war removed an evil tyrant. But a democracy's decisions, right or wrong, are supposed to take place with the informed consent of its citizens. That didn't happen this time. And we are a democracy - aren't we?

<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/04/29/opinion/29KRUG.html?ex=1052629658&ei=1&en=ed>

## HOW TO ADVERTISE

-----

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

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

Copyright 2003 The New York Times Company

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Tue, 29 Apr 2003 10:05:02 -0700  
Reply-To: "Voigt, Lynda" <[lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG](mailto:lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Voigt, Lynda" <[lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG](mailto:lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG)>  
Subject: Distribution of interviews by call number (contact attempt)  
Comments: To: "sid.grc@VERIZON.NET" <[sid.grc@VERIZON.NET](mailto:sid.grc@VERIZON.NET)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Hello Sid,

We use RDD to locate and screen potential controls for our population-based epidemiological case-control studies. We only ask eligible persons to receive a letter describing the study and another interviewer calls later to arrange an in-person interview. We complete screening on about 30% of the total number of screened respondents on the first call. Another 20% are screened on the 2nd call. Our protocol is to call 9 times at different times of the day, evening and weekend (3 each) over a 2-3 time period. The first call is usually a daytime call to eliminate business numbers in as few calls as possible. Those numbers where a potential respondent refuses screening or refuses to receive a letter about the study and numbers where an answering machine is reached on all 9 attempts are recontacted 2-3 months later by a different interviewer. The recontact calls are not included in the above estimates.

Here are some other references related to this issue that I recently found when I was reviewing this literature:

Keeter, S., Miller, C., Kohut, A., Groves, R.M., & Presser, S. (2000). Consequences of reducing nonresponse in a national telephone survey. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 64, 125-148.

Bates, N., & Creighton, K. (2000). The last five percent: What can we learn from difficult/late interviews? Proceedings of the American Statistical Association Government Statistics Section, 120-125.

Curtin, R., Presser, S., & Singer, E. (2000). The effects of response rate changes on the index of consumer sentiment. Public Opinion Quarterly, 64, 413-428.

Sebold J. Survey period length, unanswered numbers and nonresponse in telephone surveys. (In Groves et al, Telephone Survey Methodology, 1988).

Cottler, L.B., Zipp, J.F., Robins, L.N., & Sptiznagel, E.L. (1987). Difficult-to-recruit respondents and their effect on prevalence estimates in an epidemiologic survey. American Journal of Epidemiology, 125, 329-339. (You probably don't have easy access to this journal - I'll be happy to mail you a copy if you are interested. This study used an area household sample and interviewers visited the selected homes in person. They found that 32% of the interviews were completed after the second visit, mean number of visits to complete an interview was 5.31 and median was 4. The range was 1-57 (imagine 57!!)).

Lynda Voigt

Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.  
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center  
Seattle, WA  
lvoigt@fhcrc.org

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Tue, 29 Apr 2003 14:28:06 -0400  
Reply-To: Lance Hoffman <lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Lance Hoffman <lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM>  
Organization: Opinion Access Corp.  
Subject: HIV sufferers  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hello all. I was wondering if someone might be able to help me to satisfy a request from one of my clients. A client of mine is preparing to field a study on people with HIV. We have done a variety of studies like this, but sample lists are usually provided to us by the client (usually the end user client). In this case, however, my client is without sample, and was hoping I might be able to get the sample on her behalf. I have called around, but am having trouble finding people with lists of HIV sufferers. Might anyone have any suggestions for me? Please feel free to reply to the list or to me directly.

Thank you for any help you can offer, and I'm looking forward to seeing many of you at the conference.

Best regards,

Lance Hoffman  
Manager, Business Development  
Opinion Access Corp. <<http://www.opinionaccess.com/>>  
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.

---

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Tue, 29 Apr 2003 11:56:14 -0700  
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <[leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM](mailto:leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leora Lawton <[leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM](mailto:leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM)>  
Subject: callback protocols  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Folks,

In a recent note, Lynda Voigt wrote:

"Our protocol is to call 9 times

at different times of the day, evening and weekend (3 each) over a 2-3 =  
time

period. The first call is usually a daytime call to eliminate business  
numbers in as few calls as possible. Those numbers where a potential  
respondent refuses screening or refuses to receive a letter about the =  
study

and numbers where an answering machine is reached on all 9 attempts are  
recontacted 2-3 months later by a different interviewer."

I'd like to hear from other people about their call back protocols, =  
whether they have validated the procedure to be the optimal one, any =  
background. I'll report back to you all on the results. =20

leora

Leora Lawton, Ph.D.  
Director of Consumer & Demographic Research  
Population Research Systems, LLC  
A Member of the FSC Group  
100 Spear, Suite 1700  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
v: 415 777-0707, ex. 117; f: 415 777-2420;  
m: 510 928-7572  
www.populationresearchsystems.com

This information is intended solely for the individual or entity named =  
as  
the recipient hereof and may be, or contain privileged (i.e.  
attorney-client), confidential and/or proprietary information. If you =  
are  
not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying,  
distribution, or use of the contents of this transmission is prohibited. =  
If  
you have received this communication in error, please notify us =  
immediately  
by return e-mail or by e-mail to [postmaster@fsc-research.com](mailto:postmaster@fsc-research.com), and =  
destroy  
this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.  
>=20

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Tue, 29 Apr 2003 16:14:06 -0400  
Reply-To: Anne Ciemnecki <[ACiemnecki@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM](mailto:ACiemnecki@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Anne Ciemnecki <[ACiemnecki@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM](mailto:ACiemnecki@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM)>  
Subject: Career Opportunities at Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

Mathematica Policy Research, a national leader in social policy research, survey design, and data collection, seeks Survey Specialists for our Princeton, NJ and Washington, DC offices. Successful candidates will work with senior survey researchers on the development and management of national projects on significant policy issues, such as health care and education, and will have:

- \* A Master's Degree in the social sciences or a related field, or equivalent experience
- \* Minimum of one year survey research work experience, preferably in social policy
- \* Excellent oral and written communication skills
- \* Familiarity with CATI and experience with spreadsheets or other PC programs preferred

MPR is an employee owned company and offers competitive salaries, a comprehensive benefits package, and convenient office locations. Visit our



web site at [www.mathematica-mpr.com](http://www.mathematica-mpr.com) to learn more. Submit your resume, professional references, and transcripts to: Sherry Metzger, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., P.O. Box 2393, Princeton, NJ 08543-2393 or email to [HRNJ@mathematica-mpr.com](mailto:HRNJ@mathematica-mpr.com) or fax to (609) 799-0005.

Mathematica is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer.

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Tue, 29 Apr 2003 13:15:24 -0700  
Reply-To: John Oehlert <[joehlert@FRISOLUTIONS.COM](mailto:joehlert@FRISOLUTIONS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: John Oehlert <[joehlert@FRISOLUTIONS.COM](mailto:joehlert@FRISOLUTIONS.COM)>  
Subject: Re: HIV sufferers  
Comments: To: Lance Hoffman <[lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM](mailto:lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM)>  
In-Reply-To: <008901c30e7d\$15989d50\$7301a8c0@LHOFFMAN>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Lance, et al.

I am new to the organization and the list; however I have some experience in HIV research from the clinical, long-term studies I have been involved with over the years.

From my experience, I would be astounded if someone (a) has such a publicly available list and (b) would openly share the subject contact information. HIV status is very closely guarded within the HIV "community" for many very, very good reasons.

"Privacy" doesn't even come close to covering the issues. Tremendous, and well documented, concerns regarding discrimination in employment, housing, insurance, etc. are real concerns.

I don't know if the Federal HIPPA regulations might come into play for your client but you should probably take a look at ...

<http://aspe.hhs.gov/admsimp/>

I suspect the only way you will be invited into the community is to with the help of a third party. Most of our subjects came through physicians that ran HIV-oriented practices. We begged, cajoled and pleaded for them to "introduce" our study to their HIV positive patients. It was often, just handing them a flyer and asking them to consider calling us. These Docs were putting their credibility on the line ... and their clinical practices. Not an easy thing for them to do ... they had to be convinced first that you are legit and that their patients are going to be protected ... AND that the study is worth the effort. This community has been pretty much burned out with studies and questionnaires.

The other comment is that "people with HIV" is very generic. It is not the same as "people who buy Fords." Each different sub-group has its own culture that you will have to enter.

I think your best way to get access to these individuals would be to link with an existing (on-going) study and ask the study investigator to send out the information for you. Obviously, you will have to cut a deal on the cost, etc.

Hope this helps.

John

At 11:28 AM 4/29/2003, Lance Hoffman wrote:

>Hello all. I was wondering if someone might be able to help me to  
>satisfy a request from one of my clients. A client of mine is preparing  
>to field a study on people with HIV. We have done a variety of studies  
>like this, but sample lists are usually provided to us by the client  
>(usually the end user client). In this case, however, my client is  
>without sample, and was hoping I might be able to get the sample on her  
>behalf. I have called around, but am having trouble finding people with  
>lists of HIV sufferers. Might anyone have any suggestions for me?  
>Please feel free to reply to the list or to me directly.

>  
>Thank you for any help you can offer, and I'm looking forward to seeing  
>many of you at the conference.

>  
>Best regards,

>  
>Lance Hoffman  
>Manager, Business Development  
>Opinion Access Corp. <<http://www.opinionaccess.com/>>  
>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.

>  
>-----  
>  
>-----  
>Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
>Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>



Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

## Media Release for New PIPA/Knowledge Networks Poll

While Strongly Endorsing the Iraq War  
Public Rejects a New US Role Marked By Unilateral and Military  
Approaches

Favors Withdrawing Troops From Saudi Arabia, Opposes War With Syria

Supports UN Taking the Leading Role in Economic Reconstruction of Iraq

[To view the full report and questionnaire, please go to:  
<http://www.pipa.org>]

College Park, MD: A new PIPA/Knowledge Networks poll finds that, while strongly endorsing the war with Iraq, the public does not support its momentum carrying over into a changed US role in the world. Majorities reject emphasizing a more unilateral or more militarily oriented approach to dealing with world problems in general, as well as dealing with the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Seventy-five percent approve of US policy on Iraq and Americans show more confidence than at the beginning of the war that the consequences of the war will be positive. Majorities said that, as a result of the war, Iran (68%) and Syria (62%) would be less rather than more inclined to make weapons or mass destruction, though for North Korea the response was divided.

"At the same time, the public's enthusiasm for the Iraq war is highly compartmentalized," explains Steven Kull, director of the Program on International Policy Attitudes. "There is no evidence of a spill-over into other areas." Only one in five (21%) supports the idea of going to war with Syria and two out of three (67%) want the US to pull its troops out of Saudi Arabia once Iraq is stabilized.

Asked what role the US should play in the world, the response is the same as before the war: only a small minority (12%) opted for the US being "the preeminent world leader," while an overwhelming 76% said "the US should do its share in efforts to solve international problems together with other countries." Sixty-two percent still say, "The US plays the role of world policeman more than it should." Only 38% agree that "The US has the right and even the responsibility to overthrow dictatorships."

Support for working through the UN is still strong, despite the failure to get Security Council approval for the war against Iraq. Asked, "Looking back, do you think that it was the right thing to do or a mistake for the US to have tried to get UN authorization to take military action against Iraq?" an overwhelming 88% said it was. Sixty-one percent said that in the future the US should not feel more free to use military force without UN authorization. Majorities favor the UN rather than the US taking the lead in dealing with Syria (61%), Iran (57%) and

North Korea (67%).

The public divides on whether the UN or the US should manage the development of the new Iraq government. However, clear majorities favor the UN directing humanitarian relief and economic reconstruction (57%) and continuing to manage the oil for food program (70%). Only 29% said the US military should be responsible for relief and reconstruction efforts.

Even when it comes to maintaining civil order in Iraq, 54% preferred "a UN police force of police officers from various countries" rather than the US military.

Overall, the public is showing unflagging and overwhelming support for an ambitious reconstruction effort in Iraq. Eighty-six percent said that the US has "the responsibility to remain in Iraq as long as necessary until there is a stable government," with the median estimate that this will take two years. Even when presented the argument that "We shouldn't spend money on rebuilding Iraq when we have so many problems here at home," 73% rejected it in favor of the argument that leaving Iraq "would be unwise and immoral." Expectations for what will be achieved are high: 72% said the US should not leave until a government has been elected and there are laws that protect human rights.

Despite the president's popularity, an overwhelming 77% rejected the idea that "Congress should give the president full control over the way money is spent on Iraq assistance and reconstruction," opting instead for Congress retaining oversight.

The poll was conducted with a nationwide sample of 865 respondents over April 18-22. The margin of error was plus or minus 3.5%. The poll was fielded by Knowledge Networks using its nationwide panel, which is randomly selected from the entire adult population and subsequently provided internet access. For more information about this methodology, go to [www.knowledgenetworks.com/ganp](http://www.knowledgenetworks.com/ganp).

Funding for this research was provided by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and the Ford Foundation.

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Wed, 30 Apr 2003 09:06:18 -0400  
Reply-To: "Trussell, Norman" <Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Trussell, Norman" <Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>  
Subject: Re: FW: conference comments  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Richard and Doug make good points. I am assuming that the AAPOR brain trust

negotiated the best deal it could to secure Ms. Huffington's appearance. The argument for or against her appearance and the fee is moot and counter-productive at this point. However, if the committee's intent was to create interest and stir discussion, the appearance is already a huge success, based on the 30 plus posts this week on the subject.

The news story that would be of greatest benefit would point out the hypocrisy of addressing pollsters in mass (for a fee) after advocating "refusing to talk to pollsters" in a recent interview(see below).

From AH interview in  
[http://www.motherjones.com/news/qa/2003/15/we\\_350\\_01.html](http://www.motherjones.com/news/qa/2003/15/we_350_01.html)

" MJ: So, if Poll-Free America is a serious campaign, how would refusing pollsters force our leaders to lead, as your website says?

AH: Right now most of our political leaders are spineless and addicted to following public opinion polls. And yet, the secret of pollsters is that response rates are down to 35 percent. Most people refuse to talk to pollsters, and yet upon this small and unrepresentative minority, we base an enormous amount of our public policy. I'm arguing that, since we can't do anything about reducing the demand for polls, we should do something about drying up the supply. It's an easy, small way to participate in taking back democracy, refusing to talk to pollsters. Of course, you can talk to them socially. "

Norm Trussell  
email: <mailto:norman.trussell@nielsenmedia.com>

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

From: Richard [<mailto:rmaullin@FMMA.ORG>]  
Sent: Tuesday, April 29, 2003 12:27 AM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Re: FW: conference comments

Your right about the fee, it's not much by celebrity fee standards. Bu the whole issue is changed in my opinion by the fact that it is not really a fee but a donation to a charitable group in lieu of a fee. She wins in that case and protests about her five grand seem either mean spirited or uptight. My basic point is that Huffington's criticism of polls is taken too seriously by too many in this business. She is merely giving voice to an attitude that is surely "out there," that pollsters and other viziers are dictating policy that more appropriately ought to well up from the values held by leaders and debated in the open. At least she is entertaining, and professional pollsters can play off of her celebrity status to gain some attention for the arguments that polling is a lot more subtle than its caricature would suggest and that in the real world of policy-making, opinion polling is but one of many types of information that influence policy.

Richard Maullin  
Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates

2425 Colorado Ave. Suite 180  
Santa Monica, CA 90404  
310-828-1183

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

From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM]  
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 3:31 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: FW: conference comments

Richard wrote:

>The fact Adrianna Huffing ton would get paid by AAPOR will in itself be a  
>point the press will pick up on, and in my opinion compromise her "pure"  
>status as a polling critic. Imagine this: "Anti-polling critic not above  
>accepting a fee from pollsters to push her attack on polls, SUV's, etc.  
>It's all showbiz. Of course, positioning the story before it happens would  
>help assure that someone does a take on it that way.

What's so unusual about a high-profile speaker getting a fee? The  
man-bites-dog story would be if she didn't get paid - and \$5,000  
isn't outlandish. Laura Ingraham, who's nowhere near as smart or  
interesting as AH, gets two or three times that  
<<http://www.washingtonspeakers.com/speaker.cfm/2244>>.

--

Doug Henwood  
Left Business Observer  
38 Greene St - 4th fl.  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
voice +1-212-219-0010  
fax +1-212-219-0098  
cell +1-917-865-2813  
email <<mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>>  
web <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Wed, 30 Apr 2003 08:33:53 -0500  
Reply-To: David\_Moore@GALLUP.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: David Moore <David\_Moore@GALLUP.COM>  
Subject: Re: FW: conference comments  
Comments: To: Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

I am amazed at the several comments that say this discussion is "moot" or  
"whining" or "counterproductive" or "too late." Once the announcement was  
made that Ms. Huffington was the speaker, it was already "too late" -- if by

that is meant the membership's ability to reverse the decision. The membership was not consulted on that issue, and it should not have been. But that does not mean this discussion is too late, that we should not now question the decision and its justification. The discussion has helped to clarify the conditions under which she will appear (clearly, many of us had misconceptions about that), and it has stimulated the expression of various viewpoints -- both in favor and in opposition -- that this and future Councils may want to take into consideration.

Isn't that what AAPORNET is all about?

David

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Wed, 30 Apr 2003 09:54:14 -0400  
Reply-To: "Trussell, Norman" <Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Trussell, Norman" <Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>  
Subject: Re: FW: conference comments  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

David, what I said was that the "argument against" her appearance was moot, not the discussion itself. I was not trying to say that this discussion was not of great value, but that we should turn our focus now to how to make the most of the situation. Her session will occur regardless of additional cries of protest or threats of boycotts.

Norm

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

From: David\_Moore@gallup.com [mailto:David\_Moore@gallup.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2003 9:34 AM  
To: Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM; AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: RE: FW: conference comments

I am amazed at the several comments that say this discussion is "moot" or "whining" or "counterproductive" or "too late." Once the announcement was made that Ms. Huffington was the speaker, it was already "too late" -- if by that is meant the membership's ability to reverse the decision. The membership was not consulted on that issue, and it should not have been. But that does not mean this discussion is too late, that we should not now question the decision and its justification. The discussion has helped to clarify the conditions under which she will appear (clearly, many of us had misconceptions about that), and it has stimulated the expression of various viewpoints -- both in favor and in opposition -- that this and future Councils may want to take into consideration.



Isn't that what AAPORNET is all about?

David

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Wed, 30 Apr 2003 10:02:22 -0400  
Reply-To: Stephanie Berg <[stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET](mailto:stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Stephanie Berg <[stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET](mailto:stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET)>  
Subject: Re: FW: conference comments  
Comments: To: [David\\_Moore@GALLUP.COM](mailto:David_Moore@GALLUP.COM)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I'm not sure that's a valid argument (it gets kinder, keep reading). The point we are making is that, at this time, there is little action AAPOR can take to address the protests. Had the protests been voiced early on, AAPOR may have made concessions or changes of some kind. It's not fair to judge them based on the assumption that it was too late from the very beginning -- we'll never really know.

That being said, this is an easily avoidable situation for future conferences. It appears that the selection process for conference speakers is being questioned by members, and it would be wise of AAPOR to take this issue seriously. At the very least, seeking general comment on the speaker and the honorarium before invitations are extended is in order. Whether it becomes a more formal democratic process is a more difficult question, but I believe it would be a worthy debate.

=====  
Stephanie Berg  
[stephanie.berg@verizon.net](mailto:stephanie.berg@verizon.net)  
----- Original Message -----  
From: David Moore  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2003 9:33 AM  
Subject: Re: FW: conference comments

I am amazed at the several comments that say this discussion is "moot" or "whining" or "counterproductive" or "too late." Once the announcement was made that Ms. Huffington was the speaker, it was already "too late" -- if by that is meant the membership's ability to reverse the decision. The membership was not consulted on that issue, and it should not have been. But that does not mean this discussion is too late, that we should not now question the decision and its justification. The discussion has helped to clarify the conditions under which she will appear (clearly, many of us had

misconceptions about that), and it has stimulated the expression of various viewpoints -- both in favor and in opposition -- that this and future Councils may want to take into consideration.

Isn't that what AAPORNET is all about?

David

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Wed, 30 Apr 2003 10:00:59 -0400  
Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>  
Subject: Re: FW: conference comments  
Comments: To: "Trussell, Norman" <Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

My sentiments as well, re my use of the word "whining". The discussion has been very worthwhile.

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: Trussell, Norman [mailto:Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM]  
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2003 9:54 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: FW: conference comments

David, what I said was that the "argument against" her appearance was moot, not the discussion itself. I was not trying to say that this discussion was not of great value, but that we should turn our focus now to how to make the most of the situation. Her session will occur regardless of additional cries of protest or threats of boycotts.

Norm

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

From: David\_Moore@gallup.com [mailto:David\_Moore@gallup.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2003 9:34 AM  
To: Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM; AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: RE: FW: conference comments

I am amazed at the several comments that say this discussion is "moot" or "whining" or "counterproductive" or "too late." Once the announcement was made that Ms. Huffington was the speaker, it was already "too late" -- if by that is meant the membership's ability to reverse the decision. The membership was not consulted on that issue, and it should not have been. But that does not mean this discussion is too late, that we should not now question the decision and its justification. The discussion has helped to clarify the conditions under which she will appear (clearly, many of us had misconceptions about that), and it has stimulated the expression of various viewpoints -- both in favor and in opposition -- that this and future Councils may want to take into consideration.

Isn't that what AAPORNET is all about?

David

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Wed, 30 Apr 2003 15:57:13 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: An Iraqi opinion poll - well Baghdad at least  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

NDTV opinion poll: Iraqis want Saddam punished

Tariq Aziz says Saddam Hussein is alive. If he is captured what do the people of Iraq think should be done to him? Should he be punished, set free or sent into exile? NDTV's opinion poll conducted in 25 localities spread across Baghdad and covering a large sample of 1,000 people is the first real voice of the Iraqi people.

NDTV's Iraq poll results indicate that the people of Iraq are angry with

Saddam Hussein and want him punished. According to the poll, a clear majority, 55 per cent, want to see Saddam Hussein punished. While the NDTV poll shows that a much smaller number want to spare him punishment, 17 per cent want to see him set free and another 13 per cent would like to see him exiled to another country making a total of 30 per cent who do not want him punished when he is captured.

<http://www.hinduonnet.com/thehindu/stories/2003050100821200.htm>

--

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

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Wed, 30 Apr 2003 16:19:42 -0400  
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: An Iraqi opinion poll - well Baghdad at least  
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

This is how NDTV describes its alleged methodology. Anyone who thinks = this is worth the time of day, call me collect!

POLL METHODOLOGY =20

A six member NDTV polling team led by Special Correspondents Ajai Shukla = and Sanjay Ahirwal fanned out through the city of Baghdad, covering over = 25 localities, meeting people of different religions and sects.=20

People who were still trying to cope with all the death and destruction = around them...=20

A poll would have been unthinkable under Saddam Hussain and would have = sparked off immediate arrests, perhaps even executions. But getting the = polling underway was by no means an easy task.=20

In a city completely ravaged by war, with no power, water or food, = getting even a photostat machine to get a copy of the questionnaire was = a problem, not to mention the 1000 copies that were needed for the =

exercise.=20

But the problem was solved miraculously by our translator, Ahmed Khalid = Hamdan, who took the help of an Indian company, PCP International = Limited, which was made to open its premises, while our team provided = power with a portable generator set.=20

The sample of 1,000 comprised 668 men and 332 women. While the = overwhelming majority of Iraqis are Muslims, there is a significant = proportion of Christians in Iraq and in our poll 12 per cent of the = respondents were Christians.=20

With a thousand questionnaires in hand, getting Iraqis to respond was = the next big challenge.=20

Having lived in silence for the last 25 years, the people were wary and = suspicious of the entire exercise.=20

But in the end, the people of Baghdad spoke out, and spoke out loud and = clear.=20

For years, their voices have been stilled. Now, this NDTV poll has = finally given them a chance to be heard by the international community.=20

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

From: Leo G. Simonetta [mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM]

Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2003 3:57 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: An Iraqi opinion poll - well Baghdad at least

NDTV opinion poll: Iraqis want Saddam punished

Tariq Aziz says Saddam Hussein is alive. If he is captured what do the people of Iraq think should be done to him? Should he be punished, set free or sent into exile? NDTV's opinion poll conducted in 25 localities spread across Baghdad and covering a large sample of 1,000 people is the first real voice of the Iraqi people.

NDTV's Iraq poll results indicate that the people of Iraq are angry with Saddam Hussein and want him punished. According to the poll, a clear majority, 55 per cent, want to see Saddam Hussein punished. While the NDTV poll shows that a much smaller number want to spare him punishment, 17 per cent want to see him set free and another 13 per cent would like to see him exiled to another country making a total of 30 per cent who do not want him punished when he is captured.

<http://www.hinduonnet.com/thehindu/stories/2003050100821200.htm>

--

Leo G. Simonetta

Art & Science Group, LLC

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

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Wed, 30 Apr 2003 13:10:47 -0700  
Reply-To: Christopher Moore <chrismoore77@YAHOO.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Christopher Moore <chrismoore77@YAHOO.COM>  
Subject: PATRIOT Act  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Has anyone seen any questions/data specifically addressing US public opinion on the Patriot Act (I or II)? I have only been able to find data on civil liberties in general at the Roper Center.

Thanks,  
Christopher Moore

---

Do you Yahoo!?  
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.  
<http://search.yahoo.com>

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Wed, 30 Apr 2003 22:32:18 -0400  
Reply-To: cporter@hp.ufl.edu  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Colleen Kay Porter <cporter@HP.UFL.EDU>  
Subject: IRB follow-up  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Folks:

A while back I posted about the IRB challenges of

being a social/behavioral researcher affiliated with an academic medical center. I got several very helpful comments from people, and many requested that I let everyone know how things turn out.

I have been doing a survey of dental hygienists, and since this is a profession in which lots of people keep their certification without working in the field, I had wanted to start by making a phone call to confirm their status. The IRB told me that their policy "prohibited unsolicited phone calls to recruit subjects." The PI decided to go to full board to argue his case. The board ruled without hearing from us. They did decide that we could make phone calls after all. This was frustrating because we had already given up and decided to send pre-alert letters to everyone instead, which some of you suggested was a more consistent methodological approach anyway.

But they added a phrase to the pre-alert letter about respondents contacting us if they didn't want to participate in the survey. First, this seemed overkill on top of the usual language we had. (In my experience, respondents have no problem telling us they don't want to participate!) Second, the pre-alert letter had already been approved. We were yet again frustrated by the inconsistency.

Consistency with IRB review is a big deal to most researchers. As I read through some comments from others, a few people have to deal with time frames (up to a month in advance) and paperwork that might seem cumbersome. But in these cases, the researchers are pretty content, because they know what to expect and understand the rules of the game. They have to jump through hoops, but then they are assured that the projects will be approved, so they can map out a reliable schedule.

Those of us who feel like we are playing Quidditch without being able to read any of the Harry Potter books tend to be less satisfied with the responsiveness of the IRB.

And in my recent bout with the IRB, at no time did a trained survey researcher review our plans, which is also a problem.

In the past few weeks, of course, we have been trying to deal with HIPAA as well as the usual OHRP requirements. During a break at one of our

meetings, a bunch of faculty were trying to decide the HIPAA requirements for our various projects, and even though I had brought along the training materials which we were provided, there was no agreement.

Rather than let things simmer until we were out of compliance, I contacted the training coordinator for our IRB, which also serves as the privacy board, and convinced her that it would be easier to come to our department and spend an hour with us doing Q and A than to answer 27 phone calls. So I set up a meeting for next week, and the faculty are all very amazed and grateful, and other social-type researchers have asked to come as well.

In addition, I attended a routine IRB workshop about the new forms that are being implemented, and they mentioned that they would like volunteers to give feedback on the forms. Their past practice had been to show them only to the biggest users (Oncology) but recent complaints had helped them appreciate that a strictly clinical model may not work for everyone.

Well, I sent email and told the director that not only could I represent the social sciences in such an evaluation effort, but I had training in visual design. He was very positive and said that given my training, there were some other projects for which he might want my input as well.

So I am hopeful that the HIPAA meeting next week and my interactions on improving the forms will help the IRB staff better understand us social science types.

Many of us here at the Health Science Center think that review of surveys and such ought to go through the main campus IRB, since they have the expertise to really judge. That may eventually happen. Or maybe they will get someone with training in this area to serve on our IRB.

Thanks again for all your encouragement and insights.

Oh, one more thing...we did make phone calls, but between waves of questionnaires rather than at the beginning. Due to the delay caused by the IRB ruckus in January, this put us making calls during term paper season for our grad students. So I had to pitch in and make some of



the calls myself. Since I started in this business as an interviewer, this shouldn't have been hard. Like riding a bike, right? Overall, I was pretty effective and generally enjoyed the conversations. But a few times I found myself getting to the fourth ring of the phone call and thinking, "I hope they don't answer; I don't want to talk to one more person tonight." I remembered having that same thought when I was a professional interviewer. The experience was a reminder to me of how hard that job is!

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter  
Project Coordinator, University of Florida  
cporter@hp.ufl.edu  
\*\*\*AT OUR NEW OFFICE & PHONE NUMBER\*\*  
phone: 352/273-6068  
Department of Health Services Administration  
Location: 101 Newell Drive, Rm. 4136  
US Mail: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>