

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 LOG0305"

---

Date: Thu, 1 May 2003 04:45:50 -0500  
Reply-To: ALLAN L MCCUTCHEON <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: ALLAN L MCCUTCHEON <amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU>  
Subject: Last Call for Zurich  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Dear AAPOR Members,

Sibylle Hardmeier has asked me to announce that there is still space available for you to attend the WAPOR Regional Seminar in Zurich, Switzerland in June. Please see the announcement on WAPOR's website at:

<http://www.unl.edu/wapor/conferences.html#Zurich>

Also take note of the final program. This promises to be very interesting seminar in a stunning location. Registration forms are also available on the website.

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Thu, 1 May 2003 09:58:43 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Follow-up on that Virginia Polling Law/Case  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Prosecutor To Probe Survey by Va. Sheriff  
Prince William Official May Have Violated Law  
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A62765-2003Apr30.html>

By Steven Ginsberg  
Washington Post Staff Writer  
Thursday, May 1, 2003; Page B01

Prince William County Commonwealth's Attorney Paul B. Ebert has appointed a special prosecutor to investigate whether a poll commissioned last month by Democratic Sheriff E. Lee Stoffregen III, who is running for reelection, violated state law.

SNIP

The penalty for violating the election law is \$2,500.

SNIP

Stoffregen's campaign manager, Craig Bieber, has said he was unaware of the three-year-old law when he commissioned the poll. Bieber and Stoffregen also contend that any blame should lie with the polling firm, Hamilton, Beattie and Staff, because it should have been aware of the regulations.

"I didn't even know the poll was being conducted," Stoffregen said. "If and when I do mess up and have a mistake, I'll certainly take the blame for it."

The poll surveyed 400 county residents over several days last month, asking them their opinions of Stoffregen, Collier and the Republican candidate for sheriff, Glendell Hill. People who were polled said the half-hour survey also gauged their feelings about the sheriff's efforts to expand the powers of his office.

SNIP

In their campaigns Collier, a county police officer, and Hill, the county jail superintendent, have pledged that under their leadership, the sheriff's department would cease those activities. Of the investigation, Collier said he is sure a violation has occurred.

"Whether they're ignorant of the law or the polling company hired is unaware is not really an issue," he said. "Ultimately, he is responsible for it."

"Certainly the sheriff has got to take responsibility for what happened," Hill said. "We are law enforcement people, and we arrest people every day and certainly we're not above the law."

C 2003 The Washington Post Company

--

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

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Thu, 1 May 2003 11:05:46 -0400

Reply-To: Corinne Kirchner <corinne@AFB.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Corinne Kirchner <corinne@AFB.NET>  
Subject: Re: HIV sufferers  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Hi Folks (I just realized that I had sent this message only to John Oehlert but intended it for the list)-

I found John's explanation about accessing people with HIV for research to be very interesting and sensitive to the issues of privacy, and beyond. I'd like to add another caution, which I am sensitive to as a result of working in the area of disabilities; I'm not sure if it holds within the HIV activist community as well, but I am guessing it does. This has to do with the term "HIV sufferers." The attribution of "suffering" (and the pity approach implied by the term) is likely to be resented by people with HIV or those close to them, because it does not allow for the richness and variety of people's lives. This is increasingly the case as medications are allowing more people with HIV (at least, in the U.S.) to survive longer with few or no functional limitations or acute illness. But even for those people who do have such limitations, the term "sufferers" implies more than one should assume.

I hope this is helpful; I believe the issue goes beyond mere "political correctness" although I realize some AAPORites may view the issue that way.

Best,  
Corinne

Corinne Kirchner, Ph.D.  
Director of Policy Research & Program Evaluation  
American Foundation for the Blind 212-502-7640

At 01:15 PM 4/29/2003 -0700, you wrote:

>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



If you're interested, please drop me a line at deanec@washpost.com and let me know if there's a particular event you want to photograph (ie, the plenary) or if you're open to suggestions.

Thanks much--

Claudia Deane  
Associate Chair, Publications

-----  
Conference early registration deadline: April 28!  
Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Sat, 3 May 2003 11:02:59 -0400  
Reply-To: jtanur@NOTES.CC.SUNYSB.EDU  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Judith Tanur <jtanur@NOTES.CC.SUNYSB.EDU>  
Subject: helo...  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Hi. A colleague of mine raises the following question about a data set dealing with sexual harrassment. If anyone can help him, both he and I would be grateful. You can reply to me or directly to him. Thanks, Judy  
----- Forwarded by Judith Tanur/CAS on 05/03/03 11:06 AM -----

MichaelSKimmel  
<MichaelSKimmel@compuserve.com> To: Judy Tanur  
<jtanur@notes.cc.sunysb.edu>  
cc:  
Subject: helo...  
05/03/03 07:37 AM

Judy:

I need a little help locating a potential data set.

>

>You know that big study produced by the military in 2000 on sexual  
>harassment in the military. Well, I'm looking for a data set that would  
>have similar, and comparable questions on sexual orientation harassment in  
>civilian life -- to sort of try and compare the levels of harassment in  
>military and non-military settings.

>

>I don't think GSS data will have it. Do you know where we might find such  
>studies?

>

>I need to get some sense of what sorts of data sets are out there within a

>week, so please do reply soon...

Thanks.

Michael

\*\*\*\*\*

Michael Kimmel

Brooklyn, NY

michaelskimmel@compuserve.com

www.michaelkimmel.com

---

Conference early registration deadline: April 28!

Conference info: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

---

Date: Sat, 3 May 2003 08:44:07 -0400

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

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

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

Subject: Re: conference comments

Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>

In-Reply-To: <5.2.1.1.2.20030428163918.00bbc688@mail.mindspring.com>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I too find it outrageous and tragic. Her only qualification is that she is a poll basher. AAPOR plenary session is really not the platform. We have heard all she has to say on cable TV. What more? Do we need such people lecturing us in an annual conference, which we all look forward to attend? I respectfully disagree with the representatives who made this decision. =20

Second, what=92s with the \$5K fee? I see that as appalling when I see only minimal effort by AAPOR to encourage youngsters or the next generation or honor veterans like Bud Roper. =20

In this tough economy, entrepreneurs like me scrounge around to make it somehow to the conference because I see it as an important annual meeting professionally. Personally speaking, I feel the action downright offensive and disrespectful when I see AAPOR throwing the money out of the window. =20

While Mr. Ehrlich is trying to give it a positive spin, that's all it is. If he REALLY desires to have a meaningful engagement and dialogue with her there may be other appropriate venues such as a seminar/colloquium at his University or elsewhere.=20

Would some of those who made the decision stand-up and give a convincing reply to these postings? =20

Raghavan Mayur

President, TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence/TIPP

Director, Investor's Business Daily/TIPP Poll,=20

Christian Science Monitor/TIPP Poll

P: 201-986-1288

F: 201-986-0119

=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky

Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 4:44 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: conference comments

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>

-----

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====

Date: Mon, 5 May 2003 08:41:49 -0400

Reply-To: "Trussell, Norman" <[Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM](mailto:Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM)>

Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>

From: "Trussell, Norman" <[Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM](mailto:Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM)>

Subject: AAPOR Conference Golf Outing Last Call for Golfers

MIME-version: 1.0

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

To fellow conference attendees:

We still have limited space available for our outing at the Hermitage Golf Course(<http://www.hermitagegolf.com/>) on Thursday morning, 5/15. If you would like to play and have not contacted me previously, please do so no later than this Wednesday, 5/7. Please excuse the intrusion if not interested.

If interested, contact me directly  
email: [norman.trussell@nielsenmedia.com](mailto:norman.trussell@nielsenmedia.com)  
phone: 727-773-4318

Please do not reply to this message or post to AAPORnet.

What: Annual AAPOR Golf Outing  
When: May 15, 2003. First tee time: 7:00am  
Where: Hermitage Golf Course, 3939 Old Hickory Blvd., Old Hickory, TN 37138  
Cost: \$56 plus tax including GPS equipped cart or \$40 plus tax for walkers.

Thanks, and best wishes ...

Norm Trussell  
Lead Research Analyst  
Methodological Research Dept.  
Nielsen Media Research  
375 Patricia Avenue, Dunedin, FL 34698-8190  
Phone: (727)773-4318

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Mon, 5 May 2003 09:18:53 -0400  
Reply-To: Ed Freeland <[efreelan@PRINCETON.EDU](mailto:efreelan@PRINCETON.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Ed Freeland <[efreelan@PRINCETON.EDU](mailto:efreelan@PRINCETON.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I applaud the decision to invite Ms. Huffington to speak at the conference. It would be a mistake for our profession to ignore the leading spokesperson for the way in which public opinion research is perceived by a significant number of Americans. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to realize that declining response rates are about more than just call blocking technology: many people out there do not understand what we do and see no value in it. And it is naive to assume that this is not relevant to the future of our profession. I hope that the plenary session will be an important step toward a better and more widely shared understanding of the role of public opinion research in maintaining a healthy democracy. Bring it on.

Ed Freeland

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Mon, 5 May 2003 09:58:53 -0400  
Reply-To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
Comments: To: Ed Freeland <efreelan@PRINCETON.EDU>  
In-Reply-To: <3EB664BD.668C8377@princeton.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

And, there is just the outside chance that her interchange with AAPOR members at the conference might help her to better understand what polling is all about and it's importance and relevance to our society. She is an opinion leader in many important circles and, hopefully, her more positive take on public opinion research might help promote a more positive, productive public view of polling.

Dick Halpern

09:18 AM 5/5/2003 -0400, you wrote:

>I applaud the decision to invite Ms. Huffington to speak at the conference.  
>It would be a mistake for our profession to ignore the leading spokesperson  
>for the way in which public opinion research is perceived by a significant  
>number of Americans. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to realize that  
>declining response rates are about more than just call blocking technology:  
>many people out there do not understand what we do and see no value in it.  
>And it is naive to assume that this is not relevant to the future of our  
>profession. I hope that the plenary session will be an important step toward  
>a better and more widely shared understanding of the role of public opinion  
>research in maintaining a healthy democracy. Bring it on.  
>  
>Ed Freeland

\*\* \*\*

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Mon, 5 May 2003 10:21:52 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Surveyed immigrants mostly back Iraq war: Poll conducted in  
native languages finds support lower than in general population  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

While it is referred to as a New California Media poll it does not yet appear at their website:

[http://news.ncmonline.com/news/view\\_alt\\_category.html?category\\_id=95`](http://news.ncmonline.com/news/view_alt_category.html?category_id=95)

Surveyed immigrants mostly back Iraq war

Poll conducted in native languages finds support lower than in general population

<http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2003/05/05/MN139042.DTL>

Christian Berthelsen, Chronicle Staff Writer Monday, May 5, 2003

A majority of immigrants in the United States support the recent war in Iraq, but at significantly lower levels than the population at large, according to the results of a public opinion poll to be released today.

SNIP

The national poll of 1,000 immigrants from Asia, the Middle East and Latin America was conducted by Bendixen & Associates, a Latino-focused consulting group based in Miami, for New California Media, a group of 400 ethnic newspapers and broadcast and online outlets, and the University of Southern California's Annenberg Institute for Justice and Journalism.

The majority of respondents were interviewed in their native languages of Mandarin, Cantonese, Vietnamese, Korean, Tagalog, Hindi, Arabic, Persian, Urdu and Spanish. The survey's backers say they were motivated to take the poll because non-fluent English speakers are often passed over for participation in public opinion polls, and thus their views are underrepresented.

The poll was conducted April 16-24, following the fall of Baghdad and the end of major U.S. military operations in Iraq. As a benchmark, the groups compared their results with an April 14 survey by ABC News and the Washington Post, which found that 78 percent of Americans supported the military action in the Middle East, while 20 percent opposed it. The New California Media survey found wide differentials within the immigrant community in attitudes about the war, and even among different ethnic groups from the same part of the world. Vietnamese and Filipinos, for instance, were fervent supporters of U.S. action even above the level of the general population, while Koreans were more skeptical.

By comparison, the study found that 61 percent of Asians supported the war compared with 27 percent opposed, and that 50 percent of Latin Americans -- most of them from Mexico -- supported the war while 33 percent opposed it. The division was greatest among Middle Easterners, with 44 percent supporting the war but 41 percent opposing it.

SNIP

Bendixen said 95 percent of Chinese, Vietnamese and Koreans had been

interviewed in their native languages, as well as 80 percent of Latinos and 70 percent of Iranians. Among Asian Indians, Pakistanis, Filipinos and some Arab groups, about 50 percent were interviewed in their home tongue. The remainder were conducted in English.

E-mail Christian Berthelsen at [cberthelsen@sfchronicle.com](mailto:cberthelsen@sfchronicle.com).

--

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 info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Mon, 5 May 2003 10:27:07 -0400  
Reply-To: Lance Hoffman <[lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM](mailto:lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Lance Hoffman <[lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM](mailto:lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM)>  
Organization: Opinion Access Corp.  
Subject: Gordon Black quote  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Hello, all. I remember sometime in the past year reading an article which quoted Gordon Black, President of Harris Interactive, as saying that if you want to do a lengthy interview, then telephone would be his recommended methodology. Might anyone recall where this article may have appeared so I can site the source? I have tried looking for it, but I can't seem to find it.

Any help that anyone can provide on this would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks!

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 info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Mon, 5 May 2003 09:32:15 -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: conference comments  
In-Reply-To: <[5.2.1.1.2.20030505095235.02152dd0@mail.atl.bellsouth.net](mailto:5.2.1.1.2.20030505095235.02152dd0@mail.atl.bellsouth.net)>  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Although the subject of having Ms. Huffington has caused a lively and perhaps comprehensive discussion, I would like to again separate the issues of whether we should have a controversial speaker (academic, non-academic, media, political, whatever) and whether we should pay for a speaker. Is it the case that academic conferences never pay, and professional conferences (MDs, for example) do? Or am I just wrong about this?

Perhaps the committee that made the decision could enlighten us by telling us how often AAPOR has paid for a speaker, and what the thinking is about paying for speakers at this and future conferences.

Cynthia Nelson  
Center for Governmental Studies  
Northern Illinois University  
DeKalb, IL 60115  
Voice 815.753.1918  
Fax 815.753.2305  
email [cnelson@niu.edu](mailto:cnelson@niu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Mon, 5 May 2003 10:35:52 -0400  
Reply-To: Stephanie Berg <[stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET](mailto:stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET)>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Stephanie Berg <stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
Comments: To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8BIT

I'd argue that an AAPOR plenary session is a wonderful way to engage Ms. Huffington. As others have rightly pointed out, non-response is only aspect if of a greater issue. Like it or not, the polling community is experiencing an image problem.

Every day, pollsters use their skills and experience to advise clients on how to deal with image problems. Frequently, we have push our clients to confront an issue rather than silently hope it will dissappear. Shouldn't we follow the advice we so often provide? It's time we put personal sentiment and emotional reactions towards Ms. Huffington aside. Regardless of her unqualified bashing of the polling community, she is a highly recognized and often highly-respected public figure and should be acknowledged. I don't need remind anyone on this list that public perception is essentially reality.

An AAPOR plenary session is both a respectful and open-minded way to engage her directly, and lure in a little press while doing it.

Main Entry: ple·na·ry  
Pronunciation: 'plE-n&-rE, 'ple-  
Function: adjective  
Etymology: Middle English, from Late Latin plenarius, from Latin plenus full -- more at FULL  
Date: 15th century  
1 : complete in every respect

=====  
Stephanie Berg  
Research Manager  
Network Solutions  
stephanie.berg@verizon.net

----- Original Message -----  
From: dick halpern  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Sent: Monday, May 05, 2003 9:58 AM  
Subject: Re: conference comments

And, there is just the outside chance that her interchange with AAPOR members at the conference might help her to better understand what polling is all about and it's importance and relevance to our society. She is an opinion leader in many important circles and, hopefully, her more positive take on public opinion research might help promote a more positive, productive public view of polling.



Dick Halpern

09:18 AM 5/5/2003 -0400, you wrote:

>I applaud the decision to invite Ms. Huffington to speak at the conference.

>It would be a mistake for our profession to ignore the leading spokesperson

>for the way in which public opinion research is perceived by a significant

>number of Americans. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to realize that

>declining response rates are about more than just call blocking technology:

>many people out there do not understand what we do and see no value in it.

>And it is naive to assume that this is not relevant to the future of our

>profession. I hope that the plenary session will be an important step toward

>a better and more widely shared understanding of the role of public opinion

>research in maintaining a healthy democracy. Bring it on.

>

>Ed Freeland

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

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Mon, 5 May 2003 09:51:36 -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: conference comments

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Arriana's last diatribe about poll accuracy - her column after the November election - was simply flat-out wrong. She should be asked to respond to this.

The Pollsters Can't Hear The Silent Majority Filed November 14, 2002

"I'm still trying to figure out who had a more wretched Election Night 2002, the Democratic Party or America's pollsters. While Democrats lost

control of the Senate, they will live to fight another election day. Pollsters, on the other hand, in losing what scraps of credibility they had, may -- with a little help from the public -- find their entire profession obsolete, gone the way of chimney sweeps, organ pumpers, and those guys who used to make buggy whips."

[Specifically:] "And in race after race, pre-election polls proved as reliable as the iceberg spotter on the Titanic."

The short answer to Arriana (and to others) appears below - along with a link to the NCPP for the release and spreadsheet analysis.

<http://www.pollingreport.com/ncpp1.htm>

Nick

dick halpern wrote:

>  
> And, there is just the outside chance that her interchange with AAPOR  
> members at the conference might help her to better understand what polling  
> is all about and it's importance and relevance to our society. She is an  
> opinion leader in many important circles and, hopefully, her more positive  
> take on public opinion research might help promote a more positive,  
> productive public view of polling.  
>  
> Dick Halpern  
>  
> 09:18 AM 5/5/2003 -0400, you wrote:  
> >I applaud the decision to invite Ms. Huffington to speak at the conference.  
> >It would be a mistake for our profession to ignore the leading spokesperson  
> >for the way in which public opinion research is perceived by a significant  
> >number of Americans. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to realize that  
> >declining response rates are about more than just call blocking technology:  
> >many people out there do not understand what we do and see no value in it.  
> >And it is naive to assume that this is not relevant to the future of our  
> >profession. I hope that the plenary session will be an important step  
toward  
> >a better and more widely shared understanding of the role of public opinion  
> >research in maintaining a healthy democracy. Bring it on.

> >  
> >Ed Freeland

>  
> \*\* \*\* \*\* \*\*

>  
> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Sat, 3 May 2003 11:59:53 -0400

Reply-To: "Raghavan K. Mayur" <mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Raghavan K. Mayur" <mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
Comments: To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>  
In-Reply-To: <5.2.1.1.2.20030505095235.02152dd0@mail.atl.bellsouth.net>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I respectfully disagree with your take for the following reasons:

I think that the venue is just inappropriate. Does she need to speak at the plenary session "to better understand what polling is all about and it's importance and relevance to our society" Couldn't the same thing be achieved by engaging her in a dialogue in a panel discussion/forum more appropriate -- a university seminar or colloquium? Has anyone tried that before?

You say "She is an opinion leader in many important circles and, hopefully, her more positive take on public opinion research might help promote a more positive, productive public view of polling."

Could you say more specifically who belong to these "important circles"? How has AAPOR been reaching these circles in the past? It is disappointing that it has to come to this to disseminate positive view of the polling profession. For one thing, we as polling professionals should rely more on the quality of work we put out -- which should speak volumes and thereby build public trust and confidence -- rather than a T.V. pundit's world view.

What is distressing is that the logic such as this leads one to believe that we are seeking some "external" ratification -- at a cost of \$5K hoping a plenary speech would achieve this.

Raghavan Mayur  
President, TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence  
Director, Investor's Business Daily/TIPP Poll  
The Christian Science Monitor/TIPP Poll  
P: 201-986-1288

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of dick halpern  
Sent: Monday, May 05, 2003 9:59 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: conference comments

And, there is just the outside chance that her interchange with AAPOR members at the conference might help her to better understand what polling is all about and it's importance and relevance to our society. She is an opinion leader in many important circles and, hopefully, her more positive take on public opinion research might help promote a more positive,

productive public view of polling.

Dick Halpern

09:18 AM 5/5/2003 -0400, you wrote:

>I applaud the decision to invite Ms. Huffington to speak at the conference.  
>It would be a mistake for our profession to ignore the leading spokesperson  
>for the way in which public opinion research is perceived by a significant  
>number of Americans. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to realize that  
>declining response rates are about more than just call blocking technology:  
>many people out there do not understand what we do and see no value in it.  
>And it is naive to assume that this is not relevant to the future of our  
>profession. I hope that the plenary session will be an important step toward  
>a better and more widely shared understanding of the role of public opinion  
>research in maintaining a healthy democracy. Bring it on.  
>  
>Ed Freeland

\*\* \*\*

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Mon, 5 May 2003 11:28:19 -0400  
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <[cporter@HP.UFL.EDU](mailto:cporter@HP.UFL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Colleen Porter <[cporter@HP.UFL.EDU](mailto:cporter@HP.UFL.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I can see the many sides of this issue. But for me, I have to admit that part of my disappointment with this speaker is that I don't want to "waste" precious AAPOR conference time having to defend public opinion research.

I mean, that's what I do in real life. I spend a lot of time explaining and defending our methods to clients, my newspaper editor, the faculty in my college, etc. I am the only survey specialist where I work, and I am held personally responsible for every use and misuse of survey data, from the latest outrageous USA Today graphic to the new study on how many people can't afford prescription medicine.

For me, the AAPOR conference has always been a time to take a break from all that, to be with people who speak my language and understand what I do. It was a time of connecting with peers and growing stronger through being together (like the coals in the barbecue grill).

So this is like--ugh! Even the sacred halls of the AAPOR conference do not allow a respite!

I'll go, and it will be interesting. But I don't expect it to be as relaxing as past sessions.

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 info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

---

Date: Mon, 5 May 2003 09:36:37 -0700  
Reply-To: Jon Cohen <cohen@PPIC.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jon Cohen <cohen@PPIC.ORG>  
Subject: POSITION ANNOUNCEMENT: Research Associate  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

The Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) is a private, nonprofit organization dedicated to improving public policy in California through independent, objective, nonpartisan research. The institute was established in 1994 with an endowment from William R. Hewlett. PPIC is located in San Francisco, California.

Position Summary<?xml:namespace prefix = o ns =

"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />

This Research Associate position supports PPIC's ongoing public opinion survey series about Californians' attitudes toward political, social, and economic issues.

## Responsibilities

- \* Perform all data management activities associated with a survey research project, including:
  - \* Designing survey instruments
  - \* Coding and weighting data files
  - \* Applying appropriate statistical methods in analyzing data
  - \* Preparing tables, graphs, and charts.
- \* Organize and maintain the survey question database, including all internal information and related state and national survey data.
- \* Design and update the cumulative data files, and codebooks.
- \* Provide editorial support for survey reports, including error checking.
- \* Monitor surveys in the field, and track daily survey diagnostics.
- \* Use initiative in contributing to the research project.
- \* Perform administrative responsibilities as required.

## Qualifications

- \* Minimum BA/BS degree in a social science (economics, statistics, public policy, political science, etc.) or equivalent experience.
- \* Experience in quantitative empirical research.
- \* Proven analytical ability, and ability to work with large data sets.
- \* Solid computer skills (statistical package - preferably SPSS and WinCross; Microsoft Access; Microsoft Office; HTML/Internet).
- \* Excellent written and verbal communication skills.
- \* Deep interest in public opinion research.
- \* Spanish language skills are a plus.

To apply: Please send your cover letter and resume to: [resumes@ppic.org](mailto:resumes@ppic.org)  
<<mailto:resumes@ppic.org>> .

<<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>>

Jonathan Cohen  
Survey Research Manager  
Public Policy Institute of California  
500 Washington Street, Suite 800  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Tel: 415.291.4437  
Fax: 415.291.4401  
cohen@ppic.org

Any opinions expressed in this message are those of the author alone and do not necessarily reflect any position of the Public Policy Institute of California.

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Mon, 5 May 2003 13:13:24 -0400  
Reply-To: "Lawrence T. McGill" <[lmcgill@PRINCETON.EDU](mailto:lmcgill@PRINCETON.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Lawrence T. McGill" <[lmcgill@PRINCETON.EDU](mailto:lmcgill@PRINCETON.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
Comments: To: Colleen Porter <[cporter@HP.UFL.EDU](mailto:cporter@HP.UFL.EDU)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

This has been a fascinating discussion to watch unfold, and I have to admit that my own thinking about the invitation of Ms. Huffington has undergone some movement since the discussion began, a validation for me of the value of AAPORNET. My own bias is towards the widest possible expression of divergent opinions, so I have little difficulty with the idea of inviting Ms. Huffington to speak at the plenary session (to be followed by a distinguished panel of commentators, it should be remembered). I'm not sure how I feel about the use of AAPOR funds to secure her as a speaker--I remain open-minded about that for the moment.

What does concern me, though, is a thought that was prompted by Colleen's posting. It occurs to me that we will have to be on our "best behavior" during the plenary session, so as not to become unwitting fodder for subsequent columns she is bound to write following her AAPOR appearance. Perhaps we can do nothing anyway to affect what she chooses to write about public opinion polling after the conference. But my hope is that the impression of AAPOR she comes away with from the conference is one that causes her pause before lashing out at the public opinion polling community in a future column.

I've met Arianna Huffington and found her to be surprisingly well-spoken and thoughtful. She has even written some things I agree with. She may surprise us both with what she has to say at the conference and afterwards.

Larry McGill

Colleen Porter wrote:

> I can see the many sides of this issue. But for me, I have to admit  
> that part of my disappointment with this speaker is that I don't want to  
> "waste" precious AAPOR conference time having to defend public opinion

> research.  
>  
> I mean, that's what I do in real life. I spend a lot of time  
> explaining and defending our methods to clients, my newspaper editor,  
> the faculty in my college, etc. I am the only survey specialist where I  
> work, and I am held personally responsible for every use and misuse of  
> survey data, from the latest outrageous USA Today graphic to the new  
> study on how many people can't afford prescription medicine.  
>  
> For me, the AAPOR conference has always been a time to take a break  
> from all that, to be with people who speak my language and understand  
> what I do. It was a time of connecting with peers and growing stronger  
> through being together (like the coals in the barbecue grill).  
>  
> So this is like--ugh! Even the sacred halls of the AAPOR conference do  
> not allow a respite!  
>  
> I'll go, and it will be interesting. But I don't expect it to be as  
> relaxing as past sessions.  
>  
> 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 info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Mon, 5 May 2003 11:41:05 -0700  
Reply-To: Victoria Albright <[albright@FIELD.COM](mailto:albright@FIELD.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Victoria Albright <[albright@FIELD.COM](mailto:albright@FIELD.COM)>  
Subject: Questionnaire to test changes in language skills  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Hi, All!

We are developing a questionnaire to administer to children (3-7) who are being tutored in English language skills. We want to see if the tutoring is helping them improve their language skills quicker or better than if



they did not have the tutoring. (The kids are native Spanish speakers in school in California.)

It would be helpful to see and learn about other questionnaires that were developed for this purpose. Anyone have any suggestions for instruments they thought were particularly good at measuring children's transition from Spanish to English?

Many thanks, -Vicky

Victoria Albright  
Research Director  
Field Research Corporation  
415 392 5763  
albright@field.com

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

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Mon, 5 May 2003 16:35:23 -0600  
Reply-To: Quin Monson <Quin.Monson@BYU.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Quin Monson <Quin.Monson@BYU.EDU>  
Subject: 2002 VNS data  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I've seen some discussion on AAPORNET and the media of the breakdown of the 2002 VNS. However, I don't recall seeing any information about the status of the 2002 data. For anyone who has any information, I'm interested to know the following:

=20

1. Did the problems at VNS in 2002 affect the quality of the data?  
As far as I know the system for compiling the data on election day failed. My assumption is that the sampling was sound and the questionnaires were administered correctly, but that the problems were with the data entry system on election day.=20
2. Where are the data (or the completed questionnaires) and who has ownership?
3. Is anything being done to make the data publicly available?  
Will the data ever be compiled and made available through the Roper

Center and/or ICPSR as they have been in the past?

=20

I've heard enough lamenting about the loss of the 2002 VNS data to suggest that there are many people that would like access it. Now that VNS has been disbanded I'm not even sure who to make an inquiry with about what if anything will be done.

=20

Thanks for any information you can provide. =20

=20

Quin Monson

=20

=20

=20

=3D

Quin Monson

Assistant Director

Center for the Study of Elections and Democracy

Brigham Young University

Email: [Quin.Monson@byu.edu](mailto:Quin.Monson@byu.edu)

Phone: 801-422-8017

Fax: 801-422-0579

<http://csed.byu.edu>

=20

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Mon, 5 May 2003 18:59:38 -0400  
Reply-To: [HOneill536@AOL.COM](mailto:HOneill536@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Harry O'Neill <[HOneill536@AOL.COM](mailto:HOneill536@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
MIME-version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Raghavan Mayur's comments are right on target. I can't believe that her appearance will do anything but give her more grist for her polling bashing mill. If proven wrong, I'll be delighted to admit it.

Harry O'Neill

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 7 May 2003 10:55:31 -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: Disturbing if accurate  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

[http://www.enquirer.com/editions/2003/05/07/loc\\_oh-voinovich07.html](http://www.enquirer.com/editions/2003/05/07/loc_oh-voinovich07.html)

Tax foes take on Ohio senator  
Voinovich finds fault with poll

By Carl Weiser  
Enquirer Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON - An anti-tax group released a poll Tuesday showing that Ohio Republicans are so angry at Sen. George Voinovich for his stand against President Bush's tax cut that they would support other Republicans for the Senate next year, including Secretary of State Ken Blackwell.

Voinovich's office and a moderate Republican group dismissed the poll as a "push poll," meaning it was not scientifically valid and was designed to pull desired answers from people using misleading questions.

SNIP

The Republican Main Street Partnership, a group of moderate Republicans, said the Club for Growth was grandstanding and looking for media coverage.

"The poll was a farce," said the partnership's executive director, Sarah Chamberlain Resnick.

In Maine, where the Club for Growth did an identical poll against fellow tax-cut rebel Olympia Snowe, people who didn't give the right answers were screened out, she said.

"Hung up on. If they didn't get the answer they wanted to hear, you were done," she said. She didn't know if the same thing happened in Ohio. The Club for Growth's Keating called Resnick's charges untrue and "weird."

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 info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Wed, 7 May 2003 14:01:48 -0400  
Reply-To: "Chun, Young" <YChun@AIR.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Chun, Young" <YChun@AIR.ORG>  
Subject: Proactive measures in wake of tornadoes in Conference state  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

In the wake of recent tornados devastating midwest including  
Tennessee, AAPOR conference state, are there any measures for  
AAPORites to be proactive to help each other?

Young Chun, Senior Research Scientist

American Institutes for Research  
"More than 50 years of behavioral/social science research"  
1990 K Street, NW Suite 500  
Washington DC 20006

voice: 202 944 5325  
FAX: 202 737 4918

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

From: Leo G. Simonetta [mailto:[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)]  
Sent: Wednesday, May 07, 2003 10:56 AM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Disturbing if accurate

[http://www.enquirer.com/editions/2003/05/07/loc\\_oh-voinovich07.html](http://www.enquirer.com/editions/2003/05/07/loc_oh-voinovich07.html)

Tax foes take on Ohio senator  
Voinovich finds fault with poll

By Carl Weiser  
Enquirer Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON - An anti-tax group released a poll Tuesday showing that Ohio Republicans are so angry at Sen. George Voinovich for his stand against President Bush's tax cut that they would support other Republicans for the Senate next year, including Secretary of State Ken Blackwell.

Voinovich's office and a moderate Republican group dismissed the poll as a "push poll," meaning it was not scientifically valid and was designed to pull desired answers from people using misleading questions.

SNIP

The Republican Main Street Partnership, a group of moderate Republicans, said the Club for Growth was grandstanding and looking for media coverage.

"The poll was a farce," said the partnership's executive director, Sarah Chamberlain Resnick.

In Maine, where the Club for Growth did an identical poll against fellow tax-cut rebel Olympia Snowe, people who didn't give the right answers were screened out, she said.

"Hung up on. If they didn't get the answer they wanted to hear, you were done," she said. She didn't know if the same thing happened in Ohio. The Club for Growth's Keating called Resnick's charges untrue and "weird."

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 info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Wed, 7 May 2003 15:56:24 -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: The 77 Percent Solution  
MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

The LATimes Poll mentioned below asked the following question "There is evidence that Iran is developing nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. Do you think the U.S. should or should not take military action against Iran if they continue to develop these weapons?" While I couldn't find the wording of the Gallup question that she mentions she does say it was a week later and asked about an invasion rather than the less strident military action.

The 77 Percent Solution

<http://www.ariannaonline.com/columns/files/050703.html>

SNIP

"But let's put aside for the moment the ludicrousness of basing anything on increasingly inaccurate opinion polls -- with their plummeting response rates, laughably small samplings and precision-flouting margins of error, these things are becoming less reliable than Rob on "Survivor: The Amazon" -- and take a closer look at the latest numbers. You'll see that the president isn't flying anywhere near as high as Karl Rove would like us to believe."

SNIP

" Take the case of a Los Angeles Times poll conducted during the early days of the Iraq invasion. According to the survey -- which was based on the responses of 745 people obviously lacking caller ID -- 50 percent of Americans were in favor of expanding the fighting in the Middle East to include Iran if it continued to develop nuclear weapons. Pretty impressive. And utterly dubious. Just one week after the L.A. Times' headline-grabbing findings, a Gallup poll on the same subject came up with wildly contradictory results, determining that a whopping 69 percent of Americans opposed an invasion of Iran -- even if it was proven to be developing WMDs or aiding terrorists."

--

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 info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Wed, 7 May 2003 16:39:01 -0500  
Reply-To: Frank\_Newport@GALLUP.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Frank Newport <Frank\_Newport@GALLUP.COM>  
Subject: Re: The 77 Percent Solution  
Comments: To: simonetta@ARTSCI.COM  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

The column quoted below is another example of why I think there is opposition in some quarters to Huffington's appearance at AAPOR. There is a legitimate question about what scientific professionals gain from hearing poorly thought out and uninformed layperson criticisms of their procedures.

In fact, when considered thoughtfully, there is a great deal of positive understanding we gain from comparing the LA Times question with the Gallup question re invading Iran.

LA Times April 2-3

"There is evidence that Iran is developing nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. Do you think the U.S. should or should not take military action against Iran if they continue to develop these weapons?"

Should 50%  
Should not 36%  
DK 14%

CNN/USA Today/Gallup April 10

"As you may know, the U.S. believes Iran, North Korea, and Syria are either providing assistance to terrorists or attempting to develop weapons of mass destruction. For each, please say if you think the U.S. should or should not go to war with that country."

North Korea	Should	28%	Should not	67%	No Opinion	5%
Iran	Should	24%	Should not	69%	No Opinion	7%
Syria	Should	24%	Should not	68%	No Opinion	8%

Public opinion is operating in a range on this topic, and we learn more about it from the careful comparison of the different wordings.

LA Times asked about invading Iran with the conditional "...if they continue to develop these weapons". Gallup asked straight out: "U.S. should or should not go to war with that country..". LA Times used word "nuclear", Gallup did not. LA Times used wording "military action". Gallup used "go to war".

Results indicate that 50% may be an upper limit of possible support for military action against Iran invasion down the line if evidence of nuclear weapons is presented to public, but that baseline support right now is about 24%.

Variations based on question wording do not undermine the value of survey results as important scientific data but in fact enhance it. Most scientific advances are based on the study of this type of variation, not

despite it.

Our objective as pollsters is to figure out why responses vary in relationship to these question wording conditions.

No variation is meaningless or occurs in a vacuum. By analyzing differences in values on the dependent variable in relationship to stimuli differences (question wording) we gain understanding of our subject matter on this important topic.

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

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

Sent: Wednesday, May 07, 2003 3:56 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: The 77 Percent Solution

The LATimes Poll mentioned below asked the following question "There is evidence that Iran is developing nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. Do you think the U.S. should or should not take military action against Iran if they continue to develop these weapons?" While I couldn't find the wording of the Gallup question that she mentions she does say it was a week later and asked about an invasion rather than the less strident military action.

The 77 Percent Solution

<http://www.ariannaonline.com/columns/files/050703.html>

SNIP

"But let's put aside for the moment the ludicrousness of basing anything on increasingly inaccurate opinion polls -- with their plummeting response rates, laughably small samplings and precision-flouting margins of error, these things are becoming less reliable than Rob on "Survivor: The Amazon" -- and take a closer look at the latest numbers. You'll see that the president isn't flying anywhere near as high as Karl Rove would like us to believe."

SNIP

" Take the case of a Los Angeles Times poll conducted during the early days of the Iraq invasion. According to the survey -- which was based on the responses of 745 people obviously lacking caller ID -- 50 percent of Americans were in favor of expanding the fighting in the Middle East to include Iran if it continued to develop nuclear weapons. Pretty impressive. And utterly dubious. Just one week after the L.A. Times' headline-grabbing findings, a Gallup poll on the same subject came up with wildly contradictory results, determining that a whopping 69 percent of Americans opposed an invasion of Iran -- even if it was proven to be developing WMDs or aiding terrorists."



--

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 info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Thu, 8 May 2003 11:18:49 -0400  
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <cporter@HP.UFL.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Colleen Porter <cporter@HP.UFL.EDU>  
Subject: Medicaid research  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Folks:

I would like to make some connections with those of you doing research with people who receive Medicaid. Increasingly, my work seems to be leading into a lot of that.

Of course the basics of good research design still apply, but I am noticing some things that might be different as well, mostly stemming from the high transience and low education among many of the people we interview.

If you're going to be in Nashville, we can talk then:) Or if you want to respond by email.

My concerns are...

1. What kind of response rates do you get for surveys? Is getting the correct address/phone a bigger problem than obtaining cooperation? Is there a mode that works best?
2. With focus groups, are there increased problems with no-shows and giving socially acceptable answers? (Would a series of in-depth qualitative interviews be more effective?)

I'd appreciate any insights.

See you next week!

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 info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Thu, 8 May 2003 10:35:34 -0500  
Reply-To: Barry Feinberg <[bfeinberg@CUSTOMRESEARCH.COM](mailto:bfeinberg@CUSTOMRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Barry Feinberg <[bfeinberg@CUSTOMRESEARCH.COM](mailto:bfeinberg@CUSTOMRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Re: The 77 Percent Solution  
Comments: To: [Frank\\_Newport@GALLUP.COM](mailto:Frank_Newport@GALLUP.COM)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I think Frank's point about looking to see what impact differences in question wording have on what we are measuring is obviously a good one. The wording differences he looks at in the two questions could indeed make a difference in the findings. His attempt to interpret them along a continuum of opinion is helpful.

But I think that the wording of these two questions really needs to be looked at more carefully because I think there are real more fundamental problems with them.

Here is the LA Times question.

"There is evidence that Iran is developing nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. Do you think the U.S. should or should not take military action against Iran if they continue to develop these weapons?"

The LA Times question begins with the phrase "There is evidence". Any reasonable person confronted with this phrase might want to know what the evidence is and how definitive this evidence is. How true the assertion is, can influence what they might want done about it, if anything. The question preamble doesn't give anymore information and we don't know what the respondent knows about the situation from any other information sources, if anything. For all we know this may be the very

first time the respondent has even heard about this.

The question goes on to ask - "Do you think the U.S. should or should not take military action against Iran if they continue to develop these weapons."

The phrase "if they continue" implies that the evidence mentioned at the beginning is conclusive for how can you continue to do something if it hasn't started already. And what exactly does "take military action" mean to the LA Times question writers and to those who were asked and answered the question.

To my mind, this question has measured the relation between some fuzzy notion of "evidence" and some fuzzy notion about "military action." I am not sure this tells us anything.

Here is the Gallup question:

"As you may know, the U.S. believes Iran, North Korea, and Syria are either providing assistance to terrorists or attempting to develop weapons of mass destruction. For each, please say if you think the U.S. should or should not go to war with that country."

This question begins with the phrase "As you may know" - an attempt to include people who may know something about what is to follow, and also people who may not know anything about what is to follow. But whether they do or do not know anything prior to being asked this question, the question continues to tell them what they should have known in that "the US believes." Like the LA Times question, not a question based on something definitive.

The question includes three countries and two possible activities ("either/or" but not both?) that each might be up to. But the question doesn't sort out that each country might be doing different things, but just paints each with the same brush. How is a respondent supposed to differentiate the activities of each country to answer the question of whether to go to war with each or not. It is therefore not surprising that the response pattern is just about the same for each country.

Like the LA Times question, the premise in the question is fuzzy at several levels, (as you may know, the US believes, three countries, two activities, either/or). While going to war is certainly more definitive than taking military action, I don't think we know what the respondents were basing their opinions on.

I don' think this question tells us very much either.

Barry

Barry M. Feinberg, Ph.D.  
Senior Vice President  
Director, New York Office  
GfK Custom Research Inc.  
475 Park Avenue South  
New York, New York 10016  
212-330-1484  
bfeinberg@customresearch.com

>>> Frank Newport <Frank\_Newport@GALLUP.COM> 05/07/03 04:39PM >>>

The column quoted below is another example of why I think there is opposition in some quarters to Huffington's appearance at AAPOR. There is a legitimate question about what scientific professionals gain from hearing poorly thought out and uninformed layperson criticisms of their procedures.

In fact, when considered thoughtfully, there is a great deal of positive understanding we gain from comparing the LA Times question with the Gallup question re invading Iran.

LA Times April 2-3

"There is evidence that Iran is developing nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. Do you think the U.S. should or should not take military action against Iran if they continue to develop these weapons?"

Should 50%  
Should not 36%  
DK 14%

CNN/USA Today/Gallup April 10

"As you may know, the U.S. believes Iran, North Korea, and Syria are either providing assistance to terrorists or attempting to develop weapons of mass destruction. For each, please say if you think the U.S. should or should not go to war with that country."

North Korea	Should	28%	Should not	67%	No Opinion	5%
Iran	Should	24%	Should not	69%	No Opinion	7%
Syria	Should	24%	Should not	68%	No Opinion	8%

Public opinion is operating in a range on this topic, and we learn more about it from the careful comparison of the different wordings.

LA Times asked about invading Iran with the conditional "...if they continue to develop these weapons". Gallup asked straight out: "U.S. should or should not go to war with that country.." LA Times used word "nuclear", Gallup did not. LA Times used wording "military action". Gallup used "go to war".

Results indicate that 50% may be an upper limit of possible support for military action against Iran invasion down the line if evidence of nuclear weapons is presented to public, but that baseline support right now is about 24%.

Variations based on question wording do not undermine the value of survey results as important scientific data but in fact enhance it. Most scientific advances are based on the study of this type of variation, not despite it.

Our objective as pollsters is to figure out why responses vary in relationship to these question wording conditions.

No variation is meaningless or occurs in a vacuum. By analyzing differences in values on the dependent variable in relationship to stimuli differences (question wording) we gain understanding of our subject matter on this important topic.

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

From: Leo G. Simonetta [mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM]  
Sent: Wednesday, May 07, 2003 3:56 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: The 77 Percent Solution

The LATimes Poll mentioned below asked the following question "There is evidence that Iran is developing nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. Do you think the U.S. should or should not take military action against Iran if they continue to develop these weapons?"

While I couldn't find the wording of the Gallup question that she mentions she does say it was a week later and asked about an invasion rather than the less strident military action.

## The 77 Percent Solution

<http://www.ariannaonline.com/columns/files/050703.html>

SNIP

"But let's put aside for the moment the ludicrousness of basing anything on increasingly inaccurate opinion polls -- with their plummeting Nrk Avenue South New York, New response rates, laughably small samplings and precision-flouting margins of error, these things are becoming less reliable than Rob on "Survivor: The Amazon" -- and take a closer look at the latest numbers. You'll see that the president isn't flying anywhere near as high as Karl Rove would like us to believe."

SNIP

" Take the case of a Los Angeles Times poll conducted during the early days of the Iraq invasion. According to the survey -- which was based on the responses of 745 people obviously lacking caller ID -- 50 percent of Americans were in favor of expanding the fighting in the Middle East to include Iran if it continued to develop nuclear weapons. Pretty impressive. And utterly dubious. Just one week after the L.A. Times' headline-grabbing findings, a Gallup poll on the same subject came up with wildly contradictory results, determining that a whopping 69 percent of Americans opposed an invasion of Iran -- even if it was proven to be developing WMDs or aiding terrorists."

--

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 info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

---

IMPORTANT CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The documents and accompanying email communication contain confidential information belonging to the sender, GfK Custom Research Inc. and/or GfK Database Solutions, and are legally protected. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of the communicated information is strictly prohibited.

---

---

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

---

Date: Thu, 8 May 2003 15:45:02 -0400  
Reply-To: "Edelman, Murray" <EdelmanM@CBSNEWS.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Edelman, Murray" <EdelmanM@CBSNEWS.COM>  
Subject: Re: conference comments  
Comments: To: "HOneill536@AOL.COM" <HOneill536@AOL.COM>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

There have been 36 messages on this topic concerning the plenary. It was started by Harry O'Neil and the last comment on Monday was also by Harry. I just couldn't let Harry have the first and last word.

But my main reason for writing was to give everyone my new contact information.

When the plenary was first announced, I didn't like the idea of inviting Ms. Huffington. However, the strength of this discussion suggests to me that the plenary will certainly make the conference more lively and may even increase attendance at our business meeting (the true test). And it does look that many of us will gain theraputic value from being able to speak back to a visible critic.

So my opinion has changed to "undecided."

See you at the conference.

Murray Edelman  
Director of Statistics  
Election and Survey Unit  
CBS News  
524 W. 57th  
New York, New York 10019-2985

(212) 975-7526

email: [edelmanm@cbsnews.com](mailto:edelmanm@cbsnews.com)

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

From: Harry O'Neill [mailto:HOneill536@AOL.COM]

Sent: Monday, May 05, 2003 7:00 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: conference comments

Raghavan Mayur's comments are right on target. I can't believe that her appearance will do anything but give her more grist for her polling bashing mill. If proven wrong, I'll be delighted to admit it.

Harry O'Neill

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 8 May 2003 15:01:33 -0500

Reply-To: [jankiley@soltec.net](mailto:jankiley@soltec.net)

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Jan Kiley <[jankiley@SOLTEC.NET](mailto:jankiley@SOLTEC.NET)>

Subject: inquiry about focus groups

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="Windows-1252"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Over the past 25 years, I can count on one hand the focus group projects we have conducted with sessions on Friday afternoons and none on Friday evening.

What is your experience? The project I may conduct calls for 2 age-segregated groups--one 25-34 and one 35-49--on a Friday night.

Any thoughts will be appreciated.

Jan Kiley

Research Survey Service, Inc.

Champaign, Illinois 61820

217-239-7880

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 8 May 2003 17:17:09 -0400

Reply-To: [Amy.Luo@EY.COM](mailto:Amy.Luo@EY.COM)



Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Amy Luo <Amy.Luo@EY.COM>  
Subject: response categories when measuring attitudes  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Hi,

I'd like to ask references on constructing response categories when measuring attitudes. I am specifically interested in whether the response categories should start with the positive end or the negative end. For example, when asking people's health condition, do people usually use order of 'poor to excellent' (poor, fair, good, excellent) or the order of 'excellent to poor'. I have checked some references. They seem to suggest to start with the negative end. For example, Tourangeau, Rips and Rasinski in their book (1993) mentioned 'positive bias', and Sudman and Bradburn (1982) suggest to 'start with the end of a scale that is least socially desirable'. However, many national surveys used response categories like 'strongly agree to strongly disagree' or 'excellent to poor'. I wonder what your experience is.

Any input will be appreciated.

Thanks

Amy Luo  
Ernst & Young LLP - Quantitative Economics and Statistics  
Phone: 202.327.6667 / Fax: 202.327.6740  
Email: Amy.Luo@ey.com

---

The information contained in this message may be privileged and confidential= and protected from disclosure. If the reader of this message is not the in= tended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this me= ssage to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disseminat= ion, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. I= f you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediatel= y by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer. Thank you.=  
Ernst & Young LLP

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 8 May 2003 15:42:00 -0700  
Reply-To: "Dr. Judy Calder" <calder@SCS.UNR.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Dr. Judy Calder" <calder@SCS.UNR.EDU>  
Subject: Re: inquiry about focus groups  
Comments: To: [jankiley@SOLTEC.NET](mailto:jankiley@SOLTEC.NET)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=Windows-1252  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Friday night is NOT a good choice -- certainly not optimal based on my experience with focus groups, irrespective of the demographics.

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

From: "Jan Kiley" <jankiley@SOLTEC.NET>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Thursday, May 08, 2003 1:01 PM

Subject: inquiry about focus groups

> Over the past 25 years, I can count on one hand the focus group projects we

> have conducted with sessions on Friday afternoons and none on Friday

> evening.

>

> What is your experience? The project I may conduct calls for 2

> age-segregated groups--one 25-34 and one 35-49--on a Friday night.

>

> Any thoughts will be appreciated.

>

> Jan Kiley

> Research Survey Service, Inc.

> Champaign, Illinois 61820

>

> 217-239-7880

>

> -----

> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

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

>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 8 May 2003 15:58:29 -0700

Reply-To: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>

Subject: Re: inquiry about focus groups

In-Reply-To: <00a101c315b3\$0bc6e7e0\$6339c586@sabcar.unr.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

>Friday night is NOT a good choice -- certainly not optimal based on my

>experience with focus groups, irrespective of the demographics.

Unless the group is being done exclusively with social pariahs like me, who would LOVE to have something to do on a Friday night.

Jerold Pearson

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Thu, 8 May 2003 17:16:04 -0700  
Reply-To: Shapard Wolf <[shap.wolf@ASU.EDU](mailto:shap.wolf@ASU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Shapard Wolf <[shap.wolf@ASU.EDU](mailto:shap.wolf@ASU.EDU)>  
Subject: Suspending your AAPORNET messages temporarily  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

If you want to temporarily suspend your AAPORNET account (while you're in Nashville, e.g.) you can do this easily by email:

Send an email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) (NOT to [aapornet](mailto:aapornet)) with this in the body:  
set aapornet nomail

That's it. You don't need a subject line, and don't include your signature lines.

You'll get a confirming message from Listserv that it has suspended your email delivery.

When you return, send another email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this in the body:  
set aapornet mail

And remember that you can browse the archives to catch up on any messages you miss, at <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>.

If you have any troubles, please email [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

Best,  
Shap Wolf  
AAPORNET volunteer administrator

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Fri, 9 May 2003 09:55:14 -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: Suspending your AAPORNET messages temporarily  
In-Reply-To:  
<[A7AF1AE70A8C124593A1AC831EFE46FE014AB10B@ex3.asurite.ad.asu.edu](mailto:A7AF1AE70A8C124593A1AC831EFE46FE014AB10B@ex3.asurite.ad.asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

This will, of course, allow those of us who can't go this year to talk

about you behind your back.

Seriously, would someone mind posting a message from the conference on how the plenary session goes?

--

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 Shapard Wolf

> Sent: Thursday, May 08, 2003 8:16 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Suspending your AAPORNET messages temporarily

>

> If you want to temporarily suspend your AAPORNET account (while you're in

> Nashville, e.g.) you can do this easily by email:

>

> Send an email to listserv@asu.edu (NOT to aapornet) with this in the body:

> set aapornet nomail

>

> That's it. You don't need a subject line, and don't include your signature

> lines.

> You'll get a confirming message from Listserv that it has suspended your

> email delivery.

>

> When you return, send another email to listserv@asu.edu with this in the

> body:

> set aapornet mail

>

> And remember that you can browse the archives to catch up on any messages

> you miss, at <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>.

>

> If you have any troubles, please email [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

>

> Best,

> Shap Wolf

> AAPORNET volunteer administrator

>

> -----

> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

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

aapornet-request@asu.edu

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Fri, 9 May 2003 09:57:31 -0500  
Reply-To: Cecilie Gaziano <[cgaziano@PRODIGY.NET](mailto:cgaziano@PRODIGY.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Cecilie Gaziano <[cgaziano@PRODIGY.NET](mailto:cgaziano@PRODIGY.NET)>  
Subject: For sale: 1 Hermitage tour ticket & 1 Hermitage buffet ticket  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I have one ticket to the Hermitage Mansion guided tour to sell (\$8) and one ticket to the Hermitage Plantation buffet from 6 p.m. - 9 p.m. (\$54) on Thursday, May 15. If interested please contact me at [cgaziano@prodigy.net](mailto:cgaziano@prodigy.net).

Cecilie Gaziano

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Fri, 9 May 2003 09:17:44 -0700  
Reply-To: [mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu](mailto:mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike O'Neil <[mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU](mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: inquiry about focus groups  
Comments: To: [jankiley@soltec.net](mailto:jankiley@soltec.net)  
In-Reply-To: <[NEBBLCDDGKEDOKAPKABNOEBIDLAA.jankiley@soltec.net](mailto:NEBBLCDDGKEDOKAPKABNOEBIDLAA.jankiley@soltec.net)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=Windows-1252  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

It is unconventional, but we have had good luck with Saturday morning. If the Friday specification is due to client time constraints, you might propose this as an alternative.

Mike O'Neil

Michael O'Neil, PhD  
[www.oneilresearch.com](http://www.oneilresearch.com)

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>]On Behalf Of Jan Kiley  
Sent: Thursday, May 08, 2003 1:02 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: inquiry about focus groups

Over the past 25 years, I can count on one hand the focus group projects we have conducted with sessions on Friday afternoons and none on Friday

evening.

What is your experience? The project I may conduct calls for 2 age-segregated groups--one 25-34 and one 35-49--on a Friday night.

Any thoughts will be appreciated.

Jan Kiley  
Research Survey Service, Inc.  
Champaign, Illinois 61820

217-239-7880

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Fri, 9 May 2003 15:21:04 -0400  
Reply-To: Michael Bocian <[michael\\_bocian@HOTMAIL.COM](mailto:michael_bocian@HOTMAIL.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Michael Bocian <[michael\\_bocian@HOTMAIL.COM](mailto:michael_bocian@HOTMAIL.COM)>  
Subject: WSJ - Club for Growth  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Yesterday's Wall Street Journal has an editorial about a poll done for the Club for Growth about Sen. Voinovich. The poll itself is incredibly biased and the Wall Street Journal's editorializing is misleading. There are many examples that you can look at yourselves, but I'll raise just two of them:

Question:

Now I'm going to read you a description of President Bush's proposed tax cut. Many of the provisions of the 2001 tax cut would not take effect until between 2004 and 2009. President Bush wants these provisions to take effect this year, instead of waiting several more years. Tax rates would be immediately reduced, the marriage tax penalty would be immediately reduced, and taxes on families with children would be cut. The President has also proposed abolishing the double tax on dividends, leaving only a single tax on dividends.

President Bush believes that this proposal is essential to help stimulate the economy and create new jobs.

Senator George Voinovich opposes the President's tax cut proposal. He believes that the tax cut would add to the budget deficit.

Whose position do you agree with, President Bush's or Senator Voinovich's?

Bush 71%  
Voinovich 19%

Not exactly a balanced question. Another example is at the end of the survey, after questions like the above one, the poll asks:

If a more fiscally conservative Ohio Republican who was more supportive of President Bush's tax cut challenged George Voinovich in a Republican primary election for U.S. Senator, would you definitely vote for George Voinovich, or would you consider voting for the more fiscally conservative Republican challenger?

Voinovich 23%  
Fiscally conservative challenger 56%  
Undecided 21%

The WSJ editorial concludes: "When Ohio Republicans were asked whom they'd choose in a contest between Mr. Voinovich and an unnamed challenger who was more supportive of the Bush tax cut, 56% chose the challenger. Just 23% chose Senator Voinovich."

The full survey is available at:

<http://www.clubforgrowth.org/news/ohio-memo.html>

Mike Bocian

---

The new MSN 8: smart spam protection and 2 months FREE\*  
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Fri, 9 May 2003 12:48:20 -0700  
Reply-To: [john@cerc.net](mailto:john@cerc.net)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: John Nienstedt <[john@CERC.NET](mailto:john@CERC.NET)>  
Organization: CERC  
Subject: Re: conference comments (my 2 cents worth)  
In-Reply-To: <[5DE7B60BFBA5D411B961000629D522550158688E@NYCCNDX3](mailto:5DE7B60BFBA5D411B961000629D522550158688E@NYCCNDX3)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

OK, I've read all the postings related to Arianna Huffington's appearance. Let me say that I consider Huffington to be a manipulative, self-aggrandizing blowhard. If Ross Perot was a well-spoken attractive woman with intellect, he'd be Arianna Huffington. Not only that, but she's got a platform and loads of ambition which makes her somewhat dangerous as she tries to rip apart my profession.

That said, I agree with Ed: "bring it on." She's a critic. So what? We're big enough and mature enough to handle that. She's getting paid. It's going to charity and it's not that much and Bud Roper is being recognized in other ways. We won't learn anything. Everyone attending the Plenary will be exposed to public enemy #1, which may kick us in the butt to develop a solid plan to counteract the "polling is bad" mantra she's developing.

But I have one big caveat: AAPORites need to "bring it" too. Be prepared to call her on her absurdities.

John E. Nienstedt, Sr.  
john@cerc.net

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Edelman, Murray  
Sent: Thursday, May 08, 2003 12:45 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: conference comments

There have been 36 messages on this topic concerning the plenary. It was started by Harry O'Neil and the last comment on Monday was also by Harry. I just couldn't let Harry have the first and last word.

But my main reason for writing was to give everyone my new contact information.

When the plenary was first announced, I didn't like the idea of inviting Ms. Huffington. However, the strength of this discussion suggests to me that the plenary will certainly make the conference more lively and may even increase attendance at our business meeting (the true test). And it does look that many of us will gain therapeutic value from being able to speak back to a visible critic.

So my opinion has changed to "undecided."

See you at the conference.

Murray Edelman  
Director of Statistics  
Election and Survey Unit  
CBS News  
524 W. 57th  
New York, New York 10019-2985

(212) 975-7526



email: edelmanm@cbsnews.com

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

From: Harry O'Neill [mailto:HOneill536@AOL.COM]  
Sent: Monday, May 05, 2003 7:00 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: conference comments

Raghavan Mayur's comments are right on target. I can't believe that her appearance will do anything but give her more grist for her polling bashing mill. If proven wrong, I'll be delighted to admit it.

Harry O'Neill

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Fri, 9 May 2003 13:37:02 -0700  
Reply-To: Karen Nylund <[karen\\_nylund@HOTMAIL.COM](mailto:karen_nylund@HOTMAIL.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Karen Nylund <[karen\\_nylund@HOTMAIL.COM](mailto:karen_nylund@HOTMAIL.COM)>  
Subject: Visual/photo elicitation surveys and sensitive issues  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I am posting this message for a friend. Please email him directly if you = have any suggestions at [Edcomeaux@aol.com](mailto:Edcomeaux@aol.com)

I'm interested in capturing data on how faculty perceive students on = college campuses. Specifically, I want to examine whether faculty hold = negative stereotypical attitudes toward certain student groups. In = other words, do faculty attitudes differ depending on the student's = race/ethnicity. =20

For this study, race is a confounding variable. My question: is there = literature that discusses specific research designs used to capture data =

by race? In the past, I've used visual/photo elicitation to capture = data by race. Visual/photo elicitation is a technique of capturing data = in which photographs and images are used to stimulate and guide the = participant. For example, several photograph or image are shown to the = participant w/ a narrative below describing the image/photo, and the = participants is then asked to respond to image/photo. Although race is = the confounding variable in the images, the participant is not aware.

Should anyone have information related to my question, please let me = know. Eddie Comeaus Edcomeaux@aol.com=

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Fri, 9 May 2003 18:43:23 -0400  
Reply-To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>  
Subject: May 7, 2003 - The 77 Percent Solution -- Arianna Huffington  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Wish I could hear her in person along with the questions that everyone will ask in general and specifically in regard to her latest column published in our local paper, The Atlanta Constitution, and I'm sure in many others across the country.

Dick Halpern

The 77 Percent Solution -- Arianna Huffington  
Filed May 7, 2003

"Seventy-seven percent."

For weeks now, those three little words have served as the ultimate discussion stopper. A verbal knockout punch. A conversational coup de grace. The final number as final word.

Whether offered up on TV talk shows or tossed across dining room tables, that magic number -- the president's robust post-war job approval rating -- has been as effective at quelling any disagreement with the Bush administration's selectively bellicose foreign policies or its suicidal tax cuts as a laser-guided bunker buster bomb.

Seventy-seven percent. It's Bush's flak jacket. A Kevlar stat that has cloaked him in an aura of invincibility. An aura that was only augmented by Operation Photo Op, his 2G tail hook landing on the deck of the Abraham Lincoln, floating just off the perilous coast of San Diego, and by the sight of his Democratic challengers squabbling amongst themselves in South Carolina -- desperately and pathetically trying to get the audience to picture them slipping into the role of dive-bombing top gun-in-chief. The idea being, I suppose, that it was all about the presidential flight suit, and not the man inside it.

Seventy-seven percent: The president is triumphant. Seventy-seven percent: The president can do no wrong. Seventy-seven percent: End of discussion. End of democratic debate.

Or so the president and his handlers fervently hope. Only it's not. It's just the beginning.

For starters, majorities can be -- and very, very often have been -- dead wrong. For instance, "Macarena" held the top spot on the Billboard singles chart for 14 straight weeks. Need I say more? And I'm not even pointing out to the president that a majority voted against him in the last election.

But let's put aside for the moment the ludicrousness of basing anything on increasingly inaccurate opinion polls -- with their plummeting response rates, laughably small samplings and precision-flouting margins of error, these things are becoming less reliable than Rob on "Survivor: The Amazon" -- and take a closer look at the latest numbers. You'll see that the president isn't flying anywhere near as high as Karl Rove would like us to believe.

For one thing, in the latest Newsweek poll, the president's approval rating has already slumped to 65 percent -- a 12 point drop since the post-fall-of-Baghdad euphoria that goosed him to the much bandied about double sevens. And even that figure pales in comparison to the 89 percent rating his father sported after the first Gulf War -- and OI' 41 hadn't even toppled a single statue of Saddam, let alone an entire murderous regime.

When you break the numbers down further, you discover that the current President Bush is on even shakier electoral ground -- standing astride a partisan chasm that threatens to topple his own monuments. Following Desert Storm, both Republicans and Democrats felt good about the job George the Elder had done: he had a stratospheric 96 percent approval rating among his fellow Republicans and, even more importantly, an 80 percent rating among members of the opposition party, a spread of only 16 points. George the Junior, on the other hand, is facing a massive 51 point difference of opinion: 97 percent of his party members approve of his efforts, but less than half of Democrats -- 46 percent -- feel the same way.

Even after 9/11, Afghanistan, and the fall of Saddam, America is as polarized as it was during the days of dangling chads, scrubbed ballots, and endless recounts. And it's no accident: the administration's policies have sliced the body politic in two, and, as an added bonus, dramatically turned the majority of the civilized world against us.

So much for Bush's incessant campaign claims that he was going to be "a uniter not a divider."

The instability of the president's putative popularity becomes even more apparent when the subject of the polls is switched from the war in Iraq to the floundering economy here at home. Only 49 percent of Americans approve of Bush's handling of the economy, and more than half think that the president is not paying enough attention to the issue -- which is a big problem for the White House, since a majority of those polled cite the

economy as their top concern. I'm sure Team Bush wishes the rest of us were paying as little attention to the economy as he is.

It's no wonder Rove is struggling so mightily to make 2004 about little more than picking a cockpit-ready commander-in-chief. But being president entails a lot more than making tail hook landings and ordering last minute bombing runs on restaurants and mosques where Saddam is purported to be hiding. It requires vision and leadership -- and the ability to come up with a way to deal with six percent national unemployment that doesn't include hammering Congress to pass yet another tax cut for the rich or repeating the word "jobs" close to three dozen times in a single speech, as the president did two weeks ago.

But even if you put all that aside and focus exclusively on the "endless war" the administration seems determined to wage -- or at least determined to campaign on -- the White House's reliance on polling seems destined to blow up in all of our faces.

Can you think of anything more preposterous -- and dangerous -- than determining matters of war and peace based on public opinion surveys? Yet all indications are that Bush and chief strategist Rove are chronic poll watchers and takers. A scary thought when you consider how consistently unreliable polls turn out to be.

Take the case of a Los Angeles Times poll conducted during the early days of the Iraq invasion. According to the survey -- which was based on the responses of 745 people obviously lacking caller ID -- 50 percent of Americans were in favor of expanding the fighting in the Middle East to include Iran if it continued to develop nuclear weapons. Pretty impressive. And utterly dubious. Just one week after the L.A. Times' headline-grabbing findings, a Gallup poll on the same subject came up with wildly contradictory results, determining that a whopping 69 percent of Americans opposed an invasion of Iran -- even if it was proven to be developing WMDs or aiding terrorists.

So which was it? Were Americans gung ho to take on Iran or did the thought send a shiver up our collective spine? And what if the Wolfowitzes of the world had used the first set of numbers to convince Karl Rove that launching a preemptive strike against Iran would be a good political move? Would the Gallup findings have then led the president to make an apologetic call to the ruling ayatollahs in Tehran: "Sorry, fellas, my bad. But that's polling for ya!"

It's bad enough taking a poll to determine if the public is in favor of requiring school kids to wear uniforms; it's downright Strangelovian to ask them if they are in favor of attacking a sovereign nation.

Even if your approval rating is 100 percent.

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Mon, 12 May 2003 16:22:51 -0400

Reply-To: Stephanie Berg <stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Stephanie Berg <stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET>  
Subject: Seeking pricing resources  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Does anyone have any leads or references about something called a Van Westendorf technique? I believe it has to do with brand and value analysis. I am having trouble locating resources. Thanks,

=====  
Stephanie Berg  
Research Manager  
Network Solutions  
stephanie.berg@verizon.net

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Tue, 13 May 2003 08:59:10 -0400  
Reply-To: jeffrey.c.moore@CENSUS.GOV  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Jeffrey C. Moore" <jeffrey.c.moore@CENSUS.GOV>  
Subject: Q'aire Design Issue for Longitudinal Surveys -- the "nothing has changed" response  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

The Census Bureau is redesigning the questionnaire for its Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP). SIPP is a longitudinal survey, which revisits sample households every 4 months over a several-year period. The primary focus of the survey is a person-by-person, detailed accounting of income received -- from jobs/businesses, transfer programs, and assets -- over the 4-month period preceding the interview month.

One of the redesign features in the computerized questionnaire is what we call the "L" option, which is intended to be responsive to a common occurrence in the second and subsequent SIPP interviews: we ask the respondent to report, say, the amount of dividend income received from mutual funds over the past 4 months, and he or she says "It hasn't changed -- whatever I said last time" (or words to that effect). The new questionnaire allows the interviewer to record that type of response as an "L", which sends the interview to a question which recalls the report from the most recent interview, and checks its current applicability -- e.g., for an April interview: "Things may have changed, but I have recorded from last time that these mutual funds produced about \$[amount] in dividends between August 1st and the end of November. Does that still sound about right for the last 4 months, from December through March?" If yes, the amount is carried forward for the current interview period; if no, a corrected amount is sought.

Some concerns have been raised about the "L" procedure -- specifically the danger that, over the course of many interview waves, as respondents become increasingly aware of its availability, they will tend to fall back on it as an "easy out" instead of actually thinking about the most recent time period, and as a result data quality will take a hit. My question (finally!) is: Does anyone have any experience with this, or any insights as to what's likely to happen after several interviews, when we allow respondents to say "it's the same as it was before"? Or better still -- does anyone know of any research that would speak to this issue?

I'd appreciate any advice/guidance/knowledge/words of wisdom/etc. anyone could provide.

Jeff Moore  
U.S. Census Bureau

please reply to:  
jeffrey.c.moore@census.gov

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Tue, 13 May 2003 12:22:39 -0400  
Reply-To: Donald Green <donald.green@YALE.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Donald Green <donald.green@YALE.EDU>  
Subject: "Enough Already..."  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Our AAPOR Paper "Enough Already with Random Digit Dialing" may be downloaded at:

<http://www.yale.edu/isps/publications/regsampling.pdf>

The paper reports the results of four statewide polls that conducted head-to-head comparisons of random digit dialing (RDD) and registration-based sampling (RBS) prior to the 2002 elections. We report that the forecasting accuracy of RBS polls proved to be superior, at substantially lower cost. The polls were conducted by the Washington Post (MD), Quinnipiac (NY & PA), and CBS News (SD).

Cheers,  
Don Green

---

Donald Green  
Director, Institution for Social and Policy Studies  
&  
A. Whitney Griswold Professor of Political Science  
Yale University  
77 Prospect St.  
New Haven, CT 06520-8209

-----  
email address: donald.green@yale.edu  
Web: research.yale.edu/vote  
Fax 203-432-3296  
Voice 203-432-3237

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Tue, 13 May 2003 10:58:55 -0700  
Reply-To: Margaret Roller <[rmr@ROLLERRESEARCH.COM](mailto:rmr@ROLLERRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Margaret Roller <[rmr@ROLLERRESEARCH.COM](mailto:rmr@ROLLERRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Re: inquiry about focus groups

While Friday night is not the best choice, the reality remains that it is sometimes the only choice (for whatever reason). If, indeed, this is the only reasonable choice (given all the players involved), go for it. I have done it with great success. Just be careful in the (over) recruiting, re-screening, etc. When reality rears its ugly head, sometimes Friday nights must be sacrificed.

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Tue, 13 May 2003 13:53:49 -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: hosted communications provider  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Hello,

We have reached a new (to us) type of phone number in our RDD work. It is an "Access line" from a hosted communications provider (specifically AccessLine Communications (<http://AccessLine.com/>)). This appears to be a service that allows manipulation of business phone numbers, including forwarding of multiple phone numbers to a single line and conference calling. It looks like the company just purchases blocks of phone numbers from a provider and then uses these lines for manipulation of services. We are treating these as business numbers when we get a message that identifies the line as an "access line". Does anyone know more about "hosted communications providers"? I did not find much when I did a google search.

thanks!

Lynda Voigt

Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.  
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center

Seattle, WA  
LVoigt@fhcrc.org  
phone (206) 667-4519  
FAX (206) 667-5948

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Wed, 14 May 2003 10:34:36 -0400  
Reply-To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>  
Subject: Re: inquiry about focus groups  
Comments: To: rmr@ROLLERRESEARCH.COM  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

All problems associated with Friday night focus groups can be solved with enough money. Might cost more per recruit and the incentive might need to be higher to induce respondents to say yes. And, you might need to recruit more per group to seat 10 or 12 (or however many you want at the table). And, you need a little extra vigilance because when the incentive is higher, respondents who legitimately can't make it might try sending a substitute.

A focus group is a one-shot event and you just have to do what needs to be done to make sure the money you DO spend is not wasted. Skimping on incentives and not recruiting enough to fill the table undercut the ultimate success.  
JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
Selzer & Company  
Des Moines, Iowa

In a message dated 5/13/2003 1:20:44 PM Central Daylight Time,  
rmr@ROLLERRESEARCH.COM writes:

>  
> While Friday night is not the best choice, the reality remains that it is  
> sometimes the only choice (for whatever reason). If, indeed, this is the  
> only reasonable choice (given all the players involved), go for it. I have  
> done it with great success. Just be careful in the (over) recruiting,  
> re-screening, etc. When reality rears its ugly head, sometimes Friday  
> nights  
> must be sacrificed.  
>

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).

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Wed, 14 May 2003 10:54:01 -0400  
Reply-To: Phillip Downs <[pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM](mailto:pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Phillip Downs <[pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM](mailto:pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM)>  
Subject: Finding telephone numbers  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Given names and street addresses within a metro area, what sources have AAPOR members had the best success with in finding telephone numbers?  
Thanks

-----  
Phillip E. Downs, PhD  
Kerr & Downs Research  
2992 Habersham Drive  
Tallahassee, FL 32309  
Phone: 850.906.3111  
Fax: 850.906.3112  
[www.kerr-downs.com](http://www.kerr-downs.com)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Wed, 14 May 2003 11:03:25 -0400  
Reply-To: Lance Hoffman <[lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM](mailto:lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Lance Hoffman <[lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM](mailto:lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM)>  
Organization: Opinion Access Corp.  
Subject: Re: Finding telephone numbers  
Comments: To: Phillip Downs <[pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM](mailto:pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM)>  
In-Reply-To: <[NEBBJNECELDEFCLBMELLGENDDDAA.pd@kerr-downs.com](mailto:NEBBJNECELDEFCLBMELLGENDDDAA.pd@kerr-downs.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Telematch is very good, and you only pay for "hits" (what they are able to match. I have used them for both residential and business sample. They are a part of Gannett.

Telematch  
6883 Commercial Drive  
Springfield, VA 22159  
800-523-7246  
<http://www.gannetoffset.com/html/telematch.html>

Good Luck!

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

---

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

---

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Phillip Downs  
Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2003 10:54 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Finding telephone numbers

Given names and street addresses within a metro area, what sources have AAPOR members had the best success with in finding telephone numbers?  
Thanks

-----  
Phillip E. Downs, PhD  
Kerr & Downs Research  
2992 Habersham Drive  
Tallahassee, FL 32309  
Phone: 850.906.3111  
Fax: 850.906.3112  
[www.kerr-downs.com](http://www.kerr-downs.com)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 14 May 2003 14:12:30 -0400  
Reply-To: Dale Kulp <[DKulp@M-S-G.COM](mailto:DKulp@M-S-G.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Dale Kulp <[DKulp@M-S-G.COM](mailto:DKulp@M-S-G.COM)>  
Subject: Re: hosted communications provider  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Lynda,

AccessLine Communications is one of many vendors offering custom = communications services to businesses. Basically, they provide the call = handling functionality one would enjoy internally with a high-end = telephone switch (\$200,000 - \$300,000). Think of it as "Custom Calling = Services" for businesses - this could include call routing, messaging, = auto-attendant services, etc. =20

What you probably encountered was one of their inbound access lines that = customers use to modify their account, change routing rules, retrieve = messages, etc. =20

This is definitely a business number and really no different than any = other inbound business line that is used for voice, fax, or modem.

Dale Kulp

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

From: Voigt, Lynda [<mailto:lvoigt@FHCRG.ORG>]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 13, 2003 4:54 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: hosted communications provider

Hello,

We have reached a new (to us) type of phone number in our RDD work. =  
It is an "Access line" from a hosted communications provider (specifically AccessLine Communications (<http://AccessLine.com/>)). This appears to be = a service that allows manipulation of business phone numbers, including forwarding of multiple phone numbers to a single line and conference calling. It looks like the company just purchases blocks of phone = numbers from a provider and then uses these lines for manipulation of services. =  
We are treating these as business numbers when we get a message that = identifies the line as an "access line". Does anyone know more about "hosted communications providers"? I did not find much when I did a google =

search.

thanks!

Lynda Voigt

Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.  
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center  
Seattle, WA  
LVoigt@fhcrc.org  
phone (206) 667-4519  
FAX (206) 667-5948

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Wed, 14 May 2003 15:40:03 -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: Bush's Support Strong Despite Tax Cut Doubts  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Bush's Support Strong Despite Tax Cut Doubts  
By ADAM NAGOURNEY and JANET ELDER  
<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/05/14/national/14POLL.html>

Americans have persistent reservations about the tax cuts that are the centerpiece of President Bush's postwar agenda, but those concerns have not hurt Mr. Bush, who continues to ride a huge wave of support, according to the latest New York Times/CBS News poll.

The number of Americans who said they had confidence in Mr. Bush's ability to manage the economy dropped seven points, to 47 percent, in the month the president has been pushing his tax cut plan in speeches in Washington and across the nation. The poll also found that many Americans say that instead of cutting taxes, the nation should use the money to cut the deficit or finance a national health care system.

There is no evidence, however, that those doubts have damaged Mr. Bush's overall standing. The poll found that 67 percent approved of his job performance, while 70 percent said he had strong qualities of leadership, the trait that the White House has long contended would trump any concerns Americans might have about Mr. Bush's policies.

Beyond that, Americans now hold a notably more favorable view of the

Republican Party than of the Democratic Party, and 53 percent said Republicans had a clear vision of where to lead the country, compared with just 40 percent who said that of Democrats. That finding is reminiscent of what the Times/CBS News poll found last fall, just before Republicans took control of Congress.

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 info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Thu, 15 May 2003 09:56:22 -0400  
Reply-To: Donald Green <[donald.green@YALE.EDU](mailto:donald.green@YALE.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Donald Green <[donald.green@YALE.EDU](mailto:donald.green@YALE.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: "Enough Already..."  
Comments: cc: [KAF@cbsnews.com](mailto:KAF@cbsnews.com)  
In-Reply-To: <[Pine.LNX.4.44.0305131217340.17902-100000@ajax.its.yale.edu](mailto:Pine.LNX.4.44.0305131217340.17902-100000@ajax.its.yale.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

We're indebted to Kathy Frankovic, who caught an error in our "Enough Already..." paper's tables. We just posted the corrected paper/tables at

<http://www.yale.edu/isps/publications/regsampling.pdf>

The upshot of the correction is this: RDD provided a better forecast of the SD governor's race than RBS, although RBS provided better forecasts in 6 of the 7 other races. The average absolute forecast error across the 8 races we studied was 4.7 for RBS vs. 7.9 for RDD (not 8.4 as we earlier reported in error).

Best,  
Don Green

On Tue, 13 May 2003, Donald Green wrote:

> Our AAPOR Paper "Enough Already with Random Digit Dialing" may be  
> downloaded at:  
>  
> <http://www.yale.edu/isps/publications/regsampling.pdf>  
>  
> The paper reports the results of four statewide polls that conducted  
> head-to-head comparisons of random digit dialing (RDD) and

> registration-based sampling (RBS) prior to the 2002 elections. We report  
> that the forecasting accuracy of RBS polls proved to be superior, at  
> substantially lower cost. The polls were conducted by the Washington Post  
> (MD), Quinnipiac (NY & PA), and CBS News (SD).

>  
> Cheers,  
> Don Green

>  
> -----  
> Donald Green  
> Director, Institution for Social and Policy Studies  
> &  
> A. Whitney Griswold Professor of Political Science  
> Yale University  
> 77 Prospect St.  
> New Haven, CT 06520-8209

> -----  
> email address: donald.green@yale.edu  
> Web: research.yale.edu/vote  
> Fax 203-432-3296  
> Voice 203-432-3237

>  
> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>

-----  
Donald Green  
Director, Institution for Social and Policy Studies  
&  
A. Whitney Griswold Professor of Political Science  
Yale University  
77 Prospect St.  
New Haven, CT 06520-8209

-----  
email address: donald.green@yale.edu  
Web: research.yale.edu/vote  
Fax 203-432-3296  
Voice 203-432-3237

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Thu, 15 May 2003 07:05:26 -0700  
Reply-To: Mike O'Neil <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mike O'Neil <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>  
Subject: AAPOR Conference, Life Passages--and Two Invitations  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

AAPORites:

I posted this last year....it produced the most interesting and plentiful conversations I have ever had at AAPOR. So I repost, in the hopes of more of the same (and perhaps even more).

My thanks to David Moore who found this (could not find it within the aapornet archives; apparently David's system is better).

Mike O'Neil

It finally came. The dreaded AARP invitation. Certifiable old-fartdom. Damn tough pill to swallow for a rock n roll-raised/forever young baby boomer. (For those who have not yet reached this milestone, the vultures start mailing you when you are 49+ -- and they always find you).

Made me think of a conversation I had with the sage Mayer Zald when he visited here over 20 years ago. The subject was retirement. In all of my then-late-twenties innocence I asked him "Why would you ever want to retire?". I have remembered his response ever since, "After you have been doing the same thing for many years, you get to the point where you want to do something else.

I heard him, but didn't really understand.

All these years later, I do now.

I have founded and run a research firm for over 20 years. I do high-level conceptualization, research design, edit all analytical reports, the usual stuff. I am also go-to guy when the toilet backs up (I know how to use a plunger and have the phone number of a handyman), do phone wiring, figure out how to manage when three people call in sick on the same day (work harder and faster and juggle), or just about anything else happens.

Twenty plus years. Doing more or less the same thing. And I would like not to be doing exactly this forever. I am looking for a five- to ten-year plan to extricate myself from day-to-day responsibilities.

The point of all this: I am looking to associate myself with a highly trained younger person to associate with, someone with long-term interests. While I am looking to hire someone, what sets this apart from the usual job offer, is that the job has the potential for very substantial equity in a successful profitable firm with a twenty year history. And in a location with 350 bright sunny days a year in America's sixth-largest and fastest-growing city to boot. While I am open to a wide range of possibilities, anyone interested should know that this is a VERY HANDS ON organization (note above discussion of plumbing). The exact seniority of the person would seem to me to have some flexibility. For a more junior type, we could do the ten-year plan; for a more mid-career type, the five-year plan.

I'd also very much like to get advice from senior AAPORites who have been through a business transition -- either selling or taking on a partner. I

had considered selling (been approached by business brokers all the time), but have tended to believe that the market value of a business so intertwined with my persona is much less than its value as a continuing operation (although I am open-minded on the subject). The nice thing is that I do not have a need to get out. Indeed, I could see staying on indefinitely, though in a less day-to-day (really minute-to-minute) capacity--consultant/chairman--but not micro-manager.

And for those who find such a long-term commitment daunting, I am quite willing to entertain discussions with others about more conventional employment, although this is a secondary consideration at the moment -- and I realize the AAPOR conference has a procedure for this.

And the AAPOR conference is the ideal location for such conversations, either the "hire-a-potential-partner" conversation or the "I have sold a business or taken on a partner and am willing to share my wisdom" discussion.

In my experience, it is easy to not connect once you are at the conference. So I would invite anyone interested to email me by late Monday to make arrangements. (OOPS TOO LATE--SO JUST CALL MY CELL 602.316.8079 WHICH should be on from Wednesday forward. Or msg at the main conference hotel.

If this is of interest, send me an email and we can make arrangements. Worst case, we have an interesting conversation. Best case, who knows?

I assume anyone who is potentially interested is on AAPORnet, but if not, feel free to pass this on.

My apologies to any who might think this inappropriate. But I actually enjoyed wrestling with Colleen Porter's life-situation choices, so I took that as license.

Mike O'Neil

Michael O'Neil  
www.oneilresearch.com

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Thu, 15 May 2003 14:43:11 -0600  
Reply-To: Quin Monson <Quin.Monson@BYU.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Quin Monson <Quin.Monson@BYU.EDU>  
Subject: Latino party identification in California  
Comments: cc: royce@aircomusa.com  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I would like to know if anyone on AAPORNET has done or is aware of



research examining the possible effect of California's Proposition 187 (or more recently 209 and 229) on Latino party identification (in California or elsewhere). There is a widespread belief that the California Republican Party's and Gov. Pete Wilson's endorsement of 187 had a negative effect on the level of Latinos who identify as Republicans. I am searching for analysis that systematically examines this question using survey data.

Thanks,

Quin Monson

=20

=20

=20

=20

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

Quin Monson

Assistant Director

Center for the Study of Elections and Democracy

Brigham Young University

Email: [Quin.Monson@byu.edu](mailto:Quin.Monson@byu.edu)

Phone: 801-422-8017

Fax: 801-422-0579

<http://csed.byu.edu>

=20

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====

Date: Sun, 18 May 2003 21:36:27 -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)>  
Subject: Will Lester on Huffington in the Lions' Den  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

The conference was stimulating, uplifting, exhausting, informative...

just what I wanted. Kudos to everyone who organized it as well as all those who participated.

Here's AAPOR member and AP reporter Will Lester's story about the Friday night plenary:

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/uslatest/story/0,1282,-2685681,00.html>

or

[http://www.daytondailynews.com/news/content/news/ap/ap\\_story.html/National/AP.V1869.AP-Pollsters-Crit.html](http://www.daytondailynews.com/news/content/news/ap/ap_story.html/National/AP.V1869.AP-Pollsters-Crit.html)

If these links are dead by the time you try to read them, just go to Google's news pages and put in "Huffington." You'll find plenty of links to the story.

--

Scott Keeter  
Pew Research Center for the People and the Press  
1150 18th St. N.W., Suite 975  
Washington, DC 20036  
Voice 202 293 3126 x16  
Personal fax 703 832 0209  
E-mail [keeters@people-press.org](mailto:keeters@people-press.org)  
Web site <http://mason.gmu.edu/~skeeter>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Sun, 18 May 2003 22:29:44 -0400  
Reply-To: Ward Kay <[wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM](mailto:wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Ward Kay <[wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM](mailto:wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM)>  
Organization: Adirondack Communications  
Subject: Nashville Nights  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Longtime AAPOR members sometimes talk wistfully about the old meetings where discussions would last late into the night. I thought of that last night (this morning) when I looked around the lobby bar at 2:30 am to find 35 AAPOR members still going strong, including a past president and another former board member (the current board being too exhausted from the fine work to enjoy some of the fruits of the labor). Even in its larger size, AAPOR remains the Meeting Place.

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Mon, 19 May 2003 08:00:59 -0400  
Reply-To: Phillip Downs <[pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM](mailto:pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>

From: Phillip Downs <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>  
Subject: Conference  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

After 11 years of membership, I attended my first AAPOR conference. I was impressed with the friendliness and helpfulness of the attendees. It's been a while since I have attended an American Marketing Association Educators Conference, so maybe they have improved. But, the lack of pompousness coupled with the friendly, helpful nature of the attendees at AAPOR was a nice contrast to what I remember of my AMA days.

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

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Mon, 19 May 2003 08:41:18 -0500  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: On Huffington  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

BUSINESS WEEK, MAY 19, 2003

Just Say "No" to Pollsters?

That's what polling critic Ariana Huffington wants Americans to do. No wonder she just got an earful at the profession's annual meeting

TV commentator, author, and columnist Arianna Huffington thinks politicians are hooked on polls in ways that are dangerous for democracy. She has a solution. "When pollsters call, just refuse to answer any questions," she urges voters on her Web site, [www.ariannaonline.com](http://www.ariannaonline.com). "Once enough people join us, poll results will become useless, and our leaders will be forced to lead."

So fireworks were bound to explode on May 9, when Huffington, the self-described co-founder of the Partnership for a Poll-Free America, agreed to address the annual meeting in Nashville of the American Association for Public Opinion Research ([www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)), the nation's leading organization for poll researchers. By the evening's end,

Huffington was on the defensive, dodging accusations that she had her facts wrong and protesting that she had been misunderstood.

It was an exhilarating moment for the researchers, who fear that Huffington's "crusade," as she calls it, will undermine their ability to gather information from the public on all kinds of topics -- not only on voter preferences but on how many people are unemployed, how many children haven't been vaccinated, and whether old people understand the eligibility for health benefits. (Disclosure: In addition to being BusinessWeek's Economics editor, I'm its liaison to survey organizations. Also, I've attended several meetings of the AAPOR, and my wife is a member.)

**POLS' ABUSES.** Huffington's main criticism is that excessive attention to polls has turned politicians from courageous leaders into pandering marketers. Using polls, candidates and incumbents continuously fine-tune their platforms and messages to make people like them, instead of deciding what they think is right and trying to rally people to follow.

The pollsters' response? All that may be true, but it's not their fault if their results are misused. It's important to know where the public stands on the issues of the day, said Richard Morin, a writer for The Washington Post who was one of three people assigned to engage Huffington in a discussion for the audience.

Huffington alleges in her newspaper columns that polls are getting increasingly inaccurate. In fact, said Morin, the average error of polls concerning the two major candidates in the 2000 elections was just 1.1 percentage points, significantly lower than the typical margin of error 20 or 30 years ago.

**STATISTICAL DEAD HEAT.** The pundit claims that in the 2000 Presidential election, in which Al Gore won the popular vote, 80% of pollsters falsely picked George W. Bush to win more of the popular vote than Gore or to tie. In fact, say the researchers, even though most of the polls had Bush slightly ahead, the pollsters actually considered the race a statistical dead heat -- that is, Bush's tiny advantage was less than the polls' stated margin of error.

Is accuracy being degraded by the increasing rate of "nonresponse" -- in which phone calls aren't answered or people do answer and refuse to participate? That's what Huffington charges. It's a reasonable criticism, assuming that the people who do answer surveys are different from the ones who don't. But several papers at the conference presented surprising evidence that for a broad range of nonresponse rates -- say, anywhere from 30% to 70% -- more nonresponses don't worsen accuracy.

Finally, Huffington contends that polls were partially responsible for the tragedy of September 11, 2001. She says they showed that the public didn't consider terrorism a major threat, so poll-driven politicians ignored security. But Morin produced a series of polls conducted before September 11 in which the public did express major concern about terrorism -- in contrast to only three "fleeting" mentions of terrorism he found in Huffington's own prodigious output of columns.

END OF ALL POLLS? Not all of Huffington's criticisms were rejected as out of hand. The AAPOR has begun urging its members to publish the rate of nonresponse to their surveys, a step Huffington advocates. And like her, the group is on-record opposing so-called "commissioned polls" that are engineered to show public support for an organization's agenda.

What most galled the researchers, however, was Huffington's call for shutting down polling entirely. The critic said she was against only polls that were designed to help politicians tailor their messages. But when the researchers asked her to clarify that distinction in her columns and on her Web site, she wouldn't commit to doing so. On that score, the evening ended in a draw.

By Peter Coy in Nashville  
Edited by Douglas Harbrecht

To subscribe online to BusinessWeek magazine, please click here.  
Learn more, go to the BusinessWeekOnline home page

Copyright 2003, by The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc. All rights reserved.  
Terms of Use | Privacy Policy

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Mon, 19 May 2003 09:56:20 -0400  
Reply-To: "Holz, Jo" <jholz@INDEMAND.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Holz, Jo" <jholz@INDEMAND.COM>  
Subject: Re: On Huffington  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

As someone who wasn't able to attend the national conference this year and thus didn't personally see Huffington's panel, I'm fascinated with the contrast between the tenor of the Business Week article below and Will Lester's piece that was sent out earlier, which depicted the session as a love-in between Huffington and AAPOR. Did both these reporters attend the same event?

Jo Holz  
Vice President, Research  
iN DEMAND  
phone: (646) 638-8214  
fax: (646) 486-0857  
jholz@indemand.com

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

From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM]  
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 9:41 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: On Huffington

BUSINESS WEEK, MAY 19, 2003

Just Say "No" to Pollsters?

That's what polling critic Ariana Huffington wants Americans to do. No wonder she just got an earful at the profession's annual meeting

TV commentator, author, and columnist Arianna Huffington thinks politicians are hooked on polls in ways that are dangerous for democracy. She has a solution. "When pollsters call, just refuse to answer any questions," she urges voters on her Web site, [www.ariannaonline.com](http://www.ariannaonline.com). "Once enough people join us, poll results will become useless, and our leaders will be forced to lead."

So fireworks were bound to explode on May 9, when Huffington, the self-described co-founder of the Partnership for a Poll-Free America, agreed to address the annual meeting in Nashville of the American Association for Public Opinion Research ([www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)), the nation's leading organization for poll researchers. By the evening's end, Huffington was on the defensive, dodging accusations that she had her facts wrong and protesting that she had been misunderstood.

It was an exhilarating moment for the researchers, who fear that Huffington's "crusade," as she calls it, will undermine their ability to gather information from the public on all kinds of topics -- not only on voter preferences but on how many people are unemployed, how many children haven't been vaccinated, and whether old people understand the eligibility for health benefits. (Disclosure: In addition to being BusinessWeek's Economics editor, I'm its liaison to survey organizations. Also, I've attended several meetings of the AAPOR, and my wife is a member.)

**POLS' ABUSES.** Huffington's main criticism is that excessive attention to polls has turned politicians from courageous leaders into pandering marketers. Using polls, candidates and incumbents continuously fine-tune their platforms and messages to make people like them, instead of deciding what they think is right and trying to rally people to follow.

The pollsters' response? All that may be true, but it's not their fault if their results are misused. It's important to know where the public stands on the issues of the day, said Richard Morin, a writer for The Washington Post who was one of three people assigned to engage Huffington in a discussion for the audience.

Huffington alleges in her newspaper columns that polls are getting increasingly inaccurate. In fact, said Morin, the average error of polls concerning the two major candidates in the 2000 elections was just 1.1 percentage points, significantly lower than the typical margin of error 20 or 30 years ago.

**STATISTICAL DEAD HEAT.** The pundit claims that in the 2000 Presidential election, in which Al Gore won the popular vote, 80% of pollsters falsely picked George W. Bush to win more of the popular vote than Gore

or to tie. In fact, say the researchers, even though most of the polls had Bush slightly ahead, the pollsters actually considered the race a statistical dead heat -- that is, Bush's tiny advantage was less than the polls' stated margin of error.

Is accuracy being degraded by the increasing rate of "nonresponse" -- in which phone calls aren't answered or people do answer and refuse to participate? That's what Huffington charges. It's a reasonable criticism, assuming that the people who do answer surveys are different from the ones who don't. But several papers at the conference presented surprising evidence that for a broad range of nonresponse rates -- say, anywhere from 30% to 70% -- more nonresponses don't worsen accuracy.

Finally, Huffington contends that polls were partially responsible for the tragedy of September 11, 2001. She says they showed that the public didn't consider terrorism a major threat, so poll-driven politicians ignored security. But Morin produced a series of polls conducted before September 11 in which the public did express major concern about terrorism -- in contrast to only three "fleeting" mentions of terrorism he found in Huffington's own prodigious output of columns.

END OF ALL POLLS? Not all of Huffington's criticisms were rejected as out of hand. The AAPOR has begun urging its members to publish the rate of nonresponse to their surveys, a step Huffington advocates. And like her, the group is on-record opposing so-called "commissioned polls" that are engineered to show public support for an organization's agenda.

What most galled the researchers, however, was Huffington's call for shutting down polling entirely. The critic said she was against only polls that were designed to help politicians tailor their messages. But when the researchers asked her to clarify that distinction in her columns and on her Web site, she wouldn't commit to doing so. On that score, the evening ended in a draw.

By Peter Coy in Nashville  
Edited by Douglas Harbrecht

To subscribe online to BusinessWeek magazine, please click here.  
Learn more, go to the BusinessWeekOnline home page

Copyright 2003, by The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc. All rights reserved.  
Terms of Use | Privacy Policy

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Mon, 19 May 2003 09:09:58 -0500  
Reply-To: Timothy Johnson <tjohnson@SRL.UIC.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Timothy Johnson <tjohnson@SRL.UIC.EDU>

Subject: Re: On Huffington  
Comments: To: jholz@INDEMAND.COM  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I sat next to an AP reporter who left before the Morin rebuttal, not sure =  
if that was Lester...

>>> "Holz, Jo" <jholz@INDEMAND.COM> 05/19 8:56 AM >>>

As someone who wasn't able to attend the national conference this year and  
thus didn't personally see Huffington's panel, I'm fascinated with the  
contrast between the tenor of the Business Week article below and Will  
Lester's piece that was sent out earlier, which depicted the session as a  
love-in between Huffington and AAPOR. Did both these reporters attend the  
same event?

Jo Holz  
Vice President, Research  
iN DEMAND  
phone: (646) 638-8214  
fax: (646) 486-0857  
jholz@indemand.com=20

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

From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM]=20  
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 9:41 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu=20  
Subject: On Huffington

BUSINESS WEEK, MAY 19, 2003

Just Say "No" to Pollsters?

That's what polling critic Ariana Huffington wants Americans to do. No  
wonder she just got an earful at the profession's annual meeting

TV commentator, author, and columnist Arianna Huffington thinks  
politicians are hooked on polls in ways that are dangerous for  
democracy. She has a solution. "When pollsters call, just refuse to  
answer any questions," she urges voters on her Web site,  
www.ariannaonline.com. "Once enough people join us, poll results will  
become useless, and our leaders will be forced to lead."

So fireworks were bound to explode on May 9, when Huffington, the  
self-described co-founder of the Partnership for a Poll-Free America,  
agreed to address the annual meeting in Nashville of the American  
Association for Public Opinion Research (www.aapor.org), the nation's  
leading organization for poll researchers. By the evening's end,  
Huffington was on the defensive, dodging accusations that she had her  
facts wrong and protesting that she had been misunderstood.

It was an exhilarating moment for the researchers, who fear that



Huffington's "crusade," as she calls it, will undermine their ability to gather information from the public on all kinds of topics -- not only on voter preferences but on how many people are unemployed, how many children haven't been vaccinated, and whether old people understand the eligibility for health benefits. (Disclosure: In addition to being BusinessWeek's Economics editor, I'm its liaison to survey organizations. Also, I've attended several meetings of the AAPOR, and my wife is a member.)

**POLLS' ABUSES.** Huffington's main criticism is that excessive attention to polls has turned politicians from courageous leaders into pandering marketers. Using polls, candidates and incumbents continuously fine-tune their platforms and messages to make people like them, instead of deciding what they think is right and trying to rally people to follow.

The pollsters' response? All that may be true, but it's not their fault if their results are misused. It's important to know where the public stands on the issues of the day, said Richard Morin, a writer for The Washington Post who was one of three people assigned to engage Huffington in a discussion for the audience.

Huffington alleges in her newspaper columns that polls are getting increasingly inaccurate. In fact, said Morin, the average error of polls concerning the two major candidates in the 2000 elections was just 1.1 percentage points, significantly lower than the typical margin of error 20 or 30 years ago.

**STATISTICAL DEAD HEAT.** The pundit claims that in the 2000 Presidential election, in which Al Gore won the popular vote, 80% of pollsters falsely picked George W. Bush to win more of the popular vote than Gore or to tie. In fact, say the researchers, even though most of the polls had Bush slightly ahead, the pollsters actually considered the race a statistical dead heat -- that is, Bush's tiny advantage was less than the polls' stated margin of error.

Is accuracy being degraded by the increasing rate of "nonresponse" -- in which phone calls aren't answered or people do answer and refuse to participate? That's what Huffington charges. It's a reasonable criticism, assuming that the people who do answer surveys are different from the ones who don't. But several papers at the conference presented surprising evidence that for a broad range of nonresponse rates -- say, anywhere from 30% to 70% -- more nonresponses don't worsen accuracy.

Finally, Huffington contends that polls were partially responsible for the tragedy of September 11, 2001. She says they showed that the public didn't consider terrorism a major threat, so poll-driven politicians ignored security. But Morin produced a series of polls conducted before September 11 in which the public did express major concern about terrorism -- in contrast to only three "fleeting" mentions of terrorism he found in Huffington's own prodigious output of columns.

**END OF ALL POLLS?** Not all of Huffington's criticisms were rejected as out of hand. The AAPOR has begun urging its members to publish the rate of nonresponse to their surveys, a step Huffington advocates. And like her, the group is on-record opposing so-called "commissioned polls" that

are engineered to show public support for an organization's agenda.

What most galled the researchers, however, was Huffington's call for shutting down polling entirely. The critic said she was against only polls that were designed to help politicians tailor their messages. But when the researchers asked her to clarify that distinction in her columns and on her Web site, she wouldn't commit to doing so. On that score, the evening ended in a draw.

By Peter Coy in Nashville  
Edited by Douglas Harbrecht

To subscribe online to BusinessWeek magazine, please click here.  
Learn more, go to the BusinessWeekOnline home page

Copyright 2003, by The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc. All rights reserved.  
Terms of Use | Privacy Policy

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>=20  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>=20

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>=20  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Mon, 19 May 2003 10:06:38 -0400  
Reply-To: Will Lester <[wlester@AP.ORG](mailto:wlester@AP.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Will Lester <[wlester@AP.ORG](mailto:wlester@AP.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: Will Lester on Huffington in the Lions' Den  
Comments: To: Scott Keeter <[skeeter@GMU.EDU](mailto:skeeter@GMU.EDU)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

folks:

the earlier link was from the first part of the meeting written before the east coast deadlines, this updated story includes a reference to some of the later exchange.

regards,

will

^Pollsters hear from their harshest critic, caution her about the effects of her crusade<  
^By WILL LESTER=3D

^Associated Press Writer=3D

=B6 NASHVILLE, Tenn. (AP) =5F Pollsters heard one of their harshest critics say she is aiming her attacks mostly at political polls, but columnist Arianna Huffington got a reminder that her crusade can hinder all types of public opinion research.

=B6 Huffington often writes the public should hang up on pollsters when they call. On Friday night, however, she said she is not aiming her criticism at many useful surveys done by the government and other groups about social problems and public needs.

=B6 Pollsters serving on a panel to rebut Huffington's criticism reminded her that her attacks on the polls could harm many other forms of research.

=B6 "Polls are being used to enable fanatical, foolish leadership," Huffington told members of the American Association for Public Opinion Research. "They are dangerous for democracy."

=B6 Huffington has written about the evils of polling and has urged the public not to cooperate with pollsters.

=B6 But speaking at the association's annual meeting, she generally set aside her apocalyptic view of the polling profession. Instead, she urged members to use their public opinion skills to focus politicians on the nation's most serious problems at home =5F the plight of homeless children, rising unemployment and poorly funded schools.

=B6 Huffington complained that poll results like President Bush's high job approval numbers are misused by members of the media, who don't spend enough time digging beneath those results to find that the public has very mixed views on his performance on the economy and other domestic issues.

=B6 When Bush's job approval spiked above 90 percent after the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, she said, the poll result was not specifically about Bush's performance in office.

=B6 "We wanted to rally around the leader we had," she said, and the public was supporting an idea =5F of the kind of president the nation needed after the attacks.

=B6 Congress is considering more tax cuts even though earlier reductions pushed by the administration did not create jobs, she said. Those tax cuts aren't getting enough opposition from Democrats because "Democratic leaders are convinced the Americans want tax cuts," Huffington said.

=B6 The polling group is sending \$5,000 to a charity on behalf of Huffington, an expenditure that brought protests from some other members.

=B6 Some pollsters had protested bringing Huffington to their meeting and a few said they would not attend her talk.

=B6 "She's a very serious critic of ours and a media hog," said veteran pollster Harry O'Neill, who refused to hear her speak. "She's a waste of our time and our money."

=B6 =5F=5F=5F

=B6 On the Net:

=B6 American Association for Public Opinion Research:

<http://www.aapor.org>

Scott Keeter wrote:

>=20

> The conference was stimulating, uplifting, exhausting, informative...

> just what I wanted. Kudos to everyone who organized it as well as all

> those who participated.  
>=20  
> Here's AAPOR member and AP reporter Will Lester's story about the Friday  
> night plenary:  
>=20  
> <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uslatest/story/0,1282,-2685681,00.html>  
> or  
> [http://www.daytondailynews.com/news/content/news/ap/ap=5Fstory.html/Natio=  
nal/AP.V1869.AP-Pollsters-Crit.html](http://www.daytondailynews.com/news/content/news/ap/ap=5Fstory.html/Natio=al/AP.V1869.AP-Pollsters-Crit.html)  
>=20  
> If these links are dead by the time you try to read them, just go to  
> Google's news pages and put in "Huffington." You'll find plenty of links  
> to the story.  
>=20  
> --  
> Scott Keeter  
> Pew Research Center for the People and the Press  
> 1150 18th St. N.W., Suite 975  
> Washington, DC 20036  
> Voice 202 293 3126 x16  
> Personal fax 703 832 0209  
> E-mail [keeters@people-press.org](mailto:keeters@people-press.org)  
> Web site <http://mason.gmu.edu/~skeeter>  
>=20  
> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Mon, 19 May 2003 10:22:59 -0400  
Reply-To: Ken Winneg <[kwinneg@ASC.UPENN.EDU](mailto:kwinneg@ASC.UPENN.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Ken Winneg <[kwinneg@ASC.UPENN.EDU](mailto:kwinneg@ASC.UPENN.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Nashville Nights  
Comments: To: Ward Kay <[wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM](mailto:wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

And most of us who were there at 2:30 (actually, till 3), still made it to the 8:15 am sessions. Great conference! Great job, Jon, and to all who were involved.

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

From: Ward Kay [<mailto:wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM>]  
Sent: Sunday, May 18, 2003 10:30 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Nashville Nights

Longtime AAPOR members sometimes talk wistfully about the old meetings where discussions would last late into the night. I thought of that last night (this morning) when I looked around the lobby bar at 2:30 am

to find 35 AAPOR members still going strong, including a past president and another former board member (the current board being too exhausted from the fine work to enjoy some of the fruits of the labor). Even in its larger size, AAPOR remains the Meeting Place.

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Mon, 19 May 2003 10:19:04 -0400  
Reply-To: elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Elizabeth Martin <elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV>  
Subject: Re: On Huffington  
Comments: To: "Holz, Jo" <jholz@INDEMAND.COM>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

We'll clearly need a follow-up session next year on "Deconstructing Arianna"...

"Holz, Jo"  
<jholz@INDEMAND.COM> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
cc:  
Sent by: AAPORNET Subject: Re: On Huffington  
<AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
>

05/19/2003 09:56  
AM  
Please respond to  
"Holz, Jo"

As someone who wasn't able to attend the national conference this year and thus didn't personally see Huffington's panel, I'm fascinated with the contrast between the tenor of the Business Week article below and Will Lester's piece that was sent out earlier, which depicted the session as a love-in between Huffington and AAPOR. Did both these reporters attend the same event?

Jo Holz

Vice President, Research  
iN DEMAND  
phone: (646) 638-8214  
fax: (646) 486-0857  
jholz@indemand.com

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

From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM]  
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 9:41 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: On Huffington

BUSINESS WEEK, MAY 19, 2003

Just Say "No" to Pollsters?

That's what polling critic Ariana Huffington wants Americans to do. No wonder she just got an earful at the profession's annual meeting

TV commentator, author, and columnist Arianna Huffington thinks politicians are hooked on polls in ways that are dangerous for democracy. She has a solution. "When pollsters call, just refuse to answer any questions," she urges voters on her Web site, [www.ariannaonline.com](http://www.ariannaonline.com). "Once enough people join us, poll results will become useless, and our leaders will be forced to lead."

So fireworks were bound to explode on May 9, when Huffington, the self-described co-founder of the Partnership for a Poll-Free America, agreed to address the annual meeting in Nashville of the American Association for Public Opinion Research ([www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)), the nation's leading organization for poll researchers. By the evening's end, Huffington was on the defensive, dodging accusations that she had her facts wrong and protesting that she had been misunderstood.

It was an exhilarating moment for the researchers, who fear that Huffington's "crusade," as she calls it, will undermine their ability to gather information from the public on all kinds of topics -- not only on voter preferences but on how many people are unemployed, how many children haven't been vaccinated, and whether old people understand the eligibility for health benefits. (Disclosure: In addition to being BusinessWeek's Economics editor, I'm its liaison to survey organizations. Also, I've attended several meetings of the AAPOR, and my wife is a member.)

**POLS' ABUSES.** Huffington's main criticism is that excessive attention to polls has turned politicians from courageous leaders into pandering marketers. Using polls, candidates and incumbents continuously fine-tune their platforms and messages to make people like them, instead of deciding what they think is right and trying to rally people to follow.

The pollsters' response? All that may be true, but it's not their fault if their results are misused. It's important to know where the public stands on the issues of the day, said Richard Morin, a writer for The

Washington Post who was one of three people assigned to engage Huffington in a discussion for the audience.

Huffington alleges in her newspaper columns that polls are getting increasingly inaccurate. In fact, said Morin, the average error of polls concerning the two major candidates in the 2000 elections was just 1.1 percentage points, significantly lower than the typical margin of error 20 or 30 years ago.

STATISTICAL DEAD HEAT. The pundit claims that in the 2000 Presidential election, in which Al Gore won the popular vote, 80% of pollsters falsely picked George W. Bush to win more of the popular vote than Gore or to tie. In fact, say the researchers, even though most of the polls had Bush slightly ahead, the pollsters actually considered the race a statistical dead heat -- that is, Bush's tiny advantage was less than the polls' stated margin of error.

Is accuracy being degraded by the increasing rate of "nonresponse" -- in which phone calls aren't answered or people do answer and refuse to participate? That's what Huffington charges. It's a reasonable criticism, assuming that the people who do answer surveys are different from the ones who don't. But several papers at the conference presented surprising evidence that for a broad range of nonresponse rates -- say, anywhere from 30% to 70% -- more nonresponses don't worsen accuracy.

Finally, Huffington contends that polls were partially responsible for the tragedy of September 11, 2001. She says they showed that the public didn't consider terrorism a major threat, so poll-driven politicians ignored security. But Morin produced a series of polls conducted before September 11 in which the public did express major concern about terrorism -- in contrast to only three "fleeting" mentions of terrorism he found in Huffington's own prodigious output of columns.

END OF ALL POLLS? Not all of Huffington's criticisms were rejected as out of hand. The AAPOR has begun urging its members to publish the rate of nonresponse to their surveys, a step Huffington advocates. And like her, the group is on-record opposing so-called "commissioned polls" that are engineered to show public support for an organization's agenda.

What most galled the researchers, however, was Huffington's call for shutting down polling entirely. The critic said she was against only polls that were designed to help politicians tailor their messages. But when the researchers asked her to clarify that distinction in her columns and on her Web site, she wouldn't commit to doing so. On that score, the evening ended in a draw.

By Peter Coy in Nashville  
Edited by Douglas Harbrecht

To subscribe online to BusinessWeek magazine, please click here.  
Learn more, go to the BusinessWeekOnline home page

Copyright 2003, by The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc. All rights reserved.  
Terms of Use | Privacy Policy

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Mon, 19 May 2003 10:14:00 -0400  
Reply-To: Will Lester <[wlester@AP.ORG](mailto:wlester@AP.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Will Lester <[wlester@AP.ORG](mailto:wlester@AP.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: aapor coverage  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

folks:

the initial story was filed on east coast deadlines before the q and a,  
and here's the updated version to include some of the later exchanges.

regards,

w-

^Pollsters hear from their harshest critic, caution her about the  
effects of her crusade<

^By WILL LESTER=3D

^Associated Press Writer=3D

=B6 NASHVILLE, Tenn. (AP) =5F Pollsters heard one of their harshest  
critics say she is aiming her attacks mostly at political polls, but  
columnist Arianna Huffington got a reminder that her crusade can hinder  
all types of public opinion research.

=B6 Huffington often writes the public should hang up on pollsters when  
they call. On Friday night, however, she said she is not aiming her  
criticism at many useful surveys done by the government and other groups  
about social problems and public needs.

=B6 Pollsters serving on a panel to rebut Huffington's criticism  
reminded her that her attacks on the polls could harm many other forms  
of research.

=B6 "Polls are being used to enable fanatical, foolish leadership,"  
Huffington told members of the American Association for Public Opinion  
Research. "They are dangerous for democracy."

=B6 Huffington has written about the evils of polling and has urged the  
public not to cooperate with pollsters.

=B6 But speaking at the association's annual meeting, she generally set  
aside her apocalyptic view of the polling profession. Instead, she urged  
members to use their public opinion skills to focus politicians on the



nation's most serious problems at home =5F the plight of homeless children, rising unemployment and poorly funded schools.

=B6 Huffington complained that poll results like President Bush's high job approval numbers are misused by members of the media, who don't spend enough time digging beneath those results to find that the public has very mixed views on his performance on the economy and other domestic issues.

=B6 When Bush's job approval spiked above 90 percent after the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, she said, the poll result was not specifically about Bush's performance in office.

=B6 "We wanted to rally around the leader we had," she said, and the public was supporting an idea =5F of the kind of president the nation needed after the attacks.

=B6 Congress is considering more tax cuts even though earlier reductions pushed by the administration did not create jobs, she said. Those tax cuts aren't getting enough opposition from Democrats because "Democratic leaders are convinced the Americans want tax cuts," Huffington said.

=B6 The polling group is sending \$5,000 to a charity on behalf of Huffington, an expenditure that brought protests from some other members.

=B6 Some pollsters had protested bringing Huffington to their meeting and a few said they would not attend her talk.

=B6 "She's a very serious critic of ours and a media hog," said veteran pollster Harry O'Neill, who refused to hear her speak. "She's a waste of our time and our money."

=B6 =5F=5F=5F

=B6 On the Net:

=B6 American Association for Public Opinion Research:  
<http://www.aapor.org>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Mon, 19 May 2003 11:27:47 -0400  
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>  
Subject: Re: On Huffington  
Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

From the Business Week article:

"STATISTICAL DEAD HEAT. The pundit claims that in the 2000 Presidential election, in which Al Gore won the popular vote, 80% of pollsters falsely picked George W. Bush to win more of the popular vote than Gore or to tie. In fact, say the researchers, even though most of the polls had Bush slightly ahead, the pollsters actually considered the race a statistical dead heat -- that is, Bush's tiny advantage was less than the polls' stated margin of error."

As everyone on this listserv knows, the poll's stated margin of error is = an arbitrarily inflatable/deflatable number that escalates with the = confidence level. The notion of statistical significance as a binary = attribute is largely incorrect. If 10 out of 20 polls make the wrong = prediction, how do you decide which one of the 10 gets let off the hook = courtesy of sampling error? (Assumes 95 percent confidence level.) The = other 9 were just -- wrong. You can't give all 10 of them "dead heat" = exemptions without simultaneously claiming that something enormously = improbable took place. The concept of a statistical dead heat is = covering up the fact that, however slim the difference, the numerically = higher estimate is still the poll's best estimate of the population = parameter (the winner in this case).

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

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

From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
Date: Monday, May 19, 2003 9:44 AM  
Subject: On Huffington

BUSINESS WEEK, MAY 19, 2003

Just Say "No" to Pollsters?

That's what polling critic Ariana Huffington wants Americans to do. No wonder she just got an earful at the profession's annual meeting

TV commentator, author, and columnist Arianna Huffington thinks politicians are hooked on polls in ways that are dangerous for democracy. She has a solution. "When pollsters call, just refuse to answer any questions," she urges voters on her Web site, [www.ariannaonline.com](http://www.ariannaonline.com). "Once enough people join us, poll results will become useless, and our leaders will be forced to lead."

So fireworks were bound to explode on May 9, when Huffington, the self-described co-founder of the Partnership for a Poll-Free America, agreed to address the annual meeting in Nashville of the American Association for Public Opinion Research ([www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)), the nation's leading organization for poll researchers. By the evening's end, Huffington was on the defensive, dodging accusations that she had her facts wrong and protesting that she had been misunderstood.

It was an exhilarating moment for the researchers, who fear that Huffington's "crusade," as she calls it, will undermine their ability to gather information from the public on all kinds of topics -- not only on voter preferences but on how many people are unemployed, how many children haven't been vaccinated, and whether old people understand the eligibility for health benefits. (Disclosure: In addition to being BusinessWeek's Economics editor, I'm its liaison to survey organizations. Also, I've attended several meetings of the AAPOR, and my wife is a member.)

**POLS' ABUSES.** Huffington's main criticism is that excessive attention to polls has turned politicians from courageous leaders into pandering marketers. Using polls, candidates and incumbents continuously fine-tune their platforms and messages to make people like them, instead of deciding what they think is right and trying to rally people to follow.

The pollsters' response? All that may be true, but it's not their fault if their results are misused. It's important to know where the public stands on the issues of the day, said Richard Morin, a writer for The Washington Post who was one of three people assigned to engage Huffington in a discussion for the audience.

Huffington alleges in her newspaper columns that polls are getting increasingly inaccurate. In fact, said Morin, the average error of polls concerning the two major candidates in the 2000 elections was just 1.1 percentage points, significantly lower than the typical margin of error 20 or 30 years ago.

**STATISTICAL DEAD HEAT.** The pundit claims that in the 2000 Presidential election, in which Al Gore won the popular vote, 80% of pollsters falsely picked George W. Bush to win more of the popular vote than Gore or to tie. In fact, say the researchers, even though most of the polls had Bush slightly ahead, the pollsters actually considered the race a statistical dead heat -- that is, Bush's tiny advantage was less than the polls' stated margin of error.

Is accuracy being degraded by the increasing rate of "nonresponse" -- in which phone calls aren't answered or people do answer and refuse to participate? That's what Huffington charges. It's a reasonable criticism, assuming that the people who do answer surveys are different from the ones who don't. But several papers at the conference presented surprising evidence that for a broad range of nonresponse rates -- say, anywhere from 30% to 70% -- more nonresponses don't worsen accuracy.

Finally, Huffington contends that polls were partially responsible for the tragedy of September 11, 2001. She says they showed that the public didn't consider terrorism a major threat, so poll-driven politicians ignored security. But Morin produced a series of polls conducted before September 11 in which the public did express major concern about terrorism -- in contrast to only three "fleeting" mentions of terrorism he found in Huffington's own prodigious output of columns.

**END OF ALL POLLS?** Not all of Huffington's criticisms were rejected as out of hand. The AAPOR has begun urging its members to publish the rate of nonresponse to their surveys, a step Huffington advocates. And like her, the group is on-record opposing so-called "commissioned polls" that are engineered to show public support for an organization's agenda.

What most galled the researchers, however, was Huffington's call for shutting down polling entirely. The critic said she was against only polls that were designed to help politicians tailor their messages. But when the researchers asked her to clarify that distinction in her columns and on her Web site, she wouldn't commit to doing so. On that score, the evening ended in a draw.

By Peter Coy in Nashville  
Edited by Douglas Harbrecht

To subscribe online to BusinessWeek magazine, please click here.  
Learn more, go to the BusinessWeekOnline home page

Copyright 2003, by The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc. All rights reserved.  
Terms of Use | Privacy Policy

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Mon, 19 May 2003 13:21:42 -0400  
Reply-To: "Chun, Young" <YChun@AIR.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Chun, Young" <YChun@AIR.ORG>  
Subject: A couple of immediate action recommendations - RE: On Huffington  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

I see Huffington as a fine communicator while I disagree with major points of hers on free-polling society. And there is no question that AAPOR's trio discussants have done excellent rebuttals!

Yet it's now a matter of fine, timely coordination with media to release balanced coverages of one of the best debates I've heard in the past 15 AAPOR years.

A couple of immediate action recommendations are:

First for long-term AAPOR goals of better public/media relations, I strongly recommend to add an AAPOR Public Relations/Communications Chair in the Executive Committee, an efficient communicator with fine networks with media and with technical expertise in pollings and survey research methods. The responsibility of such an individual with high stature would be to deliver to the public:

- best practice of political and social pollings,
- excellent applications of survey research methods,
- fair coverage of major pollings or survey findings done by AAPOR members, and
- quality-polling or survey-based findings that are good for the public good.

Having served in AAPOR Conference Committees for years,

I recall Jim Beniger of USC and Andrew Kohut of Pew Research, former

presidents of AAPOR, has initiated and well coordinated coverage of various fine pollings conducted by AAPOR members.

Second for immediate action, I highly recommend that the AAPOR Executive Council take immediate actions for balanced coverage of this great 2003 debate by distributing an AAPOR media release or commentary in the next couple of days and working closely with major US and international media. From my experience with media, it costs only a few hundred dollars to send an immediate, persuasive media release to hundreds of major media in a day. Perhaps hundreds of media-related AAPOR members could also help distribute balanced AAPOR news out.... You can certainly count me in.

Hope we act very timely!

Continuously learning from AAPOR members and their survey researches,

Young Chun, Senior Research Scientist

American Institutes for Research  
"More than 50 years of behavioral/social science research"  
1990 K Street, NW Suite 500  
Washington DC 20006

voice: 202 944 5325  
FAX: 202 737 4918

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

From: Elizabeth Martin [mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV]  
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 10:19 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: On Huffington

We'll clearly need a follow-up session next year on "Deconstructing Arianna"...

"Holz, Jo"  
<jholz@INDEMAND.C To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
OM> cc:  
Sent by: AAPORNET Subject: Re: On Huffington  
<AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>

05/19/2003 09:56  
AM  
Please respond to  
"Holz, Jo"

As someone who wasn't able to attend the national conference this year and thus didn't personally see Huffington's panel, I'm fascinated with the contrast between the tenor of the Business Week article below and Will Lester's piece that was sent out earlier, which depicted the session as a love-in between Huffington and AAPOR. Did both these reporters attend the same event?

Jo Holz  
Vice President, Research  
iN DEMAND  
phone: (646) 638-8214  
fax: (646) 486-0857  
jholz@indemand.com

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Mon, 19 May 2003 13:26:50 -0400  
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>  
Organization: Bisconti Research, Inc.  
Subject: AP - Polls Suggest Americans Favor U.N. Ties  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Polls Suggest Americans Favor U.N. Ties  
Polls Suggest Americans' Support for Iraq War Has Not Lessened Their  
Belief in U.N.'s Importance

The Associated Press

NASHVILLE, Tenn. May 18 -  
Americans' strong support for the war with Iraq has not diminished the  
public's belief in the importance of working with the United Nations and  
winning international backing for future military action, polls suggest.

"The American public is showing significant enthusiasm for having gone  
to war, and the president has overwhelming support for that choice,"  
said Steven Kull, director of the Program on International Policy  
Attitudes. "It does seem, though, that this support is very

compartmentalized and specific to the Iraq situation."

Kull emphasized that point in a presentation during the weekend to the American Association for Public Opinion Research at its annual meeting.

....

See full story: [http://abcnews.go.com/wire/US/ap20030518\\_324.html](http://abcnews.go.com/wire/US/ap20030518_324.html)

-----  
Mark David Richards

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Mon, 19 May 2003 13:34:23 -0400  
Reply-To: "Donelan, Karen" <KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Donelan, Karen" <KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG>  
Subject: A real case: response rates, publication and the news  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Last week, a group of researchers at Stanford received considerable press attention for an article published in JAMA (the journal of the American Medical Association) based on a survey conducted by Knowledge Networks. The research was funded by Stanford, the National Institute on Aging and the Veterans Administration.

The reported response rate was 69.4%. Additional detail on methods is provided. I have posted the link below to the article, and to a couple of press releases/stories.

<http://jama.ama-assn.org/cgi/content/full/289/18/2400>

[http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2003-05-13-internet-usat\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2003-05-13-internet-usat_x.htm)

[http://www.eurekalert.org/pub\\_releases/2003-05/sumc-srp050803.php](http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2003-05/sumc-srp050803.php)

This article makes clear the practical challenges of implementing our more theoretical discussions about reporting response rates. JAMA typically rejects without peer review surveys where the response rates fall below 50%. I have argued about this cutoff, and gotten flexibility once or twice, but its a long held tradition. I am aware that JAMA has published at least one other major paper based on the KN panels.

At AAPOR, we heard some evidence that effective response rates for KN surveys has dropped to the 10-25% range because of panel attrition. We also heard data from KN at AAPOR who indicated that attrition does not

seem to have profoundly influenced findings except in the case where internet usage is being measured.

I would invite any or all of you to read the manuscript, to reflect on our discussions about reporting of response rates, to read the media coverage of the study, and to offer your views in this list or in responses to news organizations or JAMA editors offering your views, whatever they may be.

In the interest of full disclosure, I am not a disinterested observer. I do research in public opinion about internet use (see recent issue of Public Perspective) funded by a number of organizations. I serve as a peer reviewer for several health/medical journals, and am an unpaid member of the editorial board of an online medical journal called Medscape General Medicine. I am frequently asked to review papers about survey data in multiple modes. I also have done, but not published, a number of online surveys.

Karen Donelan, Sc.D.  
Senior Scientist  
MGH Institute for Health Policy  
Massachusetts General Hospital  
Boston, MA 02114

617 726 0681  
kdonelan@partners.org

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Mon, 19 May 2003 13:45:20 -0400  
Reply-To: Michael Cohen <mcohen@FABMAC.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Michael Cohen <mcohen@FABMAC.COM>  
Subject: Huffington Transcript?  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Is a transcript of the Huffington session available for AAPOR members (especially for those of us who were unable to attend the meeting)?

\*\*\*\*\*

Michael D. Cohen, Ph.D.  
Vice President for Public Affairs  
Fabrizio, McLaughlin & Associates  
915 King Street, Second Floor



Alexandria, VA 22314  
(703) 684-4510 Phone  
(703) 739-0664 Fax

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

From: Chun, Young [mailto:YChun@air.org]  
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 1:35 PM  
To: 'Michael Cohen'  
Subject: RE: A couple of immediate action recommendations - RE: On Huffington

Hi Mike,  
Your excellent recommendation reached just me.  
If you meant it to send all in AAPORnet, you may  
send your message to AAPORNET@asu.edu

Young

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

From: Michael Cohen [mailto:mcohen@fabmac.com]  
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 1:31 PM  
To: 'Chun, Young'  
Subject: RE: A couple of immediate action recommendations - RE: On Huffington

To start, we might want to get a transcript of the session available.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of Chun, Young  
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 1:22 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: A couple of immediate action recommendations - RE: On Huffington

I see Huffington as a fine communicator while I disagree with major points of hers on free-polling society. And there is no question that AAPOR's trio discussants have done excellent rebuttals!

Yet it's now a matter of fine, timely coordination with media to release balanced coverages of one of the best debates I've heard in the past 15 AAPOR years.

A couple of immediate action recommendations are:

First for long-term AAPOR goals of better public/media relations, I strongly recommend to add an AAPOR Public Relations/Communications Chair in the Executive Committee, an efficient communicator with fine

networks with media and with technical expertise in pollings and survey research methods. The responsibility of such an individual with high stature would be to deliver to the public:

- best practice of political and social pollings,
- excellent applications of survey research methods,
- fair coverage of major pollings or survey findings done by AAPOR members, and
- quality-polling or survey-based findings that are good for the public good.

Having served in AAPOR Conference Committees for years, I recall Jim Beniger of USC and Andrew Kohut of Pew Research, former

presidents of AAPOR, has initiated and well coordinated coverage of various fine pollings conducted by AAPOR members.

Second for immediate action, I highly recommend that the AAPOR Executive Council take immediate actions for balanced coverage of this great 2003 debate by distributing an AAPOR media release or commentary in the next couple of days and working closely with major US and international media. From my experience with media, it costs only a few hundred dollars to send an immediate, persuasive media release to hundreds of major media in a day. Perhaps hundreds of media-related AAPOR members could also help distribute balanced AAPOR news out.... You can certainly count me in.

Hope we act very timely!

Continuously learning from AAPOR members and their survey researches,

Young Chun, Senior Research Scientist

American Institutes for Research  
"More than 50 years of behavioral/social science research"  
1990 K Street, NW Suite 500  
Washington DC 20006

voice: 202 944 5325  
FAX: 202 737 4918

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

From: Elizabeth Martin [mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV]  
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 10:19 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: On Huffington

We'll clearly need a follow-up session next year on "Deconstructing Arianna"...

"Holz, Jo"  
<jholz@INDEMAND.COM> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
cc:  
Sent by: AAPORNET Subject: Re: On Huffington  
<AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
>

05/19/2003 09:56  
AM  
Please respond to  
"Holz, Jo"

As someone who wasn't able to attend the national conference this year and thus didn't personally see Huffington's panel, I'm fascinated with the contrast between the tenor of the Business Week article below and Will Lester's piece that was sent out earlier, which depicted the session as a love-in between Huffington and AAPOR. Did both these reporters attend the same event?

Jo Holz  
Vice President, Research  
iN DEMAND  
phone: (646) 638-8214  
fax: (646) 486-0857  
jholz@indemand.com

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Mon, 19 May 2003 12:53:58 -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: On Huffington  
Comments: To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0

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

There were 10 national polls conducted over the final days - nine of which ranged from Gore +2 points to Bush +3 points. The distribution favored Bush - and exit poll data showed that Gore was winning the late deciders (last 3 days) which includes election day.

Gore won the popular vote by 0.51 of a percentage point.

So I have an issue with the statement "the numerically higher estimate is still the poll's best estimate" - especially since final releases to the general public said otherwise:

Popular Vote a Toss-up, Pew Research Center;  
No Clear Winner, ABC;  
We Don't Know!...Bush and Gore Virtually Equal, Harris;  
Gore Has A Slight Edge, CBS.

Those characterizations for the public were consistent with the outcome - and with sample theory.

Nick

> "James P. Murphy" wrote:

>

> From the Business Week article:

>

> "STATISTICAL DEAD HEAT. The pundit claims that in the 2000

> Presidential

> election, in which Al Gore won the popular vote, 80% of pollsters

> falsely picked George W. Bush to win more of the popular vote than

> Gore

> or to tie. In fact, say the researchers, even though most of the polls

> had Bush slightly ahead, the pollsters actually considered the race a

> statistical dead heat -- that is, Bush's tiny advantage was less than

> the polls' stated margin of error."

> As everyone on this listserv knows, the poll's stated margin of error

> is an arbitrarily inflatable/deflatable number that escalates with the

> confidence level. The notion of statistical significance as a binary

> attribute is largely incorrect. If 10 out of 20 polls make the wrong

> prediction, how do you decide which one of the 10 gets let off the

> hook courtesy of sampling error? (Assumes 95 percent confidence

> level.) The other 9 were just -- wrong. You can't give all 10 of them

> "dead heat" exemptions without simultaneously claiming that something

> enormously improbable took place. The concept of a statistical dead

> heat is covering up the fact that, however slim the difference, the

> numerically higher estimate is still the poll's best estimate of the

> population parameter (the winner in this case).

>

> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

> Voice (610) 408-8800

> Fax (610) 408-8802

> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

> From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
> Date: Monday, May 19, 2003 9:44 AM  
> Subject: On Huffington  
>  
> BUSINESS WEEK, MAY 19, 2003  
>  
> Just Say "No" to Pollsters?  
> That's what polling critic Ariana Huffington wants Americans to do. No  
> wonder she just got an earful at the profession's annual meeting  
>  
> TV commentator, author, and columnist Arianna Huffington thinks  
> politicians are hooked on polls in ways that are dangerous for  
> democracy. She has a solution. "When pollsters call, just refuse to  
> answer any questions," she urges voters on her Web site,  
> www.ariannaonline.com. "Once enough people join us, poll results will  
> become useless, and our leaders will be forced to lead."  
>  
> So fireworks were bound to explode on May 9, when Huffington, the  
> self-described co-founder of the Partnership for a Poll-Free America,  
> agreed to address the annual meeting in Nashville of the American  
> Association for Public Opinion Research (www.aapor.org), the nation's  
> leading organization for poll researchers. By the evening's end,  
> Huffington was on the defensive, dodging accusations that she had her  
> facts wrong and protesting that she had been misunderstood.  
>  
> It was an exhilarating moment for the researchers, who fear that  
> Huffington's "crusade," as she calls it, will undermine their ability  
> to  
> gather information from the public on all kinds of topics -- not only  
> on  
> voter preferences but on how many people are unemployed, how many  
> children haven't been vaccinated, and whether old people understand  
> the  
> eligibility for health benefits. (Disclosure: In addition to being  
> BusinessWeek's Economics editor, I'm its liaison to survey  
> organizations. Also, I've attended several meetings of the AAPOR, and  
> my  
> wife is a member.)  
>  
> POLS' ABUSES. Huffington's main criticism is that excessive attention  
> to polls has turned politicians from courageous leaders into pandering  
> marketers. Using polls, candidates and incumbents continuously  
> fine-tune  
> their platforms and messages to make people like them, instead of  
> deciding what they think is right and trying to rally people to  
> follow.  
>  
> The pollsters' response? All that may be true, but it's not their  
> fault  
> if their results are misused. It's important to know where the public  
> stands on the issues of the day, said Richard Morin, a writer for The  
> Washington Post who was one of three people assigned to engage  
> Huffington in a discussion for the audience.

>  
> Huffington alleges in her newspaper columns that polls are getting  
> increasingly inaccurate. In fact, said Morin, the average error of  
> polls  
> concerning the two major candidates in the 2000 elections was just 1.1  
> percentage points, significantly lower than the typical margin of  
> error  
> 20 or 30 years ago.  
>  
> STATISTICAL DEAD HEAT. The pundit claims that in the 2000  
> Presidential  
> election, in which Al Gore won the popular vote, 80% of pollsters  
> falsely picked George W. Bush to win more of the popular vote than  
> Gore  
> or to tie. In fact, say the researchers, even though most of the polls  
> had Bush slightly ahead, the pollsters actually considered the race a  
> statistical dead heat -- that is, Bush's tiny advantage was less than  
> the polls' stated margin of error.  
> Is accuracy being degraded by the increasing rate of "nonresponse" --  
> in  
> which phone calls aren't answered or people do answer and refuse to  
> participate? That's what Huffington charges. It's a reasonable  
> criticism, assuming that the people who do answer surveys are  
> different  
> from the ones who don't. But several papers at the conference  
> presented  
> surprising evidence that for a broad range of nonresponse rates --  
> say,  
> anywhere from 30% to 70% -- more nonresponses don't worsen accuracy.  
>  
> Finally, Huffington contends that polls were partially responsible for  
> the tragedy of September 11, 2001. She says they showed that the  
> public  
> didn't consider terrorism a major threat, so poll-driven politicians  
> ignored security. But Morin produced a series of polls conducted  
> before  
> September 11 in which the public did express major concern about  
> terrorism -- in contrast to only three "fleeting" mentions of  
> terrorism  
> he found in Huffington's own prodigious output of columns.  
>  
> END OF ALL POLLS? Not all of Huffington's criticisms were rejected as  
> out of hand. The AAPOR has begun urging its members to publish the  
> rate  
> of nonresponse to their surveys, a step Huffington advocates. And like  
> her, the group is on-record opposing so-called "commissioned polls"  
> that  
> are engineered to show public support for an organization's agenda.  
>  
> What most galled the researchers, however, was Huffington's call for  
> shutting down polling entirely. The critic said she was against only  
> polls that were designed to help politicians tailor their messages.  
> But  
> when the researchers asked her to clarify that distinction in her

> columns and on her Web site, she wouldn't commit to doing so. On that  
> score, the evening ended in a draw.  
>  
> By Peter Coy in Nashville  
> Edited by Douglas Harbrecht  
>  
> To subscribe online to BusinessWeek magazine, please click here.  
> Learn more, go to the BusinessWeekOnline home page  
>  
> Copyright 2003, by The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc. All rights reserved.  
> Terms of Use | Privacy Policy  
>  
> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Mon, 19 May 2003 15:00:13 -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: Re: A real case: response rates, publication and the news  
Comments: To: "Donelan, Karen" <[KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG](mailto:KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Are you sure about the response rate? I haven't checked in this case,  
but in the past the response rate provided by Knowledge Networks did not  
include the substantial non-response entailed in creating their panel,  
but only the non-response of the panel to a particular survey.

Howard

Donelan, Karen wrote:

>Last week, a group of researchers at Stanford received  
>considerable press attention for an article published  
>in JAMA (the journal of the American Medical Association)  
>based on a survey conducted by Knowledge Networks. The research  
>was funded by Stanford, the National Institute on Aging and the  
>Veterans Administration.  
>  
>The reported response rate was 69.4%. Additional detail on methods  
>is provided. I have posted the link below to the article,  
>and to a couple of press releases/stories.  
>  
><http://jama.ama-assn.org/cgi/content/full/289/18/2400>  
>  
>[http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2003-05-13-internet-usat\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2003-05-13-internet-usat_x.htm)  
>  
>[http://www.eurekaalert.org/pub\\_releases/2003-05/sumc-srp050803.php](http://www.eurekaalert.org/pub_releases/2003-05/sumc-srp050803.php)

>  
>This article makes clear the practical challenges of implementing  
>our more theoretical discussions about reporting response rates. JAMA  
typically  
>rejects without peer review surveys where the response rates fall below 50%.  
>I have argued about this cutoff, and gotten flexibility once or twice, but  
>its a long held tradition. I am aware that JAMA has published at least one  
other  
>major paper  
>based on the KN panels.  
>  
>At AAPOR, we heard some evidence that effective response rates for KN  
>surveys has dropped to the 10-25% range because of panel attrition.  
>We also heard data from KN at AAPOR who indicated that attrition does not  
>seem to have profoundly influenced findings except in the case where internet  
>usage is being measured.  
>  
>I would invite any or all of you to read the manuscript, to reflect on our  
>discussions  
>about reporting of response rates, to read the media coverage of the study,  
and  
>to  
>offer your views in this list or in responses to news organizations or JAMA  
>editors  
>offering your views, whatever they may be.  
>  
>In the interest of full disclosure, I am not a disinterested observer. I do  
>research in public opinion about internet use (see recent issue of Public  
>Perspective) funded by a number of organizations. I serve as a peer reviewer  
for  
>several health/medical journals, and am an unpaid member of the editorial  
board  
>of an online medical journal called Medscape General Medicine. I am  
frequently  
>asked to review papers about survey data in multiple modes. I also have  
done,  
>but not published, a number of online surveys.  
>  
>  
>Karen Donelan, Sc.D.  
>Senior Scientist  
>MGH Institute for Health Policy  
>Massachusetts General Hospital  
>Boston, MA 02114  
>  
>617 726 0681  
>kdonelan@partners.org  
>  
>-----  
>Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>  
>



-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Mon, 19 May 2003 15:38:40 -0400  
Reply-To: "Jon A. Krosnick" <krosnick@OSU.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Jon A. Krosnick" <krosnick@OSU.EDU>  
Subject: Fwd: Re: A real case: response rates, publication and the news  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

The JAMA article clearly explains that 69.4% is the percent of KN panel members invited to complete the questionnaire who did so.

>Date: Mon, 19 May 2003 15:00:13 -0400  
>From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
>Subject: Re: A real case: response rates, publication and the news  
>Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>Reply-to: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
>X-Accept-Language: en-us, en  
>User-Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows; U; Windows NT 5.0; en-US; rv:1.0.1)  
> Gecko/20020823 Netscape/7.0  
>Comments: To: "Donelan, Karen" <KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG>

>  
>Are you sure about the response rate? I haven't checked in this case,  
>but in the past the response rate provided by Knowledge Networks did not  
>include the substantial non-response entailed in creating their panel,  
>but only the non-response of the panel to a particular survey.

> Howard

>  
>Donelan, Karen wrote:

>>Last week, a group of researchers at Stanford received  
>>considerable press attention for an article published  
>>in JAMA (the journal of the American Medical Association)  
>>based on a survey conducted by Knowledge Networks. The research  
>>was funded by Stanford, the National Institute on Aging and the  
>>Veterans Administration.

>>  
>>The reported response rate was 69.4%. Additional detail on methods  
>>is provided. I have posted the link below to the article,  
>>and to a couple of press releases/stories.

>>  
>><http://jama.ama-assn.org/cgi/content/full/289/18/2400>

>>  
>>[http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2003-05-13-internet-usat\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2003-05-13-internet-usat_x.htm)

>>  
>>[http://www.eurekalert.org/pub\\_releases/2003-05/sumc-srp050803.php](http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2003-05/sumc-srp050803.php)

>>  
>>This article makes clear the practical challenges of implementing  
>>our more theoretical discussions about reporting response rates. JAMA

>>typically  
>>rejects without peer review surveys where the response rates fall below 50%.  
>>I have argued about this cutoff, and gotten flexibility once or twice, but  
>>its a long held tradition. I am aware that JAMA has published at least  
>>one other  
>>major paper  
>>based on the KN panels.

>>  
>>At AAPOR, we heard some evidence that effective response rates for KN  
>>surveys has dropped to the 10-25% range because of panel attrition.  
>>We also heard data from KN at AAPOR who indicated that attrition does not  
>>seem to have profoundly influenced findings except in the case where  
internet  
>>usage is being measured.

>>  
>>I would invite any or all of you to read the manuscript, to reflect on our  
>>discussions  
>>about reporting of response rates, to read the media coverage of the  
>>study, and  
>>to  
>>offer your views in this list or in responses to news organizations or JAMA  
>>editors  
>>offering your views, whatever they may be.

>>  
>>In the interest of full disclosure, I am not a disinterested observer. I do  
>>research in public opinion about internet use (see recent issue of Public  
>>Perspective) funded by a number of organizations. I serve as a peer  
>>reviewer for  
>>several health/medical journals, and am an unpaid member of the editorial  
>>board  
>>of an online medical journal called Medscape General Medicine. I am  
>>frequently  
>>asked to review papers about survey data in multiple modes. I also have  
>>done,  
>>but not published, a number of online surveys.

>>  
>>  
>>Karen Donelan, Sc.D.  
>>Senior Scientist  
>>MGH Institute for Health Policy  
>>Massachusetts General Hospital  
>>Boston, MA 02114

>>  
>>617 726 0681  
>>kdonelan@partners.org  
>>

>>-----  
>>Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>>  
>  
>-----  
>Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Mon, 19 May 2003 16:48:52 -0400  
Reply-To: Eleanor Singer <esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Eleanor Singer <esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU>  
Subject: Re: A real case: response rates, publication and the news  
Comments: To: Jon Krosnick <krosnick@osu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

But remember, those who are invited to participate in a particular survey are a small fraction of those originally recruited to the panel by RDD methods. Michael Dennis could speak better than I to how much attrition there is at various steps along the way and the effective response rate to a particular survey.

Eleanor Singer

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

From: Jon A. Krosnick [mailto:krosnick@OSU.EDU]  
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 3:39 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Fwd: Re: A real case: response rates, publication and the news

The JAMA article clearly explains that 69.4% is the percent of KN panel members invited to complete the questionnaire who did so.

>Date: Mon, 19 May 2003 15:00:13 -0400  
>From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
>Subject: Re: A real case: response rates, publication and the news  
>Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>Reply-to: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
>X-Accept-Language: en-us, en  
>User-Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows; U; Windows NT 5.0; en-US; rv:1.0.1)  
> Gecko/20020823 Netscape/7.0  
>Comments: To: "Donelan, Karen" <KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG>  
>  
>Are you sure about the response rate? I haven't checked in this case,  
>but in the past the response rate provided by Knowledge Networks did not  
>include the substantial non-response entailed in creating their panel,  
>but only the non-response of the panel to a particular survey.  
> Howard  
>  
>Donelan, Karen wrote:  
>  
>>Last week, a group of researchers at Stanford received  
>>considerable press attention for an article published

>>in JAMA (the journal of the American Medical Association)  
>>based on a survey conducted by Knowledge Networks. The research  
>>was funded by Stanford, the National Institute on Aging and the  
>>Veterans Administration.  
>>  
>>The reported response rate was 69.4%. Additional detail on methods  
>>is provided. I have posted the link below to the article,  
>>and to a couple of press releases/stories.  
>>  
>><http://jama.ama-assn.org/cgi/content/full/289/18/2400>  
>>  
>>[http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2003-05-13-internet-usat\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2003-05-13-internet-usat_x.htm)  
>>  
>>[http://www.eurekalert.org/pub\\_releases/2003-05/sumc-srp050803.php](http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2003-05/sumc-srp050803.php)  
>>  
>>This article makes clear the practical challenges of implementing  
>>our more theoretical discussions about reporting response rates. JAMA  
>>typically  
>>rejects without peer review surveys where the response rates fall below  
>>50%.  
>>I have argued about this cutoff, and gotten flexibility once or twice, but  
>>its a long held tradition. I am aware that JAMA has published at least  
>>one other  
>>major paper  
>>based on the KN panels.  
>>  
>>At AAPOR, we heard some evidence that effective response rates for KN  
>>surveys has dropped to the 10-25% range because of panel attrition.  
>>We also heard data from KN at AAPOR who indicated that attrition does not  
>>seem to have profoundly influenced findings except in the case where  
>>internet  
>>usage is being measured.  
>>  
>>I would invite any or all of you to read the manuscript, to reflect on our  
>>discussions  
>>about reporting of response rates, to read the media coverage of the  
>>study, and  
>>to  
>>offer your views in this list or in responses to news organizations or  
>>JAMA  
>>editors  
>>offering your views, whatever they may be.  
>>  
>>In the interest of full disclosure, I am not a disinterested observer. I  
>>do  
>>research in public opinion about internet use (see recent issue of Public  
>>Perspective) funded by a number of organizations. I serve as a peer  
>>reviewer for  
>>several health/medical journals, and am an unpaid member of the editorial  
>>board  
>>of an online medical journal called Medscape General Medicine. I am  
>>frequently  
>>asked to review papers about survey data in multiple modes. I also have  
>>done,

>>>but not published, a number of online surveys.

>>

>>

>>Karen Donelan, Sc.D.

>>Senior Scientist

>>MGH Institute for Health Policy

>>Massachusetts General Hospital

>>Boston, MA 02114

>>

>>617 726 0681

>>kdonelan@partners.org

>>

>>-----

>>Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

>>

>

>-----

>Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 20 May 2003 06:50:26 -0400

Reply-To: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU>

Subject: Re: On Huffington

Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Mr. Nick Panagakis,

You state that you have "an issue with the statement 'the numerically higher estimate

is still the poll's best estimate' ". Well, in a situation in which one can

pick only one of two alternatives, you are left with either the higher estimate or the lower as your best estimate. I can't believe you would pick the lower figure to be better than the higher in any case.

When I taught statistics decades ago, I would always ask my students to put a number on the probability of intelligent life outside our solar system. I would then tell the students that it's either 1.0 or 0.0 -- intermediate values are your subjective estimate.

Gore won the popular vote. Bush won the electoral vote. If the best estimate was that Bush would win the popular vote, it was wrong; if it was that Gore would win the popular vote, it was right. But, as Virginia Woolf might have said, "An estimate is an Estimate is an ESTIMATE."

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: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM]  
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 1:54 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: On Huffington

There were 10 national polls conducted over the final days - nine of which ranged from Gore +2 points to Bush +3 points. The distribution favored Bush - and exit poll data showed that Gore was winning the late deciders (last 3 days) which includes election day.

Gore won the popular vote by 0.51 of a percentage point.

So I have an issue with the statement "the numerically higher estimate is still the poll's best estimate" - especially since final releases to the general public said otherwise:  
Popular Vote a Toss-up, Pew Research Center;  
No Clear Winner, ABC;  
We Don't Know!...Bush and Gore Virtually Equal, Harris;  
Gore Has A Slight Edge, CBS.

Those characterizations for the public were consistent with the outcome - and with sample theory.

Nick

> "James P. Murphy" wrote:  
>  
> From the Business Week article:  
>  
> "STATISTICAL DEAD HEAT. The pundit claims that in the 2000  
> Presidential  
> election, in which Al Gore won the popular vote, 80% of pollsters  
> falsely picked George W. Bush to win more of the popular vote than  
> Gore  
> or to tie. In fact, say the researchers, even though most of the polls  
> had Bush slightly ahead, the pollsters actually considered the race a  
> statistical dead heat -- that is, Bush's tiny advantage was less than  
> the polls' stated margin of error."  
> As everyone on this listserv knows, the poll's stated margin of error  
> is an arbitrarily inflatable/deflatable number that escalates with the  
> confidence level. The notion of statistical significance as a binary

> attribute is largely incorrect. If 10 out of 20 polls make the wrong  
> prediction, how do you decide which one of the 10 gets let off the  
> hook courtesy of sampling error? (Assumes 95 percent confidence  
> level.) The other 9 were just -- wrong. You can't give all 10 of them  
> "dead heat" exemptions without simultaneously claiming that something  
> enormously improbable took place. The concept of a statistical dead  
> heat is covering up the fact that, however slim the difference, the  
> numerically higher estimate is still the poll's best estimate of the  
> population parameter (the winner in this case).

>  
> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
> Voice (610) 408-8800  
> Fax (610) 408-8802  
> [jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com](mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com)  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
> Date: Monday, May 19, 2003 9:44 AM  
> Subject: On Huffington

>  
> BUSINESS WEEK, MAY 19, 2003

>  
> Just Say "No" to Pollsters?  
> That's what polling critic Ariana Huffington wants Americans to do. No  
> wonder she just got an earful at the profession's annual meeting

>  
> TV commentator, author, and columnist Arianna Huffington thinks  
> politicians are hooked on polls in ways that are dangerous for  
> democracy. She has a solution. "When pollsters call, just refuse to  
> answer any questions," she urges voters on her Web site,  
> [www.ariannaonline.com](http://www.ariannaonline.com). "Once enough people join us, poll results will  
> become useless, and our leaders will be forced to lead."

>  
> So fireworks were bound to explode on May 9, when Huffington, the  
> self-described co-founder of the Partnership for a Poll-Free America,  
> agreed to address the annual meeting in Nashville of the American  
> Association for Public Opinion Research ([www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)), the nation's  
> leading organization for poll researchers. By the evening's end,  
> Huffington was on the defensive, dodging accusations that she had her  
> facts wrong and protesting that she had been misunderstood.

>  
> It was an exhilarating moment for the researchers, who fear that  
> Huffington's "crusade," as she calls it, will undermine their ability  
> to  
> gather information from the public on all kinds of topics -- not only  
> on  
> voter preferences but on how many people are unemployed, how many  
> children haven't been vaccinated, and whether old people understand  
> the  
> eligibility for health benefits. (Disclosure: In addition to being  
> BusinessWeek's Economics editor, I'm its liaison to survey  
> organizations. Also, I've attended several meetings of the AAPOR, and  
> my  
> wife is a member.)

>  
> POLS' ABUSES. Huffington's main criticism is that excessive attention  
> to polls has turned politicians from courageous leaders into pandering  
> marketers. Using polls, candidates and incumbents continuously  
> fine-tune  
> their platforms and messages to make people like them, instead of  
> deciding what they think is right and trying to rally people to  
> follow.  
>  
> The pollsters' response? All that may be true, but it's not their  
> fault  
> if their results are misused. It's important to know where the public  
> stands on the issues of the day, said Richard Morin, a writer for The  
> Washington Post who was one of three people assigned to engage  
> Huffington in a discussion for the audience.  
>  
> Huffington alleges in her newspaper columns that polls are getting  
> increasingly inaccurate. In fact, said Morin, the average error of  
> polls  
> concerning the two major candidates in the 2000 elections was just 1.1  
> percentage points, significantly lower than the typical margin of  
> error  
> 20 or 30 years ago.  
>  
> STATISTICAL DEAD HEAT. The pundit claims that in the 2000  
> Presidential  
> election, in which Al Gore won the popular vote, 80% of pollsters  
> falsely picked George W. Bush to win more of the popular vote than  
> Gore  
> or to tie. In fact, say the researchers, even though most of the polls  
> had Bush slightly ahead, the pollsters actually considered the race a  
> statistical dead heat -- that is, Bush's tiny advantage was less than  
> the polls' stated margin of error.  
> Is accuracy being degraded by the increasing rate of "nonresponse" --  
> in  
> which phone calls aren't answered or people do answer and refuse to  
> participate? That's what Huffington charges. It's a reasonable  
> criticism, assuming that the people who do answer surveys are  
> different  
> from the ones who don't. But several papers at the conference  
> presented  
> surprising evidence that for a broad range of nonresponse rates --  
> say,  
> anywhere from 30% to 70% -- more nonresponses don't worsen accuracy.  
>  
> Finally, Huffington contends that polls were partially responsible for  
> the tragedy of September 11, 2001. She says they showed that the  
> public  
> didn't consider terrorism a major threat, so poll-driven politicians  
> ignored security. But Morin produced a series of polls conducted  
> before  
> September 11 in which the public did express major concern about  
> terrorism -- in contrast to only three "fleeting" mentions of  
> terrorism



> he found in Huffington's own prodigious output of columns.  
>  
> END OF ALL POLLS? Not all of Huffington's criticisms were rejected as  
> out of hand. The AAPOR has begun urging its members to publish the  
> rate  
> of nonresponse to their surveys, a step Huffington advocates. And like  
> her, the group is on-record opposing so-called "commissioned polls"  
> that  
> are engineered to show public support for an organization's agenda.  
>  
> What most galled the researchers, however, was Huffington's call for  
> shutting down polling entirely. The critic said she was against only  
> polls that were designed to help politicians tailor their messages.  
> But  
> when the researchers asked her to clarify that distinction in her  
> columns and on her Web site, she wouldn't commit to doing so. On that  
> score, the evening ended in a draw.  
>  
> By Peter Coy in Nashville  
> Edited by Douglas Harbrecht  
>  
> To subscribe online to BusinessWeek magazine, please click here.  
> Learn more, go to the BusinessWeekOnline home page  
>  
> Copyright 2003, by The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc. All rights reserved.  
> Terms of Use | Privacy Policy  
>

> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====

Date: Tue, 20 May 2003 07:08:55 -0500  
Reply-To: ALLAN L MCCUTCHEON <[amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: ALLAN L MCCUTCHEON <[amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU](mailto:amccutch@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU)>  
Subject: POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIPS ON SURVEY DATA COLLECTION IN THE HEALTH SCIENCES.

MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln Gallup Research Center is offering up to two postdoctoral fellowships to focus on verbal report data collection and measurement methods in the health sciences. Fellowships will be offered for two years, and continuing appointments within the Center are possible, dependent on funding. We are seeking candidates who have

experience and interests in pursuing survey research to explore issues on health risks (e.g., cancer, substance use) and/or health disparities. Interested applicants should possess a doctoral degree in public health, psychology, sociology, survey methodology, social work, or any other related social, behavioral, or health science discipline. Fellows will be expected to work collaboratively with Center staff on ongoing funded projects and in the development of grant proposals. Annual stipends are competitive (between \$32,000 and \$50,000) depending on the number of years of postdoctoral experience. The position will include fringe benefits and a travel allowance. Start date is negotiable. Review of applications will continue until the positions are filled. Send vita, (p)reprints, a cover letter describing interests, and 3 letters of reference to:

Dr. Robert Belli  
Postdoctoral Fellowships  
UNL Gallup Research Center  
200 North 11th Street  
P.O. Box 880241  
Lincoln, NE 68588-0241

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Tue, 20 May 2003 09:01:05 -0400  
Reply-To: [lindeman@bard.edu](mailto:lindeman@bard.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mark Lindeman <[lindeman@BARD.EDU](mailto:lindeman@BARD.EDU)>  
Subject: Re; On Huffington  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Nathaniel Ehrlich <[nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:nehrlich@ISR.UMICH.EDU)> wrote in part:

> When I taught statistics decades ago, I would always ask my students to put  
> a number on the probability of intelligent life outside our solar system. I  
> would then tell the students that it's either 1.0 or 0.0 -- intermediate  
> values are your subjective estimate.  
> Gore won the popular vote. Bush won the electoral vote. If the best  
> estimate  
> was that Bush would win the popular vote, it was wrong; if it was that Gore  
> would win the popular vote, it was right.

OK, but if we're considering a binary estimate, then "confidence levels"  
and "margins of error" referring to proportion estimates no longer pertain.  
James Murphy originally wrote in part,

>> If 10 out of 20 polls make the wrong  
>> prediction, how do you decide which one of the 10 gets let off the  
>> hook courtesy of sampling error? (Assumes 95 percent confidence  
>> level.) The other 9 were just -- wrong.

And that, I think, is about where he lost Nick Panagakis and me. If a race is essentially a tie, you should expect 10 out of 20 polls to make the wrong prediction, if forced to predict. Of course, in practice, some polls will call the race a tie, not just a "statistical dead heat." And Gore actually had more votes than Bush. But we still can expect a substantial number of wrong forced predictions. The 95 percent confidence level on which a particular "margin of error" depends doesn't imply 95% confidence of calling the election correctly (again, if forced to make a call).

On the other hand, the original article attributed to Huffington the claim that 80% of polls wrongly predicted that Bush would get more votes. If that's true, meta-analysis may show some systematic error in the predictions even though most estimates of the margin of victory were within the margin of error. For instance, we certainly wouldn't expect 16 out of 20 polls to make the wrong forced prediction, even within their margins of error. The probability of that would be well under 1%, given perfectly fair surveys. So, Huffington's point as relayed by Business Week may have some force.

Based on what Nick says about the distribution of predictions, the systematic error might be on the order of 1 point or so -- not what most people have in mind when they complain about surveys being biased or unreliable. Given that voters do have the prerogative to change their minds at the last minute, no pre-election sample can perfectly represent the actual electorate.

Mark Lindeman  
Bard College

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Tue, 20 May 2003 09:23:34 -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: Re; On Huffington  
Comments: To: "lindeman@bard.edu" <[lindeman@bard.edu](mailto:lindeman@bard.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Dear Mr. Lindeman,  
The point here is both semantic and statistical.  
I was responding to Panagakis "issue with the statement 'the numerically higher estimate is still the poll's best estimate' ": that's going to be true, even if the level of confidence is so low that one would be foolish --or forced at gunpoint--to make any prediction at all.  
But now I ask, how can you say that "if we're considering a binary estimate, then "confidence levels" and "margins of error" referring to proportion

estimates no longer pertain"? Any question is always reducible to a binary estimate - do you take position A or B? We then assign a value of 0.0 for A and 1.0 for B and if the point estimate derived from the poll is .56, with a margin of error of +/-5%, at the 95% confidence level, then one must presume that, 95% of the time, .51 will be the lower limit of the final result, and B will win, because .51>.50.

That does not mean, of course, that the final result CANNOT be below .5, just that if you followed the same procedures 100 times, you would expect that 95 of those would be at .51 or above, and 5 would be below .51. That's your EXPECTATION. You could get 100 results below .51, but you cannot change the estimate without violating statistical procedures. All any one of us can do is be very careful that all of the mathematical assumptions that underlie the prediction have been met. To modify the prediction based on a hunch, or a 'trend', negates the entire process. Fifty years ago, Meehl wrote about clinical and statistical prediction, and his precepts are still valid. Estimates are only estimates. No more Virginia Woolf, just consider the Chinese proverb, "Prediction is difficult, especially as regards the future."

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: Mark Lindeman [mailto:lindeman@BARD.EDU]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2003 9:01 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re; On Huffington

Nathaniel Ehrlich <nehrllich@ISR.UMICH.EDU> wrote in part:

> When I taught statistics decades ago, I would always ask my students to put  
> a number on the probability of intelligent life outside our solar system.  
I  
> would then tell the students that it's either 1.0 or 0.0 -- intermediate  
> values are your subjective estimate.  
> Gore won the popular vote. Bush won the electoral vote. If the best  
> estimate  
> was that Bush would win the popular vote, it was wrong; if it was that  
Gore  
> would win the popular vote, it was right.

OK, but if we're considering a binary estimate, then "confidence levels" and "margins of error" referring to proportion estimates no longer pertain. James Murphy originally wrote in part,

>> If 10 out of 20 polls make the wrong  
>> prediction, how do you decide which one of the 10 gets let off the  
>> hook courtesy of sampling error? (Assumes 95 percent confidence  
>> level.) The other 9 were just -- wrong.

And that, I think, is about where he lost Nick Panagakis and me. If a race is essentially a tie, you should \_expect\_ 10 out of 20 polls to make the wrong prediction, \_if forced to predict\_. Of course, in practice, some polls will call the race a tie, not just a "statistical dead heat." And Gore actually had more votes than Bush. But we still can expect a substantial number of wrong forced predictions. The 95 percent confidence level on which a particular "margin of error" depends doesn't imply 95% confidence of calling the election correctly (again, if forced to make a call).

On the other hand, the original article attributed to Huffington the claim that 80% of polls wrongly predicted that Bush would get more votes. If that's true, meta-analysis may show some systematic error in the predictions even though most estimates of the margin of victory were within the margin of error. For instance, we certainly wouldn't expect \_16\_ out of 20 polls to make the wrong forced prediction, even within their margins of error. The probability of that would be well under 1%, given perfectly fair surveys. So, Huffington's point as relayed by Business Week may have some force.

Based on what Nick says about the distribution of predictions, the systematic error might be on the order of 1 point or so -- not what most people have in mind when they complain about surveys being biased or unreliable. Given that voters do have the prerogative to change their minds at the last minute, no pre-election sample can perfectly represent the actual electorate.

Mark Lindeman  
Bard College

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Tue, 20 May 2003 09:30:39 -0500  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>  
Subject: FW: Educating our youth  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Please respond to Ms. Remmel direct at: guerrillaguide@hotmail.com =20

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

From: Norm Strassner [mailto:guerrillaguide@hotmail.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2003 1:45 PM  
To: AAPOR-INFO  
Subject: Educating our youth

Hello,  
I am working for Fascinating Learning Factory, a 501c3 non-profit=20  
corporation with a new television series in development dedicated to=20  
educating our youth about the importance of civic engagement and =  
political=20  
participation. Guerrilla Guide to Politics is a 26 episode series =  
focused on=20  
informing young adults about civic rights and opportunities.

We are planning to do an episode titled, Polling which will focus =  
on=20  
these two questions:

Who's using them and why?  
In what ways do they influence decision makers?

I am wondering if you have any specific ideas or information that could =  
be=20  
of interest to our project. If you could get back to me I would greatly=20  
appreciate it, and if you have any interest in helping our cause then =  
please=20  
let us know. Our website is [www.fascinating.tv](http://www.fascinating.tv). There is a concept pilot =  
and=20  
proposal available if you would like to see it.  
Thank you for your time.

Rebecca Remmel  
4535 Broadway, suite 102  
Boulder, CO 80304  
303-545-9955

---

Protect your PC - get McAfee.com VirusScan Online =20  
<http://clinic.mcafee.com/clinic/ibuy/campaign.asp?cid=3D3963>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Tue, 20 May 2003 11:01:02 -0400  
Reply-To: Mark Lindeman <[lindeman@BARD.EDU](mailto:lindeman@BARD.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mark Lindeman <[lindeman@BARD.EDU](mailto:lindeman@BARD.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Re; On Huffington  
In-Reply-To: <[5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E0EC395D8@isr.umich.edu](mailto:5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700A0C9B4268E0EC395D8@isr.umich.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

[I apologize to all for the spurious semicolon in the subject header, which inadvertently created a new thread.]

In further brief response to Nathaniel Ehrlich:

>I was responding to Panagakis "issue with the statement 'the numerically  
>higher estimate is still the poll's best estimate' ': that's going to be  
>>true, even if the level of confidence is so low that one would be foolish  
>--or forced at gunpoint--to make any prediction at all.

Sure, that statement is defensible, albeit a bit obscure. Nick Panagakis' point perhaps would have been clearer if he had quoted more of Murphy in context. I did this to some extent, but it's quite possible that I misinterpreted Murphy. We're all more or less thinking out loud here, so we have plenty of opportunities to misunderstand each other.

>But now I ask, how can you say that "if we're considering a binary estimate,  
>then "confidence levels" and "margins of error" referring to proportion  
>estimates no longer pertain"? Any question is always reducible to a binary  
>estimate - do you take position A or B? We then assign a value of 0.0 for A  
>and 1.0 for B and if the point estimate derived from the poll is .56, with a  
>margin of error of +/-5%, at the 95% confidence level, then one must presume  
>that, 95% of the time, .51 will be the lower limit of the final result, and  
>B will win, because .51>.50.

Yes, if a survey's 95% confidence interval (for a two-person race) excludes 0.5, a reasonably confident prediction is possible. However, in the actual case, most of the 95% confidence intervals did not permit confident predictions, which explains the headlines cited by Panagakis: e.g., "Popular Vote a Toss-up," "No Clear Winner," and "We Don't Know!" In the actual case, there was no reason to expect 95% of the surveys to correctly predict the popular vote winner, at gunpoint or otherwise. Murphy's argument that one wrong poll (out of 20) could be "let off the hook" and the other nine "were just -- wrong" seems to imply otherwise. At the same time, it's true that if 80% of some considerable number of polls showed Bush even slightly ahead of Gore, there is an anomaly to be explained, albeit perhaps not a very important anomaly.

Mark Lindeman  
Bard College

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Tue, 20 May 2003 11:09:20 -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: AAPOR Conference in the News  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

In addition to the Huffington stories I found the following:

POLLING NOTEBOOK: Polls suggest no support for a basic shift in U.S.  
global role  
[http://www.boston.com/dailynews/138/nation/POLLING\\_NOTEBOOK\\_Polls\\_suggest.shtml](http://www.boston.com/dailynews/138/nation/POLLING_NOTEBOOK_Polls_suggest.shtml)

Bush appears to have edge over Democrats in several crucial states  
<http://www.tribnet.com/24hour/politics/story/892081p-6215125c.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 info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Tue, 20 May 2003 11:21:33 -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: Re; On Huffington  
Comments: To: Mark Lindeman <[lindeman@BARD.EDU](mailto:lindeman@BARD.EDU)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Thanks, Mark, that clarifies things.  
But, as I lapse into full Columbo mode, there's just one more thing...  
It's just possible that the individuals who write the words that the news outlets publish or broadcast have the fantasy that what they say might actually have an influence on the outcome. Especially in a very close race, the person who favors candidate A might say, "it's too close to call, but



last minute trends indicate that Candidate A is gaining on B, so I'll predict a win for A" if [s]he would rather see A win than B; the same data might be interpreted by a B supporter that, "although A is gaining on B, B's lead has been constant, and it's too little too late". This is not precisely what Heisenberg had in mind when writing about the Uncertainty Principle. But it would be interesting to have an independent judgment of the leanings of the 80% of the 'Bush is leading' pollsters and the 20% who concluded otherwise.

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: Mark Lindeman [mailto:lindeman@BARD.EDU]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2003 11:01 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Re; On Huffington

[I apologize to all for the spurious semicolon in the subject header, which inadvertently created a new thread.]

In further brief response to Nathaniel Ehrlich:

>I was responding to Panagakis "issue with the statement 'the numerically  
>higher estimate is still the poll's best estimate' ': that's going to be  
>>true, even if the level of confidence is so low that one would be foolish  
>--or forced at gunpoint--to make any prediction at all.

Sure, that statement is defensible, albeit a bit obscure. Nick Panagakis' point perhaps would have been clearer if he had quoted more of Murphy in context. I did this to some extent, but it's quite possible that I misinterpreted Murphy. We're all more or less thinking out loud here, so we have plenty of opportunities to misunderstand each other.

>But now I ask, how can you say that "if we're considering a binary estimate,  
>then "confidence levels" and "margins of error" referring to proportion  
>estimates no longer pertain"? Any question is always reducible to a binary  
>estimate - do you take position A or B? We then assign a value of 0.0 for A  
>and 1.0 for B and if the point estimate derived from the poll is .56, with  
a  
>margin of error of +/-5%, at the 95% confidence level, then one must  
presume  
>that, 95% of the time, .51 will be the lower limit of the final result, and  
>B will win, because .51>.50.

Yes, if a survey's 95% confidence interval (for a two-person race) excludes 0.5, a reasonably confident prediction is possible. However, in the actual case, most of the 95% confidence intervals did not permit confident predictions, which explains the headlines cited by Panagakis: e.g., "Popular Vote a Toss-up," "No Clear Winner," and "We Don't Know!" In the actual case, there was no reason to expect 95% of the surveys to correctly predict the popular vote winner, at gunpoint or otherwise. Murphy's argument that one wrong poll (out of 20) could be "let off the hook" and the other nine "were just -- wrong" seems to imply otherwise. At the same time, it's true that if 80% of some considerable number of polls showed Bush even slightly ahead of Gore, there is an anomaly to be explained, albeit perhaps not a very important anomaly.

Mark Lindeman  
Bard College

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Tue, 20 May 2003 11:49:58 -0400  
Reply-To: Philip Meyer <[pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU](mailto:pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Philip Meyer <[pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU](mailto:pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Re; On Huffington  
Comments: To: Mark Lindeman <[lindeman@BARD.EDU](mailto:lindeman@BARD.EDU)>  
In-Reply-To: <[5.2.1.1.0.20030520100630.00a019e0@mail.bard.edu](mailto:5.2.1.1.0.20030520100630.00a019e0@mail.bard.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Good thread! It motivated me to pull down a battered copy of Kelley's table of percentile values of the unit normal curve to estimate the confidence level when two candidates are half a point apart.

You would need an error margin of .0025 -- the amount that the leader has above 50%. That's a quarter of a percentage point.

Assuming a sample size of 800 and no design effects, using a one-tailed test, the confidence level for that margin of error is about 56%.

That's not much better than flipping a coin, but it is better. And it means we should have expected 56%, not 95%, of the polls to call the right outcome.

Since I'm not a real statistician, perhaps somebody on the list would like to check my calculation.

=====

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

---

On Tue, 20 May 2003, Mark Lindeman wrote:

> Date: Tue, 20 May 2003 11:01:02 -0400  
> From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: Re; On Huffington  
>  
> [I apologize to all for the spurious semicolon in the subject header, which  
> inadvertently created a new thread.]  
>  
> In further brief response to Nathaniel Ehrlich:  
>  
>>I was responding to Panagakis "issue with the statement 'the numerically  
>>higher estimate is still the poll's best estimate' ': that's going to be  
>>>true, even if the level of confidence is so low that one would be foolish  
>>--or forced at gunpoint--to make any prediction at all.  
>  
> Sure, that statement is defensible, albeit a bit obscure. Nick Panagakis'  
> point perhaps would have been clearer if he had quoted more of Murphy in  
> context. I did this to some extent, but it's quite possible that I  
> misinterpreted Murphy. We're all more or less thinking out loud here, so  
> we have plenty of opportunities to misunderstand each other.  
>  
>>But now I ask, how can you say that "if we're considering a binary  
estimate,  
>>then "confidence levels" and "margins of error" referring to proportion  
>>estimates no longer pertain"? Any question is always reducible to a binary  
>>estimate - do you take position A or B? We then assign a value of 0.0 for A  
>>and 1.0 for B and if the point estimate derived from the poll is .56, with  
a  
>>margin of error of +/-5%, at the 95% confidence level, then one must  
presume  
>>that, 95% of the time, .51 will be the lower limit of the final result, and  
>>B will win, because .51>.50.  
>  
> Yes, if a survey's 95% confidence interval (for a two-person race) excludes  
> 0.5, a reasonably confident prediction is possible. However, in the actual  
> case, most of the 95% confidence intervals did not permit confident  
> predictions, which explains the headlines cited by Panagakis: e.g.,  
> "Popular Vote a Toss-up," "No Clear Winner," and "We Don't Know!" In the  
> actual case, there was no reason to expect 95% of the surveys to correctly  
> predict the popular vote winner, at gunpoint or otherwise. Murphy's  
> argument that one wrong poll (out of 20) could be "let off the hook" and  
> the other nine "were just -- wrong" seems to imply otherwise. At the same  
> time, it's true that if 80% of some considerable number of polls showed  
> Bush even slightly ahead of Gore, there is an anomaly to be explained,  
> albeit perhaps not a very important anomaly.

>  
> Mark Lindeman  
> Bard College  
>  
> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Tue, 20 May 2003 13:28:57 -0400  
Reply-To: [MMokrzycki@AP.ORG](mailto:MMokrzycki@AP.ORG)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: [MMokrzycki@AP.ORG](mailto:MMokrzycki@AP.ORG)  
Subject: sampling error (was Re: Re; On Huffington)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

I'm far from being a real statistician, but in giving poll coverage guidance to AP reporters and editors (not a lot of statisticians in this group either), my thinking is that if the difference between two candidates is less than the margin of sampling error, the chances that the candidate who's "behind" is actually tied or ahead are great enough that it's best to say the candidates are "about even." Perhaps we err slightly on the conservative side in doing so but I think the greater risk is of making more of a potential narrow "lead" than is warranted. This is from the AP Stylebook entry on polls -- I'd welcome feedback:

\* Do not exaggerate poll results. In particular, with pre-election polls, these are the rules for deciding when to write that the poll finds one candidate is leading another:

- If the difference between the candidates is more than twice the sampling error margin, then the poll says one candidate is leading.
- If the difference is less than the sampling error margin, the poll says that the race is close, that the candidates are "about even." (Do not use the term "statistical dead heat," which is inaccurate if there is any difference between the candidates; if the poll finds the candidates are tied, say they're tied.)
- If the difference is at least equal to the sampling error but no more than twice the sampling error, then one candidate can be said

to be

"apparently leading" or "slightly ahead" in the race.

Re discussion below of a half-point difference between candidates, AP style also is to round poll numbers, on the grounds that to state them to the first decimal place implies greater precision that is possible from a sampling. Strikes me as silly to say a candidate is polling 57.1 percent when sampling error could cause a swing of three or four whole points.

Also, a question -- my understanding is a 95% confidence interval means that hypothetically, if you took 20 samplings for the same poll, 19 times out of 20 each result in the poll would fall within the stated margin of sampling error. Is that really the same as saying that if we're looking at 20 \*different\* polls, only one gets let "off the hook" and any others that fall outside that margin are "just wrong," statistically speaking? House effects and other factors must confound the comparison when we're so far from the hypothetical situation on which the confidence interval is based. I was wondering this the other day at AAPOR after hearing Warren Mitofsky deliver his summary of the NCPP Polling Review Board's 2002 wrapup, which found that "84% of the polls differed from the election outcome by less than their theoretical margin of error." Is that a "very good performance" as the review panel concluded, or not as good as in theory it should have been with all the polls having been reported at the 95% confidence level?

Mike Mokrzycki, AP

Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>  
Sent by: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
05/20/2003 11:49 AM  
Please respond to Philip Meyer

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
cc:  
Subject: Re: Re; On Huffington

Good thread! It motivated me to pull down a battered copy of Kelley's table of percentile values of the unit normal curve to estimate the confidence level when two candidates are half a point apart.

You would need an error margin of .0025 -- the amount that the leader has above 50%. That's a quarter of a percentage point.

Assuming a sample size of 800 and no design effects, using a one-tailed test, the confidence level for that margin of error is about 56%.

That's not much better than flipping a coin, but it is better. And it means we should have expected 56%, not 95%, of the polls to call the right

outcome.

Since I'm not a real statistician, perhaps somebody on the list would like to check my calculation.

---

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

---

On Tue, 20 May 2003, Mark Lindeman wrote:

> Date: Tue, 20 May 2003 11:01:02 -0400  
> From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: Re; On Huffington  
>  
> [I apologize to all for the spurious semicolon in the subject header,  
which  
> inadvertently created a new thread.]  
>  
> In further brief response to Nathaniel Ehrlich:  
>  
> >I was responding to Panagakis "issue with the statement 'the  
numerically  
> >higher estimate is still the poll's best estimate' ': that's going to  
be  
> >>true, even if the level of confidence is so low that one would be  
foolish  
> >--or forced at gunpoint--to make any prediction at all.  
>  
> Sure, that statement is defensible, albeit a bit obscure. Nick  
Panagakis'  
> point perhaps would have been clearer if he had quoted more of Murphy in  
> context. I did this to some extent, but it's quite possible that I  
> misinterpreted Murphy. We're all more or less thinking out loud here,  
so  
> we have plenty of opportunities to misunderstand each other.  
>  
> >But now I ask, how can you say that "if we're considering a binary  
estimate,  
> >then "confidence levels" and "margins of error" referring to proportion  
> >estimates no longer pertain"? Any question is always reducible to a  
binary  
> >estimate - do you take position A or B? We then assign a value of 0.0  
for A  
> >and 1.0 for B and if the point estimate derived from the poll is .56,  
with a  
> >margin of error of +/-5%, at the 95% confidence level, then one must  
presume  
> >that, 95% of the time, .51 will be the lower limit of the final result,

and  
> >B will win, because .51>.50.  
>  
> Yes, if a survey's 95% confidence interval (for a two-person race)  
excludes  
> 0.5, a reasonably confident prediction is possible. However, in the  
actual  
> case, most of the 95% confidence intervals did not permit confident  
> predictions, which explains the headlines cited by Panagakis: e.g.,  
> "Popular Vote a Toss-up," "No Clear Winner," and "We Don't Know!" In  
the  
> actual case, there was no reason to expect 95% of the surveys to  
correctly  
> predict the popular vote winner, at gunpoint or otherwise. Murphy's  
> argument that one wrong poll (out of 20) could be "let off the hook" and  
> the other nine "were just -- wrong" seems to imply otherwise. At the  
same  
> time, it's true that if 80% of some considerable number of polls showed  
> Bush even slightly ahead of Gore, there is an anomaly to be explained,  
> albeit perhaps not a very important anomaly.  
>  
> Mark Lindeman  
> Bard College  
>  
> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
aapornet-request@asu.edu  
>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

---

Date: Tue, 20 May 2003 14:39:45 -0400  
Reply-To: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>  
Subject: Re: sampling error (was Re: Re; On Huffington)  
In-Reply-To: <OF24B61964.3E6BC87C-ON85256D2C.005CC225@ap.org>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

In response to Mike Mokrzycki,

I like the AP guidelines, and the warning against "statistical dead heat"  
-- shame on me for slavishly quoting Business Week. I guess if we needed a

race metaphor in place of "about even," a case could be made for "statistical photo finish."

>Re discussion below of a half-point difference between candidates, AP style also is to round poll numbers, on the grounds that to state them to the first decimal place implies greater precision than is possible from a sampling. Strikes me as silly to say a candidate is polling 57.1 percent when sampling error could cause a swing of three or four whole points.

Yes. By the way, Philip Meyer's half-point difference (I think Nathaniel Ehrlich earlier gave a similar figure) was approximately the actual difference between Gore and Bush, not a sample estimate. As we bounce the statistical rubble, these fractions of a point can make some difference, but the day before an election, we shouldn't care much whether the difference between two candidates in the polls is "1 percent" (which might mean 1.49) or "2 percent" (which might mean 1.51).

>Also, a question -- my understanding is a 95% confidence interval means that hypothetically, if you took 20 samplings for the same poll, 19 times out of 20 each result in the poll would fall within the stated margin of sampling error. Is that really the same as saying that if we're looking at 20 \*different\* polls, only one gets let "off the hook" and any others that fall outside that margin are "just wrong," statistically speaking?

No, it isn't -- although, "statistically speaking," there aren't exactly supposed to be any of the "house effects and other factors" that you allude to below. (By the way, I'm not at all sure that the previous discussion of 20 different polls had to do with those polls' respective margins of error. I think the question you are asking is a good and different question.)

>House effects and other factors must confound the comparison when we're so far from the hypothetical situation on which the confidence interval is based. >I was wondering this the other day at AAPOR after hearing Warren Mitofsky deliver his summary of the NCPP Polling Review Board's 2002 wrapup, which >found that "84% of the polls differed from the election outcome by less than their theoretical margin of error." Is that a "very good performance" as the review panel concluded, or not as good as in theory it should have been with all the polls having been reported at the 95% confidence level?

My answer is, both. As you say, we're so far from the hypothetical situation on which the confidence interval is based that it's remarkable that the polls come that close. If we assume, just for fun, that 84% of all possible polls would have differed from the outcome by less than their theoretical margin of error and that the results are normally distributed, then my back-of-the-envelope estimate is that the "true" margin of error is 40-50% larger than the theoretical estimate. So, by my intuition, the sampling error is on average considerably larger than error from other sources, and I think that counts as "very good." Personally, if I were Arianna Huffington (ha!), election predictions would not be on my punch list of complaints about polling.

Mark Lindeman  
Bard College



-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Tue, 20 May 2003 14:44:42 -0400  
Reply-To: "Steve, Kenneth" <[Kenneth.Steve@NIELSENMEDIA.COM](mailto:Kenneth.Steve@NIELSENMEDIA.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Steve, Kenneth" <[Kenneth.Steve@NIELSENMEDIA.COM](mailto:Kenneth.Steve@NIELSENMEDIA.COM)>  
Subject: Re: sampling error (was Re: Re; On Huffington)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

>Also, a question -- my understanding is a 95% confidence interval means  
>that hypothetically, if you took 20 samplings for the same poll, 19 times  
>out of 20 each result in the poll would fall within the stated margin of  
>sampling error.

This is actually a misstatement, albeit a common one. It's hard to speak of such things casually without bending the true meaning. It is also technically incorrect to say that approximately 95 out of 100 samples drawn at random would contain the true population parameter. The correct way to say it is that at the 95% confidence level, if we were to draw an infinite number of samples, on average 95 out of 100 CIs would contain the true population parameter. It know it sounds much the same, but it is quite different and contains critical differences. Stated in this way it is easy to see that, while not likely, all 100 (or 20 for that matter) CIs may not actually capture the true parameter.

>Is that really the same as saying that if we're looking at  
>20 \*different\* polls, only one gets let "off the hook" and any others that  
>fall outside that margin are "just wrong," statistically speaking?

The decision to believe or disregard any estimate is independent of the results of any other. No one gets let off the hook :)

Nice thread.

Best Regards.  
Ken Steve  
Lead Research Analyst  
Nielsen Media Research  
(727)773-4317

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Tue, 20 May 2003 11:54:52 -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: Re: sampling error (was Re: Re; On Huffington)  
Comments: To: MMokrzycki@AP.ORG  
In-Reply-To: <OF24B61964.3E6BC87C-ON85256D2C.005CC225@ap.org>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Using the z-table (area under a normal curve), polls with an average margin of error of 4.2% (the average in my analysis presented on Saturday) should differ from the election results by an average of 1.4%. Polls with error margins of 5% should differ by an average of 1.7%. The NCPP report shows a figure of 2.4% and my analysis shows 3.1% (our "samples" differ in a few important respects).

Issues of time from the election, differences in allocation of undecideds, sampling frames (RDD vs. list), weighting procedures, and presence or absence of minor party voters can all increase total error above and beyond the reported sampling error.

Thus, Mike is quite right to ask whether 84% falling within the reported margin of error, as reported by the NCPP analysis, is good when statistical theory clearly says that figure should be 95%. In my population of polls (I start September 1st while the NCPP starts two weeks before the election, so my group has more potential error related to time from the election) I find fully 27% falling outside the average margin of error (I used the average because I couldn't find the reported margin of error for a number of polls but didn't want to omit them from the analysis; I'm working on rectifying that issue).

However, that 27% figure is consistent with a margin of error of 7.4% rather than 4.2% or even 5%, again using the z-table.

I could go on about other sources of error in election polls but I'll stop for now. My AAPOR paper is posted on my website (url below left) if anyone wants to see more of my analysis. I plan on doing some significant updates and improvements on the paper within the next week or two so please make sure to check back if you're thinking about citing it. Thanks,

-- 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>  
\*\*\*\*\*

On Tue, 20 May 2003 MMokrzycki@AP.ORG wrote:

- > I'm far from being a real statistician, but in giving poll coverage
- > guidance to AP reporters and editors (not a lot of statisticians in this
- > group either), my thinking is that if the difference between two
- > candidates is less than the margin of sampling error, the chances that the
- > candidate who's "behind" is actually tied or ahead are great enough that
- > it's best to say the candidates are "about even." Perhaps we err slightly

> on the conservative side in doing so but I think the greater risk is of  
> making more of a potential narrow "lead" than is warranted. This is from  
> the AP Stylebook entry on polls -- I'd welcome feedback:

>  
> \* Do not exaggerate poll results. In particular, with  
> pre-election polls, these are  
> the rules for deciding when to write that the poll finds one  
> candidate is leading  
> another:  
> -- If the difference between the candidates is more than  
> twice the sampling  
> error margin, then the poll says one candidate is  
> leading.  
> -- If the difference is less than the sampling error  
> margin, the poll says that  
> the race is close, that the candidates are "about even."  
> (Do not use the  
> term "statistical dead heat," which is inaccurate if  
> there is any difference  
> between the candidates; if the poll finds the candidates  
> are tied, say  
> they're tied.)  
> -- If the difference is at least equal to the sampling  
> error but no more than  
> twice the sampling error, then one candidate can be said  
> to be  
> "apparently leading" or "slightly ahead" in the race.

>  
> Re discussion below of a half-point difference between candidates, AP  
> style also is to round poll numbers, on the grounds that to state them to  
> the first decimal place implies greater precision that is possible from a  
> sampling. Strikes me as silly to say a candidate is polling 57.1 percent  
> when sampling error could cause a swing of three or four whole points.

>  
> Also, a question -- my understanding is a 95% confidence interval means  
> that hypothetically, if you took 20 samplings for the same poll, 19 times  
> out of 20 each result in the poll would fall within the stated margin of  
> sampling error. Is that really the same as saying that if we're looking at  
> 20 \*different\* polls, only one gets let "off the hook" and any others that  
> fall outside that margin are "just wrong," statistically speaking? House  
> effects and other factors must confound the comparison when we're so far  
> from the hypothetical situation on which the confidence interval is based.  
> I was wondering this the other day at AAPOR after hearing Warren Mitofsky  
> deliver his summary of the NCPP Polling Review Board's 2002 wrapup, which  
> found that "84% of the polls differed from the election outcome by less  
> than their theoretical margin of error." Is that a "very good performance"  
> as the review panel concluded, or not as good as in theory it should have  
> been with all the polls having been reported at the 95% confidence level?

>  
> Mike Mokrzycki, AP

>  
>  
>  
>  
>

>  
> Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>  
> Sent by: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
> 05/20/2003 11:49 AM  
> Please respond to Philip Meyer

>  
>  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> cc:  
> Subject: Re: Re; On Huffington

>  
> Good thread! It motivated me to pull down a battered copy of Kelley's  
> table of percentile values of the unit normal curve to estimate the  
> confidence level when two candidates are half a point apart.

>  
> You would need an error margin of .0025 -- the amount that the leader  
> has above 50%. That's a quarter of a percentage point.

>  
> Assuming a sample size of 800 and no design effects, using a  
> one-tailed test, the confidence level for that margin of error is about  
> 56%.

>  
> That's not much better than flipping a coin, but it is better. And it  
> means we should have expected 56%, not 95%, of the polls to call the right  
> outcome.

>  
> Since I'm not a real statistician, perhaps somebody on the list would  
> like to check my calculation.

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

>  
>  
> On Tue, 20 May 2003, Mark Lindeman wrote:

>  
>> Date: Tue, 20 May 2003 11:01:02 -0400  
>> From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>  
>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>> Subject: Re: Re; On Huffington

>>  
>> [I apologize to all for the spurious semicolon in the subject header,  
> which  
>> inadvertently created a new thread.]

>>  
>> In further brief response to Nathaniel Ehrlich:

>>  
>>> I was responding to Panagakis "issue with the statement 'the  
> numerically  
>>> higher estimate is still the poll's best estimate' ': that's going to

> be  
>> >true, even if the level of confidence is so low that one would be  
> foolish  
>> >--or forced at gunpoint--to make any prediction at all.  
>>  
>> Sure, that statement is defensible, albeit a bit obscure. Nick  
> Panagakis'  
>> point perhaps would have been clearer if he had quoted more of Murphy in  
>> context. I did this to some extent, but it's quite possible that I  
>> misinterpreted Murphy. We're all more or less thinking out loud here,  
> so  
>> we have plenty of opportunities to misunderstand each other.  
>>  
>> >But now I ask, how can you say that "if we're considering a binary  
> estimate,  
>> >then "confidence levels" and "margins of error" referring to proportion  
>> >estimates no longer pertain"? Any question is always reducible to a  
> binary  
>> >estimate - do you take position A or B? We then assign a value of 0.0  
> for A  
>> >and 1.0 for B and if the point estimate derived from the poll is .56,  
> with a  
>> >margin of error of +/-5%, at the 95% confidence level, then one must  
> presume  
>> >that, 95% of the time, .51 will be the lower limit of the final result,  
> and  
>> >B will win, because .51>.50.  
>>  
>> Yes, if a survey's 95% confidence interval (for a two-person race)  
> excludes  
>> 0.5, a reasonably confident prediction is possible. However, in the  
> actual  
>> case, most of the 95% confidence intervals did not permit confident  
>> predictions, which explains the headlines cited by Panagakis: e.g.,  
>> "Popular Vote a Toss-up," "No Clear Winner," and "We Don't Know!" In  
> the  
>> actual case, there was no reason to expect 95% of the surveys to  
> correctly  
>> predict the popular vote winner, at gunpoint or otherwise. Murphy's  
>> argument that one wrong poll (out of 20) could be "let off the hook" and  
>> the other nine "were just -- wrong" seems to imply otherwise. At the  
> same  
>> time, it's true that if 80% of some considerable number of polls showed  
>> Bush even slightly ahead of Gore, there is an anomaly to be explained,  
>> albeit perhaps not a very important anomaly.  
>>  
>> Mark Lindeman  
>> Bard College  
>>  
>> -----  
>> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>>  
>  
> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>  
> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Tue, 20 May 2003 15:36:12 -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: sampling error (was Re: Re; On Huffington)  
Comments: To: "Steve, Kenneth" <[Kenneth.Steve@NIELSENMEDIA.COM](mailto:Kenneth.Steve@NIELSENMEDIA.COM)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Steve,

Your statement, "The correct way to say it is that at the 95% confidence level, if we were to draw an infinite number of samples, on average 95 out of 100 CIs would contain the true population parameter." is close to my understanding of the definition of a confidence interval.

Consider that any statistic, let's say the average height in inches of adult American males in 2000, is a value calculated on a sample. A parameter is the actual value of the population of all American males. Statistics approximate parameters.

If I sample  $n$  American adult males and compute an average, then the sampling error [Sampling error =  $\text{SQRT of } (.9604 (N-n) / (nN-n))$ ] is directly related to  $n$  [sample size] and  $N$  [target population size] and the ratio of the two. But once your population is above 50,000, it might as well be 50 billion. So if your estimate of height is 70 inches, and your sampling error is +/- 5%, then your 95% CI = 70" +/- 3.5". This means only that you have an expectation, based on your sample, that the true parameter is within that range. The parameter is a constant.

So, I would re-arrange your definition to say that the true population parameter will generate samples within a given range 95% of the time -- and 5% of the time, the same population, sampled in exactly the same way, will generate sample values outside that range.

We all tend to lose sight of the fact that the only way to determine the true value is to measure every element in the set that we call the population. Anything else is an estimate, without guarantees.

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: Steve, Kenneth [mailto:Kenneth.Steve@NIELSENMEDIA.COM]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2003 2:45 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: sampling error (was Re: Re; On Huffington)

>Also, a question -- my understanding is a 95% confidence interval means  
>that hypothetically, if you took 20 samplings for the same poll, 19 times  
>out of 20 each result in the poll would fall within the stated margin of  
>sampling error.

This is actually a misstatement, albeit a common one. It's hard to speak of such things casually without bending the true meaning. It is also technically incorrect to say that approximately 95 out of 100 samples drawn at random would contain the true population parameter. The correct way to say it is that at the 95% confidence level, if we were to draw an infinite number of samples, on average 95 out of 100 CIs would contain the true population parameter. It know it sounds much the same, but it is quite different and contains critical differences. Stated in this way it is easy to see that, while not likely, all 100 (or 20 for that matter) CIs may not actually capture the true parameter.

>Is that really the same as saying that if we're looking at  
>20 \*different\* polls, only one gets let "off the hook" and any others that  
>fall outside that margin are "just wrong," statistically speaking?

The decision to believe or disregard any estimate is independent of the results of any other. No one gets let off the hook :)

Nice thread.

Best Regards.  
Ken Steve  
Lead Research Analyst  
Nielsen Media Research  
(727)773-4317

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
-----

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Tue, 20 May 2003 12:58:52 -0700  
Reply-To: "Berry, Sandy" <[berry@RAND.ORG](mailto:berry@RAND.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Berry, Sandy" <[berry@RAND.ORG](mailto:berry@RAND.ORG)>  
Subject: FW: Recent JAMA article on Internet use  
Comments: To: Eleanor Singer <[esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

I read the article and followed up with the corresponding author to obtain the technical appendix, which he promptly provided (attached to this message). I reviewed it quickly and didn't find any reference to response rates, though it addresses comparability of the sample with other sources quite extensively. I'm interested in what people think of the KN documentation, since there is nothing mysterious about their sampling and weighting techniques as I understand them, except that they are not described in the published literature when their findings are presented.

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

From: Loren Baker [<mailto:laurence.baker@stanford.edu>]  
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 9:35 PM  
To: Sandy Berry  
Cc: [laurence.baker@stanford.edu](mailto:laurence.baker@stanford.edu)  
Subject: Re: Recent JAMA article on Internet use

Attached is our technical appendix. I'd be happy to discuss the methods with you further if you have questions.  
Laurence Baker

At 03:41 AM 5/17/2003 -0700, you wrote:

>I read your recent article with great interest. Please send me the  
>technical appendix referred to in the methods section. I am very  
>interested in this methodology. Thanks very much!

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Tue, 20 May 2003 16:43:49 -0400  
Reply-To: "Donelan, Karen" <[KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG](mailto:KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Donelan, Karen" <[KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG](mailto:KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: Recent JAMA article on Internet use  
Comments: To: "Berry, Sandy" <[berry@RAND.ORG](mailto:berry@RAND.ORG)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1



Thanks to everyone for responses to my posting.  
I think there is agreement that authors did acknowledge  
that the response rate they reported was among invited respondents  
to a panel.

I think what troubles me is that they question other surveys for  
unreported nonresponse and claim an advantage to several surveys where  
effective response rates may indeed be higher. Several people responding  
to me individually indicated that effective response rates  
in surveys they conducted with KN are considerably lower than reported in  
this article.

So, do we have an obligation to disclose effective response rates?  
Or to provide additional sample disposition info so people can calculate  
them?  
Or do we leave it to readers to read carefully?

I am working on the possibility of getting AAPOR response rate standards on  
the agenda of  
an international group of medical journal editors. Part of this effort will  
also be to try  
to get them to move beyond simplistic response rate cutoffs and consider  
other measures  
of survey quality. If anyone is interested please reply to me directly.  
Thanks

Karen Donelan, Sc.D.  
Senior Scientist in Health Policy  
MGH Cancer Center/MGH Institute for Health Policy  
100 Blossom Street, Cox 640  
Boston, MA 02114

617.726.0681 (office phone)  
617.726.2000 (page)  
kdonelan@partners.org <mailto:kdonelan@partners.org>

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

From: Berry, Sandy [mailto:berry@RAND.ORG]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2003 3:59 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: FW: Recent JAMA article on Internet use

I read the article and followed up with the corresponding author to obtain  
the technical appendix, which he promptly provided (attached to this  
message). I reviewed it quickly and didn't find any reference to response  
rates, though it addresses comparability of the sample with other sources  
quite extensively. I'm interested in what people think of the KN  
documentation, since there is nothing mysterious about their sampling and  
weighting techniques as I understand them, except that they are not

described in the published literature when their findings are presented.

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

From: Loren Baker [mailto:laurence.baker@stanford.edu]

Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 9:35 PM

To: Sandy Berry

Cc: laurence.baker@stanford.edu

Subject: Re: Recent JAMA article on Internet use

Attached is our technical appendix. I'd be happy to discuss the methods with you further if you have questions.

Laurence Baker

At 03:41 AM 5/17/2003 -0700, you wrote:

>I read your recent article with great interest. Please send me the  
>technical appendix referred to in the methods section. I am very  
>interested in this methodology. Thanks very much!

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Tue, 20 May 2003 17:44:16 -0400

Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>

Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>

From: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>

Subject: Re: Recent JAMA article on Internet use

In-Reply-To: <[57531340B9FDD611A8580008026158F10109857D@phsexch26.mgh.harvard.edu](mailto:57531340B9FDD611A8580008026158F10109857D@phsexch26.mgh.harvard.edu)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

The last time I looked Knowledge Networks completed interviews at a little over 20 percent of the household sample numbers they initially selected.

They lose participants at every stage of the process. Their response rate is not as good as the average RDD survey because they have more steps in their selection process and attrition at each step.

warren mitofsky

At 04:43 PM 5/20/2003, you wrote:

>Thanks to everyone for responses to my posting.

>I think there is agreement that authors did acknowledge

>that the response rate they reported was among invited respondents

>to a panel.

>

>I think what troubles me is that they question other surveys for

>unreported nonresponse and claim an advantage to several surveys where  
>effective response rates may indeed be higher. Several people responding  
>to me individually indicated that effective response rates  
>in surveys they conducted with KN are considerably lower than reported in  
>this article.  
>  
>So, do we have an obligation to disclose effective response rates?  
>Or to provide additional sample disposition info so people can calculate  
>them?  
>Or do we leave it to readers to read carefully?  
>  
>I am working on the possibility of getting AAPOR response rate standards on  
>the agenda of  
>an international group of medical journal editors. Part of this effort will  
>also be to try  
>to get them to move beyond simplistic response rate cutoffs and consider  
>other measures  
>of survey quality. If anyone is interested please reply to me directly.  
>Thanks

>  
>  
>  
>  
>Karen Donelan, Sc.D.  
>Senior Scientist in Health Policy  
>MGH Cancer Center/MGH Institute for Health Policy  
>100 Blossom Street, Cox 640  
>Boston, MA 02114  
>  
>617.726.0681 (office phone)  
>617.726.2000 (page)  
>kdonelan@partners.org <mailto:kdonelan@partners.org>

>  
>  
>  
>-----Original Message-----  
>From: Berry, Sandy [mailto:berry@RAND.ORG]  
>Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2003 3:59 PM  
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>Subject: FW: Recent JAMA article on Internet use

>  
>  
>I read the article and followed up with the corresponding author to obtain  
>the technical appendix, which he promptly provided (attached to this  
>message). I reviewed it quickly and didn't find any reference to response  
>rates, though it addresses comparability of the sample with other sources  
>quite extensively. I'm interested in what people think of the KN  
>documentation, since there is nothing mysterious about their sampling and  
>weighting techniques as I understand them, except that they are not  
>described in the published literature when their findings are presented.

>  
>-----Original Message-----  
>From: Loren Baker [mailto:laurence.baker@stanford.edu]  
>Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 9:35 PM  
>To: Sandy Berry

>Cc: laurence.baker@stanford.edu  
>Subject: Re: Recent JAMA article on Internet use  
>  
>  
>Attached is our technical appendix. I'd be happy to discuss the methods  
>with you further if you have questions.  
>Laurence Baker

>  
>  
>At 03:41 AM 5/17/2003 -0700, you wrote:  
>>I read your recent article with great interest. Please send me the  
>>technical appendix referred to in the methods section. I am very  
>>interested in this methodology. Thanks very much!

>-----  
>Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

>-----  
>Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Tue, 20 May 2003 18:50:07 -0400  
Reply-To: "Michael P. Massagli" <[mikemassagli@ATTBI.COM](mailto:mikemassagli@ATTBI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Michael P. Massagli" <[mikemassagli@ATTBI.COM](mailto:mikemassagli@ATTBI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Recent JAMA article on Internet use  
Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Warren describes a not very pretty picture.

Are we getting any closer to having a theoretically well-defined and empirically verified method for either protecting against, correcting for, or estimating non-response bias? Are we accepting that these low response rates are inevitable and inconsequential?

=====  
Michael P. Massagli  
617 680 2403  
[mikemassagli@attbi.com](mailto:mikemassagli@attbi.com)

----- Original Message -----  
From: "Warren Mitofsky" <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
To: <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>

Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2003 5:44 PM  
Subject: Re: Recent JAMA article on Internet use

> The last time I looked Knowledge Networks completed interviews at a little  
> over 20 percent of the household sample numbers they initially selected.  
> They lose participants at every stage of the process. Their response rate  
> is not as good as the average RDD survey because they have more steps in  
> their selection process and attrition at each step.  
> warren mitofsky  
>  
> At 04:43 PM 5/20/2003, you wrote:  
>>Thanks to everyone for responses to my posting.  
>>I think there is agreement that authors did acknowledge  
>>that the response rate they reported was among invited respondents  
>>to a panel.  
>>  
>>I think what troubles me is that they question other surveys for  
>>unreported nonresponse and claim an advantage to several surveys where  
>>effective response rates may indeed be higher. Several people responding  
>>to me individually indicated that effective response rates  
>>in surveys they conducted with KN are considerably lower than reported in  
>>this article.  
>>  
>>So, do we have an obligation to disclose effective response rates?  
>>Or to provide additional sample disposition info so people can calculate  
>>them?  
>>Or do we leave it to readers to read carefully?  
>>  
>>I am working on the possibility of getting AAPOR response rate standards  
on  
>>the agenda of  
>>an international group of medical journal editors. Part of this effort  
will  
>>also be to try  
>>to get them to move beyond simplistic response rate cutoffs and consider  
>>other measures  
>>of survey quality. If anyone is interested please reply to me directly.  
>>Thanks  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>Karen Donelan, Sc.D.  
>>Senior Scientist in Health Policy  
>>MGH Cancer Center/MGH Institute for Health Policy  
>>100 Blossom Street, Cox 640  
>>Boston, MA 02114  
>>  
>>617.726.0681 (office phone)  
>>617.726.2000 (page)  
>>kdonelan@partners.org <mailto:kdonelan@partners.org>  
>>  
>>  
>>

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

>>From: Berry, Sandy [mailto:berry@RAND.ORG]

>>Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2003 3:59 PM

>>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>>Subject: FW: Recent JAMA article on Internet use

>>

>>

>>I read the article and followed up with the corresponding author to obtain

>>the technical appendix, which he promptly provided (attached to this

>>message). I reviewed it quickly and didn't find any reference to response

>>rates, though it addresses comparability of the sample with other sources

>>quite extensively. I'm interested in what people think of the KN

>>documentation, since there is nothing mysterious about their sampling and

>>weighting techniques as I understand them, except that they are not

>>described in the published literature when their findings are presented.

>>

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

>>From: Loren Baker [mailto:laurence.baker@stanford.edu]

>>Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 9:35 PM

>>To: Sandy Berry

>>Cc: laurence.baker@stanford.edu

>>Subject: Re: Recent JAMA article on Internet use

>>

>>

>>Attached is our technical appendix. I'd be happy to discuss the methods

>>with you further if you have questions.

>>Laurence Baker

>>

>>

>>At 03:41 AM 5/17/2003 -0700, you wrote:

>>>I read your recent article with great interest. Please send me the

>>>technical appendix referred to in the methods section. I am very

>>>interested in this methodology. Thanks very much!

>>

>>-----

>>Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

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

>>

>>-----

>>Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

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

>

>-----

> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

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

>

-----

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 21 May 2003 00:10:54 -0400  
Reply-To: John Robinson <[ROBINSON@SOCY.UMD.EDU](mailto:ROBINSON@SOCY.UMD.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: John Robinson <[ROBINSON@SOCY.UMD.EDU](mailto:ROBINSON@SOCY.UMD.EDU)>  
Subject: NEW GSS Data Available  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

### GSS 2002 Data Now Available Online

Researchers interested in analyzing the year 2002 GSS data, in which the year 2000 Internet module was replicated, can now do so interactively by visiting [webuse.umd.edu](http://webuse.umd.edu) and clicking on GSS1972-2002 as the data set of interest. This site uses the UC Berkeley SDA software for online analyses using cross-tabs, analysis of means, MCA and other multivariate regression programs. (Those interested in obtaining the raw GSS data can do so through the Roper Center at the University of Connecticut.) The [webuse.umd.edu](http://webuse.umd.edu) website also archives survey data from other national surveys of Internet use conducted by the Pew Internet project, UCLA, NTIA and University of Maryland time-diary projects.

John Robinson  
Director, Internet Scholars Program  
Department of Sociology  
Univ. of Maryland, CP

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Wed, 21 May 2003 10:36:21 -0400  
Reply-To: Mark Lamias <[Mark.Lamias@GRIZZARD.COM](mailto:Mark.Lamias@GRIZZARD.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mark Lamias <[Mark.Lamias@GRIZZARD.COM](mailto:Mark.Lamias@GRIZZARD.COM)>  
Subject: Corporate Headquarters  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Since this list seems to have great success at directing others toward data sources (i.e. number of internet users, etc.), I thought I'd ask my own challenging question. I'm looking for the number of corporate headquarters in the largest U.S. cities. Does anyone know where I can find this type of information?

Thanks, in advance, for your help.

Sincerely yours,

Mark J. Lamias  
Statistical Consultant  
229 Peachtree Street - 12th Floor  
Atlanta, GA 30303

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Wed, 21 May 2003 10:49:24 -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: Further on sampling error  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Reading yesterday's thread on sampling error in pre-election polling had =  
for me an other-worldly quality, like watching a tennis match on Pluto - =  
fascinating, yet not of this planet. With no disrespect to the learned =  
participants, it seems to me that their calculations are based on a =  
premise that doesn't quite apply: probability sampling of a known =  
universe.=20

This is precisely the crux of the difficulty in pre-election polling. We =  
are polling for an unknown universe - one that does not yet exist, and =  
will exist only fleetingly on and around Election Day. Voters. =  
Pre-election polls are required to estimate this unknown universe, =  
introducing a whole 'nother (and incalculable) level of bias. That is =  
what makes it so remarkable that they come as close as they do as often =  
as they do.

Pre-election poll analysis is based on much more than recitations of =  
sampling errors and confidence intervals. It's also based on =  
intelligence - the ability to produce and explain a good likely voter =  
model. Example, our last 2000 pre-election poll at ABC News had 19 =  
percent of "likely voters" as members of union households. That looked =  
too low - turnout in 1996 was 23 percent union. This, rather than simple =  
sampling error, is the kind of information that informed our judgment =  
when our lead paragraph characterized our 48-45 percent Bush-Gore result =  
as "close enough for turnout to make the difference." Indeed we were =  
this explicit, in the fifth paragraph of that final analysis: "Take =  
union voters as an example: They account for 19 percent of all likely =  
voters in this poll, which is down from their share in the 1996 =  
election, 23 percent. If they boost their turnout to reach or exceed its =  
1996 level, they'd boost Gore in the process."

Union turnout, 24 hours later, was 26 percent of the electorate. =  
Retrospectively, when we model our "likely voter" universe to 26 percent =  
union, we get a dead heat.

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>



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

---

Date: Wed, 21 May 2003 11:39:53 -0400  
Reply-To: "Goldenberg, Karen - BLS" <Goldenberg.Karen@BLS.GOV>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Goldenberg, Karen - BLS" <Goldenberg.Karen@BLS.GOV>  
Subject: Re: Corporate Headquarters  
Comments: To: Mark Lamias <Mark.Lamias@GRIZZARD.COM>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Depends on how finely you want to define corporate headquarters.  
Under the new NAICS industry classifications, industry 551114 encompasses "corporate, subsidiary, and regional managing offices," and includes central administrative offices and similar management entities. If you can live with that classification, you can find the number of establishments (or employment, total wages, average monthly employment, and a few other things) with that industry classification for metropolitan areas from the Bureau of Labor Statistics website. Go to [www.bls.gov](http://www.bls.gov) and select

- Employment & Unemployment (right side of screen)
- State and county employment, which will bring you to the home page for Covered Employment and Wages.
- Get Detailed Statistics
- Create customized tables, one screen
- In Item #1, scroll most of the way down to Metropolitan Area groupings
- In Item #3, type 551114 and Find so you can select the industry.

The rest is relatively easy to follow.

This procedure works for any industry code and any state, county, or metro area in the U.S.

Good luck. Feel free to contact me off-list if you encounter a problem.

Karen Goldenberg

\*\*\*\*\*

Karen L. Goldenberg  
U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics  
2 Massachusetts Ave. NE, Room 4985  
Washington, DC 20212  
Voice: 202-691-6358 Fax: 202-691-5999  
[Goldenberg.Karen@bls.gov](mailto:Goldenberg.Karen@bls.gov)

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

From: Mark Lamias [<mailto:Mark.Lamias@GRIZZARD.COM>]  
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2003 10:36 AM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Corporate Headquarters

Since this list seems to have great success at directing others toward data sources (i.e. number of internet users, etc.), I thought I'd ask my own challenging question. I'm looking for the number of corporate headquarters in the largest U.S. cities. Does anyone know where I can find this type of information?

Thanks, in advance, for your help.

Sincerely yours,

Mark J. Lamias  
Statistical Consultant  
229 Peachtree Street - 12th Floor  
Atlanta, GA 30303

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

---

Date: Wed, 21 May 2003 10:04:34 -0700  
Reply-To: Betsy Strick <bstrick@PSY.UCSD.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Betsy Strick <bstrick@PSY.UCSD.EDU>  
Subject: q. re survey scanners  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Does anyone have suggestions for good (and not too expensive) survey scanners/programs? We've been using Scantron/ParScore, but would prefer something more flexible. If you'd like to respond directly to me, my email address is [bstrick@psy.ucsd.edu](mailto:bstrick@psy.ucsd.edu)

Thanks,  
Betsy

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

---

Date: Wed, 21 May 2003 14:05:21 -0400  
Reply-To: "Mulrow, Jeri M." <jmulrow@NSF.GOV>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Mulrow, Jeri M." <jmulrow@NSF.GOV>  
Subject: Employment Opportunity at NSF  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

Employment Opportunity at NSF

The Division of Science Resources Statistics within the National Science Foundation (NSF), an agency of the U.S. government, is seeking a Mathematical Statistician with survey research and methodology experience to support the collection and dissemination of information about the nation's science and engineering resources. Salary ranges from \$69,054 to \$108,785. Applications are due June 19, 2003.

Interested applicants may find the full job posting at  
<<http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2003/e20030065/e20030065.pdf>>  
<http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2003/e20030065/e20030065.pdf> or contact Jeanette A.  
Dale on (703) 292-4343 or email <<mailto:jdale@nsf.gov>> [jdale@nsf.gov](mailto:jdale@nsf.gov).

More information about the Division of Science Resource Statistics and the  
National Science Foundation may be found at  
<<http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/start.htm>> <http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/start.htm>.

For information about specific job duties contact Ron Fecso on (703)  
292-7769 or email <<mailto:Rfecso@nsf.gov>> [Rfecso@nsf.gov](mailto:Rfecso@nsf.gov) or Jeri Mulrow on  
(703) 292-4784 or email <<mailto:Jmulrow@nsf.gov>> [Jmulrow@nsf.gov](mailto:Jmulrow@nsf.gov).

\*\*\*\*\*

Jeri Mulrow  
Science Resources Statistics  
National Science Foundation  
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 965  
Arlington, VA 22230  
Tel: 703-292-4784  
Fax: 703-292-9092

\*\*\*\*\*

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====

Date: Wed, 21 May 2003 15:56:16 -0400  
Reply-To: [elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Elizabeth Martin <[elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV)>  
Subject: Re: Huffington Transcript?  
Comments: To: Michael Cohen <[mcohen@FABMAC.COM](mailto:mcohen@FABMAC.COM)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Council is working on making it available. We'll let you know--it will  
take a little time.

Michael Cohen  
<[mcohen@FABMAC.CO](mailto:mcohen@FABMAC.CO)> To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
M> cc:  
Sent by: AAPORNET Subject: Huffington

Transcript?

<[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
>

05/19/2003 01:45  
PM  
Please respond to  
Michael Cohen

Is a transcript of the Huffington session available for AAPOR members  
(especially for those of us who were unable to attend the meeting)?

\*\*\*\*\*

Michael D. Cohen, Ph.D.  
Vice President for Public Affairs  
Fabrizio, McLaughlin & Associates  
915 King Street, Second Floor  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
(703) 684-4510 Phone  
(703) 739-0664 Fax

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

From: Chun, Young [mailto:YChun@air.org]  
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 1:35 PM  
To: 'Michael Cohen'  
Subject: RE: A couple of immediate action recommendations - RE: On  
Huffington

Hi Mike,  
Your excellent recommendation reached just me.  
If you meant it to send all in AAPORnet, you may  
send your message to AAPORNET@asu.edu

Young

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

From: Michael Cohen [mailto:mcohen@fabmac.com]  
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 1:31 PM  
To: 'Chun, Young'  
Subject: RE: A couple of immediate action recommendations - RE: On  
Huffington

To start, we might want to get a transcript of the session available.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Chun, Young  
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 1:22 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: A couple of immediate action recommendations - RE: On Huffington

I see Huffington as a fine communicator while I disagree with major points of hers on free-polling society. And there is no question that AAPOR's trio discussants have done excellent rebuttals!

Yet it's now a matter of fine, timely coordination with media to release balanced coverages of one of the best debates I've heard in the past 15 AAPOR years.

A couple of immediate action recommendations are:

First for long-term AAPOR goals of better public/media relations, I strongly recommend to add an AAPOR Public Relations/Communications

Chair in the Executive Committee, an efficient communicator with fine networks with media and with technical expertise in pollings and survey research methods. The responsibility of such an individual with high stature would be to deliver to the public:

- best practice of political and social pollings,
- excellent applications of survey research methods,
- fair coverage of major pollings or survey findings done by AAPOR members, and
- quality-polling or survey-based findings that are good for the public good.

Having served in AAPOR Conference Committees for years, I recall Jim Beniger of USC and Andrew Kohut of Pew Research, former

presidents of AAPOR, has initiated and well coordinated coverage of various fine pollings conducted by AAPOR members.

Second for immediate action, I highly recommend that the AAPOR Executive Council take immediate actions for balanced coverage of this great 2003 debate by distributing an AAPOR media release or commentary in the next couple of days and working closely with major US and international media. From my experience with media, it costs only a few hundred dollars to send an immediate, persuasive media release to hundreds of major media in a day. Perhaps hundreds of media-related AAPOR members could also help distribute balanced AAPOR news out.... You can certainly count me in.

Hope we act very timely!

Continuously learning from AAPOR members and their survey researches,

Young Chun, Senior Research Scientist

American Institutes for Research  
"More than 50 years of behavioral/social science research"  
1990 K Street, NW Suite 500  
Washington DC 20006

voice: 202 944 5325  
FAX: 202 737 4918

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

From: Elizabeth Martin [mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV]  
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 10:19 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: On Huffington

We'll clearly need a follow-up session next year on "Deconstructing Arianna"...

"Holz, Jo"  
<jholz@INDEMAND.C To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
OM> cc:  
Sent by: AAPORNET Subject: Re: On Huffington  
<AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>

05/19/2003 09:56  
AM  
Please respond to  
"Holz, Jo"

As someone who wasn't able to attend the national conference this year and thus didn't personally see Huffington's panel, I'm fascinated with the contrast between the tenor of the Business Week article below and Will Lester's piece that was sent out earlier, which depicted the session as a love-in between Huffington and AAPOR. Did both these reporters attend the same event?

Jo Holz  
Vice President, Research  
iN DEMAND  
phone: (646) 638-8214  
fax: (646) 486-0857  
jholz@indemand.com

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Wed, 21 May 2003 14:36:18 -0700  
Reply-To: Douglas Strand <dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Douglas Strand <dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU>  
Subject: Fwd: Re: Huffington Transcript?  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

If the council could also release a videotape of the event, that would be great for use in my next public opinion class. I bet it would be a great educational tool for use with students at many colleges and universities. Of course, we'd be willing to pay for any copies we wanted.

Thanks for the consideration.

Douglas Strand, Ph.D.  
Lecturer in Political Science  
and  
Project Director  
Public Agendas and Citizen Engagement Survey (PACES)  
Survey Research Center  
UC Berkeley  
354 Barrows Hall  
Tel: 510-642-0508  
Fax: 510-642-9665

>Date: Wed, 21 May 2003 15:56:16 -0400  
>From: Elizabeth Martin <elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV>  
>Subject: Re: Huffington Transcript?  
>Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>Reply-to: elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV

>X-Mailer: Lotus Notes Release 5.0.11 July 24, 2002  
>X-MIMETrack: Serialize by Router on LNHQ08MTA/HQ/BOC(Release 5.0.11 |July  
24,  
> 2002) at 05/21/2003 03:56:19 PM  
>Comments: To: Michael Cohen <mcohen@FABMAC.COM>

>  
>Council is working on making it available. We'll let you know--it will  
>take a little time.

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> Michael Cohen  
> <mcohen@FABMAC.CO To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> M> cc:  
> Sent by: AAPORNET Subject: Huffington

> Transcript?  
> <AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>

>  
>  
> 05/19/2003 01:45  
> PM  
> Please respond to  
> Michael Cohen

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>Is a transcript of the Huffington session available for AAPOR members  
>(especially for those of us who were unable to attend the meeting)?

>  
>\*\*\*\*\*

>Michael D. Cohen, Ph.D.  
>Vice President for Public Affairs  
>Fabrizio, McLaughlin & Associates  
>915 King Street, Second Floor  
>Alexandria, VA 22314  
>(703) 684-4510 Phone  
>(703) 739-0664 Fax

>  
>  
>-----Original Message-----  
>From: Chun, Young [mailto:YChun@air.org]  
>Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 1:35 PM  
>To: 'Michael Cohen'  
>Subject: RE: A couple of immediate action recommendations - RE: On  
>Huffington

>  
>  
>



> Hi Mike,  
> Your excellent recommendation reached just me.  
> If you meant it to send all in AAPORnet, you may  
> send your message to AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Young

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

>From: Michael Cohen [mailto:mcohen@fabmac.com]

>Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 1:31 PM

>To: 'Chun, Young'

>Subject: RE: A couple of immediate action recommendations - RE: On  
>Huffington

>To start, we might want to get a transcript of the session available.

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of Chun, Young

>Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 1:22 PM

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: A couple of immediate action recommendations - RE: On  
>Huffington

> I see Huffington as a fine communicator while I disagree with  
> major points of hers on free-polling society. And there is no  
> question that AAPOR's trio discussants have done excellent  
>rebuttals!

> Yet it's now a matter of fine, timely coordination with media to  
> release balanced coverages of one of the best debates I've heard in  
>the  
> past 15 AAPOR years.

> A couple of immediate action recommendations are:

> First for long-term AAPOR goals of better public/media relations,  
> I strongly recommend to add an AAPOR Public  
>Relations/Communications

> Chair in the Executive Committee, an efficient communicator with  
>fine

> networks with media and with technical expertise in pollings and  
> survey research methods. The responsibility of such an individual

>with  
> high stature would be to deliver to the public:

> - best practice of political and social pollings,  
> - excellent applications of survey research methods,  
> - fair coverage of major pollings or survey findings done by AAPOR  
>members, and

> - quality-polling or survey-based findings that are good for the  
>public good.

> Having served in AAPOR Conference Committees for years,

> I recall Jim Beniger of USC and Andrew Kohut of Pew Research,  
>former  
>  
> presidents of AAPOR, has initiated and well coordinated coverage of  
> various fine pollings conducted by AAPOR members.  
>  
> Second for immediate action, I highly recommend that the AAPOR  
> Executive Council take immediate actions for balanced coverage of  
> this great 2003 debate by distributing an AAPOR media release or  
>commentary  
> in the next couple of days and working closely with  
> major US and international media. From my experience with media,  
> it costs only a few hundred dollars to send an immediate,  
>persuasive  
> media release to hundreds of major media in a day. Perhaps  
>hundreds  
>of  
> media-related AAPOR members could also help distribute balanced  
>AAPOR  
> news out.... You can certainly count me in.  
>  
> Hope we act very timely!

>  
> Continuously learning from AAPOR members and their survey researches,  
>  
> Young Chun, Senior Research Scientist  
>  
> American Institutes for Research  
> "More than 50 years of behavioral/social science research"  
> 1990 K Street, NW Suite 500  
> Washington DC 20006  
>  
> voice: 202 944 5325  
> FAX: 202 737 4918  
>  
>

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

>From: Elizabeth Martin [mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV]  
>Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 10:19 AM  
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>Subject: Re: On Huffington

>  
>  
>We'll clearly need a follow-up session next year on "Deconstructing  
>Arianna"...

>  
>  
>  
>  
> "Holz, Jo"  
> <jholz@INDEMAND.C To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> OM> cc:  
> Sent by: AAPORNET Subject: Re: On Huffington

> <AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>

>  
>  
> 05/19/2003 09:56  
> AM  
> Please respond to  
> "Holz, Jo"  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

>As someone who wasn't able to attend the national conference this year and  
>thus didn't personally see Huffington's panel, I'm fascinated with the  
>contrast between the tenor of the Business Week article below and Will  
>Lester's piece that was sent out earlier, which depicted the session as a  
>love-in between Huffington and AAPOR. Did both these reporters attend the  
>same event?

>  
>Jo Holz  
>Vice President, Research  
>iN DEMAND  
>phone: (646) 638-8214  
>fax: (646) 486-0857  
>jholz@indemand.com  
>

>-----  
>Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>

>-----  
>Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>

>-----  
>Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Wed, 21 May 2003 17:20:08 -0700  
Reply-To: Mike Dennis <mdennis@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mike Dennis <mdennis@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM>  
Subject: A real case: response rates, publication and the news  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

We'd like to take the opportunity offered by the email thread this week =

on the AAPOR listserv about the reporting of response rates, citing last week's article published in JAMA (May 14, 2003;289:2400-2406), to provide additional information and perspective.=20

We provided our customers all response rate information. Our customers work with editors and journal reviewers in deciding what information to publish. The JAMA article confirms a lack of uniformity in procedures for disclosing response rates, as Timothy Johnson showed us last week at the AAPOR meeting.

The authors of the JAMA article provided a 13-page technical appendix addressing the generalizability of the survey data but because of space restrictions, it was not published. The authors updated the appendix to include reporting of the response rate information. The report is at <http://www.herc.research.med.va.gov/SHI%20appendix.pdf>. =20

Publishing research based on panel surveys with lower-than-single-survey response rates is a challenge that we've been addressing by conducting methodological research and by providing detailed information to customers (e.g., nonresponse, sample composition, benchmarking, and mode effect studies). We also provide reports to help the research community think about the impact of nonresponse on data quality (i.e., the effect of the aging of the panel on nonresponse as discussed at <http://www.knowledgenetworks.com/ganp/aapor2003.pdf>).=20

The overall response rates vary from study to study within a panel and are greatly a function of survey design and how much our customers can invest resources that will increase the response rate. There is room for discussion on how to conceptualize and calculate panel-based response rates, and we hope, by providing detailed sampling and weighting documentation in our reports to our clients, and by conducting methods research on such topics as panel attrition, to contribute to this discussion.

We encourage readers of this note to direct their questions about the KN panel to us.

Regards,

Mike Dennis  
Knowledge Networks

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

From: Eleanor Singer [mailto:[esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU](mailto:esinger@ISR.UMICH.EDU)]  
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 1:49 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: A real case: response rates, publication and the news

But remember, those who are invited to participate in a particular survey are a small fraction of those originally recruited to the panel by RDD methods. Michael Dennis could speak better than I to how much attrition

there is at various steps along the way and the effective response rate =  
to a  
particular survey.

Eleanor Singer

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

From: Jon A. Krosnick [mailto:krosnick@OSU.EDU]  
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 3:39 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Fwd: Re: A real case: response rates, publication and the news

The JAMA article clearly explains that 69.4% is the percent of KN panel members invited to complete the questionnaire who did so.

>Date: Mon, 19 May 2003 15:00:13 -0400  
>From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
>Subject: Re: A real case: response rates, publication and the news  
>Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>Reply-to: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
>X-Accept-Language: en-us, en  
>User-Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows; U; Windows NT 5.0; en-US; rv:1.0.1)  
> Gecko/20020823 Netscape/7.0  
>Comments: To: "Donelan, Karen" <KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG>  
>  
>Are you sure about the response rate? I haven't checked in this case,  
>but in the past the response rate provided by Knowledge Networks did =  
>not  
>include the substantial non-response entailed in creating their panel,  
>but only the non-response of the panel to a particular survey.  
> Howard  
>  
>Donelan, Karen wrote:  
>  
>>Last week, a group of researchers at Stanford received  
>>considerable press attention for an article published  
>>in JAMA (the journal of the American Medical Association)  
>>based on a survey conducted by Knowledge Networks. The research  
>>was funded by Stanford, the National Institute on Aging and the  
>>Veterans Administration.  
>>  
>>The reported response rate was 69.4%. Additional detail on methods  
>>is provided. I have posted the link below to the article,  
>>and to a couple of press releases/stories.  
>>  
>><http://jama.ama-assn.org/cgi/content/full/289/18/2400>  
>>  
>>[http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2003-05-13-internet-usat\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2003-05-13-internet-usat_x.htm)  
>>  
>>[http://www.eurekalert.org/pub\\_releases/2003-05/sumc-srp050803.php](http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2003-05/sumc-srp050803.php)  
>>

>>This article makes clear the practical challenges of implementing  
>>our more theoretical discussions about reporting response rates. JAMA  
>>typically  
>>rejects without peer review surveys where the response rates fall =  
below  
50%.  
>>I have argued about this cutoff, and gotten flexibility once or twice, =  
but  
>>its a long held tradition. I am aware that JAMA has published at least  
>>one other  
>>major paper  
>>based on the KN panels.  
>>  
>>At AAPOR, we heard some evidence that effective response rates for KN  
>>surveys has dropped to the 10-25% range because of panel attrition.  
>>We also heard data from KN at AAPOR who indicated that attrition does =  
not  
>>seem to have profoundly influenced findings except in the case where  
internet  
>>usage is being measured.  
>>  
>>I would invite any or all of you to read the manuscript, to reflect on =  
our  
>>discussions  
>>about reporting of response rates, to read the media coverage of the  
>>study, and  
>>to  
>>offer your views in this list or in responses to news organizations or  
JAMA  
>>editors  
>>offering your views, whatever they may be.  
>>  
>>In the interest of full disclosure, I am not a disinterested observer. =  
I  
do  
>>research in public opinion about internet use (see recent issue of =  
Public  
>>Perspective) funded by a number of organizations. I serve as a peer  
>>reviewer for  
>>several health/medical journals, and am an unpaid member of the =  
editorial  
>>board  
>>of an online medical journal called Medscape General Medicine. I am  
>>frequently  
>>asked to review papers about survey data in multiple modes. I also =  
have  
>>done,  
>>but not published, a number of online surveys.  
>>  
>>  
>>Karen Donelan, Sc.D.  
>>Senior Scientist  
>>MGH Institute for Health Policy  
>>Massachusetts General Hospital

>>Boston, MA 02114  
>>  
>>617 726 0681  
>>kdonelan@partners.org  
>>

>>-----  
>>Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>>

>-----  
>Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Thu, 22 May 2003 10:31:07 -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: How good are the polls? - The Hill  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

[http://www.thehill.com/campaign/052103\\_mellman.aspx](http://www.thehill.com/campaign/052103_mellman.aspx)

## THE POLLSTERS

How good are the polls?

By Mark S. Mellman

Do media polls, as reported by television and newspapers, accurately predict elections? It seems like a simple question. But its simplicity is deceptive. The answer is quite complex.

It all depends on your definition of accurate. After the 1948 Truman-Dewey debacle, a group of statisticians set out to measure poll accuracy and developed eight different ways of defining it. At last weekend's annual conference of the American Association of Public Opinion Research, at least three more approaches were introduced.

SNIP

One of the culprits here are those pesky undecideds. How you assume they will break dramatically impacts how you measure poll accuracy.

SNIP

After tearing some hair out, you might conclude that elections are about winning and losing. So how many winners did you pick? A reasonable criterion, perhaps.

SNIP

With so many criteria, it's not surprising that analysts come to different conclusions. At last weekend's conference, the National Council on Public Opinion Polls reviewed 159 polls reported in the media between Oct. 20, 2002 and election day, and concluded they showed "a very good performance" with an "average candidate error of 2.4 percentage points."

Another team of distinguished scholars reported, "Neutral (non partisan) polls were significantly overstating Democratic strength in the last month of the campaign." University of Oregon political scientist Joel Bloom summed up his findings, and the underlying problem, saying polls "performed well by some measures, fairly to poorly on others and quite poorly on one more."

By the standard of 'gross accuracy,' things turned out pretty well for the public polls. Nobody who was seen as winning in a landslide lost, and nobody who was supposed to be in a close race won by a landslide. The polls told us a great deal about the general shape of the races even without predicting the final vote.

Before faulting polls, the critics have a responsibility to define what they mean by accurate. They will find it's not so easy.

--

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 info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Thu, 22 May 2003 11:10:17 -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: How good are the polls? - The Hill  
Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
In-Reply-To: <003601c3206e5c8e50710\$130a010a@LEO>



MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The more things change....

Here is an account of 1944 congressional hearings on the Gallup Poll from Jean Converse's "Survey Research in the United States" (p207):

Gallup was called on the congressional map to explain why he had again underestimated the Democratic vote in 1944, as in 1940: in some two-thirds of the forty-eight states, the polling forecast was less than the actual election tally of Democratic votes. The estimates for New York were of special concern. Gallup's adjustments (a complicated set of weights that tried to take into account turnout, trends, different sources of data, varying degrees of competence among local field staff, etc.) were jiggered this way and that in the months before the election. For New York, the final forecast read 49.5 percent, when the final real vote gave Roosevelt 51.8 percent. Congressmen and consultants both criticized Gallup's failure to point out publicly that there had been any adjustments, and they resisted his defense that journalistic requirements did not permit such technical detail. They felt that he could have said something quite simple in the reports and could have made the full technical details available on request.

Nearly everything in this paragraph could have been written last week, although congressmen generally have a more relaxed attitude (or is it contempt?) toward polling today.

Jan Werner

-----  
Leo G. Simonetta wrote:

- > [http://www.thehill.com/campaign/052103\\_mellman.aspx](http://www.thehill.com/campaign/052103_mellman.aspx)
- >
- >
- > THE POLLSTERS
- > How good are the polls?
- > By Mark S. Mellman
- >
- > Do media polls, as reported by television and newspapers, accurately
- > predict elections? It seems like a simple question. But its simplicity
- > is deceptive. The answer is quite complex.
- >
- > It all depends on your definition of accurate. After the 1948 Truman-
- > Dewey debacle, a group of statisticians set out to measure poll accuracy
- > and developed eight different ways of defining it. At last weekend's
- > annual conference of the American Association of Public Opinion
- > Research, at least three more approaches were introduced.

>  
> SNIP  
>  
> One of the culprits here are those pesky undecideds. How you assume they  
> will break dramatically impacts how you measure poll accuracy.

>  
> SNIP

>  
> After tearing some hair out, you might conclude that elections are about  
> winning and losing. So how many winners did you pick? A reasonable  
> criterion, perhaps.

>  
> SNIP

>  
> With so many criteria, it's not surprising that analysts come to  
> different conclusions. At last weekend's conference, the National  
> Council on Public Opinion Polls reviewed 159 polls reported in the media  
> between Oct. 20, 2002 and election day, and concluded they showed "a  
> very good performance" with an "average candidate error of 2.4  
> percentage points."

>  
> Another team of distinguished scholars reported, "Neutral (non partisan)  
> polls were significantly overstating Democratic strength in the last  
> month of the campaign." University of Oregon political scientist Joel  
> Bloom summed up his findings, and the underlying problem, saying polls  
> "performed well by some measures, fairly to poorly on others and quite  
> poorly on one more."

>  
> By the standard of 'gross accuracy,' things turned out pretty well for  
> the public polls. Nobody who was seen as winning in a landslide lost,  
> and nobody who was supposed to be in a close race won by a landslide.  
> The polls told us a great deal about the general shape of the races even  
> without predicting the final vote.

>  
> Before faulting polls, the critics have a responsibility to define what  
> they mean by accurate. They will find it's not so easy.

>  
> --  
> 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 info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Thu, 22 May 2003 11:06:26 -0400  
Reply-To: Nancy Clusen <NClusen@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nancy Clusen <NClusen@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM>  
Subject: Pollwatch  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Hello,

Does anyone have any information on or experience with Pollwatch--The National Organization of Citizen Exit Pollers? Their website says that they are "a non-profit, non-partisan, all volunteer organization coordinating citizen efforts, and helping to guarantee the validity of the election process."

Thank you.

Nancy Clusen

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Thu, 22 May 2003 08:22:28 -0700  
Reply-To: Wei Yen <weiyen@UCLA.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Wei Yen <weiyen@UCLA.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Huffington Transcript?  
In-Reply-To: <OF4811CF05.A4948473-ON85256D2D.006D6F3A-85256D2D.006D858B@tco.census.gov>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Is it also possible to get a copy of the video? I find it worthwhile collecting. The discussants did a superb job. Some of the dynamics in the exchange simply cannot be transcribed.

Wei Yen

At 03:56 PM 5/21/2003 -0400, Elizabeth Martin wrote:

>Council is working on making it available. We'll let you know--it will  
>take a little time.

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

Michael Cohen  
<mcohen@FABMAC.CO To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
M> cc:  
Sent by: AAPORNET Subject: Huffington

> Transcript?

> <AAPORNET@asu.edu

> >

>

>

> 05/19/2003 01:45

> PM

> Please respond to

> Michael Cohen

>

>

>

>

>

>

>Is a transcript of the Huffington session available for AAPOR members

>(especially for those of us who were unable to attend the meeting)?

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>Michael D. Cohen, Ph.D.

>Vice President for Public Affairs

>Fabrizio, McLaughlin & Associates

>915 King Street, Second Floor

>Alexandria, VA 22314

>(703) 684-4510 Phone

>(703) 739-0664 Fax

>

>

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

>From: Chun, Young [mailto:YChun@air.org]

>Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 1:35 PM

>To: 'Michael Cohen'

>Subject: RE: A couple of immediate action recommendations - RE: On

>Huffington

>

>

>

> Hi Mike,

> Your excellent recommendation reached just me.

> If you meant it to send all in AAPORnet, you may

> send your message to AAPORNET@asu.edu

>

> Young

>

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

>From: Michael Cohen [mailto:mcohen@fabmac.com]

>Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 1:31 PM

>To: 'Chun, Young'

>Subject: RE: A couple of immediate action recommendations - RE: On

>Huffington

>

>

>To start, we might want to get a transcript of the session available.

>

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of Chun, Young

>Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 1:22 PM

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: A couple of immediate action recommendations - RE: On

>Huffington

>

>

> I see Huffington as a fine communicator while I disagree with  
> major points of hers on free-polling society. And there is no  
> question that AAPOR's trio discussants have done excellent

>rebuttals!

> Yet it's now a matter of fine, timely coordination with media to  
> release balanced coverages of one of the best debates I've heard in

>the

> past 15 AAPOR years.

>

> A couple of immediate action recommendations are:

>

> First for long-term AAPOR goals of better public/media relations,

> I strongly recommend to add an AAPOR Public

>Relations/Communications

> Chair in the Executive Committee, an efficient communicator with

>fine

> networks with media and with technical expertise in pollings and  
> survey research methods. The responsibility of such an individual

>with

> high stature would be to deliver to the public:

>

> - best practice of political and social pollings,

> - excellent applications of survey research methods,

> - fair coverage of major pollings or survey findings done by AAPOR

>members, and

> - quality-polling or survey-based findings that are good for the

>public good.

>

> Having served in AAPOR Conference Committees for years,

> I recall Jim Beniger of USC and Andrew Kohut of Pew Research,

>former

>

> presidents of AAPOR, has initiated and well coordinated coverage of  
> various fine pollings conducted by AAPOR members.

>

> Second for immediate action, I highly recommend that the AAPOR

> Executive Council take immediate actions for balanced coverage of

> this great 2003 debate by distributing an AAPOR media release or

>commentary

> in the next couple of days and working closely with

> major US and international media. From my experience with media,

> it costs only a few hundred dollars to send an immediate,

>persuasive

> media release to hundreds of major media in a day. Perhaps

>hundreds

>of

> media-related AAPOR members could also help distribute balanced  
> AAPOR  
> news out.... You can certainly count me in.  
>  
> Hope we act very timely!  
>  
>  
> Continuously learning from AAPOR members and their survey researches,  
>  
> Young Chun, Senior Research Scientist  
>  
> American Institutes for Research  
> "More than 50 years of behavioral/social science research"  
> 1990 K Street, NW Suite 500  
> Washington DC 20006  
>  
> voice: 202 944 5325  
> FAX: 202 737 4918  
>  
>

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

>From: Elizabeth Martin [mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV]  
>Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 10:19 AM  
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>Subject: Re: On Huffington  
>  
>

>We'll clearly need a follow-up session next year on "Deconstructing  
>Arianna"...

>  
>  
>  
>  
> "Holz, Jo"  
> <jholz@INDEMAND.C To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> OM> cc:  
> Sent by: AAPORNET Subject: Re: On Huffington  
> <AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> >

>  
>  
> 05/19/2003 09:56  
> AM  
> Please respond to  
> "Holz, Jo"  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

>As someone who wasn't able to attend the national conference this year and  
>thus didn't personally see Huffington's panel, I'm fascinated with the  
>contrast between the tenor of the Business Week article below and Will

>Lester's piece that was sent out earlier, which depicted the session as a  
>love-in between Huffington and AAPOR. Did both these reporters attend the  
>same event?

>

>Jo Holz  
>Vice President, Research  
>iN DEMAND  
>phone: (646) 638-8214  
>fax: (646) 486-0857  
>jholz@indemand.com

>

>-----  
>Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>

>-----  
>Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>

>-----  
>Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Thu, 22 May 2003 13:55:30 -0400  
Reply-To: "Chun, Young" <YChun@AIR.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Chun, Young" <YChun@AIR.ORG>  
Subject: Re: Recent JAMA article on Internet use  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Based on my reading of the technical appendix,  
I've excerpted the following results at every stage  
of panel data collection:

Panel acceptance rate = 41.2% (due to refusal to be included in  
panel)  
Active panel rate = 35.5% (due to attrition)  
survey completion rate = 69% (due to refusal or not completing  
consent form)

Thus the OVERALL panel response rate, the product  
of the three terms above, is 10.09% which is extremely low.

Am I wrong about this computation? What factors did I  
not account for? Please correct me if I'm wrong.

Young Chun

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

From: Berry, Sandy [mailto:berry@RAND.ORG]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2003 3:59 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: FW: Recent JAMA article on Internet use

I read the article and followed up with the corresponding author to obtain the technical appendix, which he promptly provided (attached to this message). I reviewed it quickly and didn't find any reference to response rates, though it addresses comparability of the sample with other sources quite extensively. I'm interested in what people think of the KN documentation, since there is nothing mysterious about their sampling and weighting techniques as I understand them, except that they are not described in the published literature when their findings are presented.

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

From: Loren Baker [mailto:laurence.baker@stanford.edu]  
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 9:35 PM  
To: Sandy Berry  
Cc: laurence.baker@stanford.edu  
Subject: Re: Recent JAMA article on Internet use

Attached is our technical appendix. I'd be happy to discuss the methods with you further if you have questions.  
Laurence Baker

At 03:41 AM 5/17/2003 -0700, you wrote:

>I read your recent article with great interest. Please send me the  
>technical appendix referred to in the methods section. I am very  
>interested in this methodology. Thanks very much!

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Thu, 22 May 2003 13:02:47 -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: sampling error (was Re: Re; On Huffington)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit



Many good comments on this thread. Here are soem "tweaks".

> MMokrzycki@AP.ORG wrote:

>> I was wondering this the other day at AAPOR after hearing Warren Mitofsky  
>> deliver his summary of the NCPP Polling Review Board's 2002 wrapup, which  
>> found that "84% of the polls differed from the election outcome by less  
>> than their theoretical margin of error." Is that a "very good performance"  
>> as the review panel concluded, or not as good as in theory it should have  
>> been with all the polls having been reported at the 95% confidence level?

Comments: I agree with Langer's comment: "It seems to me that their calculations are based on a premise that doesn't quite apply: probability sampling of a known universe." He mentioned problems of sample composition.

I would add the problem of \*decided\* voters. In some races (e.g., MN) preferences remain fluid - voters switching their preferences or undecided voters finally making up their minds or even folks deciding whether to vote or not . Some on election day. These are decisions that can't possibly be reflected in state polls 1-2 weeks out from election day and not entirely in final weekend national presidential polls. So 84% of state polls within error margins led to the conclusion of very good. Observors should look at performance with some element of "slack" in addition to statistical error.

>> On Tue, 20 May 2003, Mark Lindeman wrote:  
>> At the same  
>> time, it's true that if 80% of some considerable number of polls showed  
>> Bush even slightly ahead of Gore, there is an anomaly to be explained,  
>> albeit perhaps not a very important anomaly.

Comments: There were not a considerable number of final presidential polls in 2000 - only ten.

Regarding the anomaly - If the assumption is that the distribution of errors should have been closer to normal, NCPP analysis of past presidential polls since 1956 shows they are hardly ever normal. Error distribution was symmetrical only once, 1984.

This is because the normal distribution is based on \*all possible\* sample outcomes, not just \*ten\* sample outcomes.

<Kenneth.Steve@NIELSENMEDIA.COM "The correct way to say it is that at the 95% confidence level, if we were to draw an infinite number of samples, on average 95 out of 100 CIs would contain the true population parameter."

(BTW, Arianna included in her eight "wrong polls", the Harris poll which had the race tied, a race Gore won by 0.51 points. Imagine that, a standard of +/- 0.5%)

From Melman's The Hill story

"Were they more right or wrong than an Illinois poll that gave Sen. Dick Durbin (D) a 21-point margin (compared to 28 points on an election day), but in doing so underestimated Durbin vote by 6 points and his opponent by 5."

First comment: Durbin won that race 60% to 38% - a 22-point margin, not 28.

More from Melman's The Hill story

"One might explain the incorrect estimates of the margins for [Incumbents] Levin and Sessions by arguing that undecideds tend to break to the challenger, which they did in those cases. But not in the case of incumbent Durbin. In that race, most undecideds broke toward the incumbent. Only careful analysis of poll internals can provide evidence on the disposition of the undecideds."

Second comment: In the NCPP analysis, six IL polls bracketed Durbin's 22- point win, ranging from 17 to 24 margins favoring Durbin. So Melman's point still holds: no incumbent effect in the Durbin race. But past work shows that about 70% of incumbent polls "tend to break to the challenger" as Melman says.

A - So considering three incumbent races (Durbin, Levin and Sessions), one of them can be expected not to fit the pattern.

B - Durbin sat on his lead for much of the campaign until the final couple of weeks with ads distinguishing his name from his opponent - Durkin. So there could have been some name confusion in pre-election polls cleared up later by the "durBin" ad campaign or by the visual stimulus of the ballot as opposed to verbal in a phone poll.

Nick

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/Archives>: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Thu, 22 May 2003 16:22:39 -0400  
Reply-To: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>  
Subject: Re: sampling error (was Re: Re; On Huffington)  
In-Reply-To: <3ECD10C0.7E1BA6AA@marketsharescorp.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Nick Panagakis writes:

>Comments: There were not a considerable number of final presidential  
>polls in 2000 - only ten.

Good point -- I was mixing hypotheticals and actuals. I've finally gone back to the 2001 Huffington column which, I suppose, started all this, at <http://www.ariannaonline.com/columns/files/020101.html> . She reports that 7 polls leaned Bush, 2 leaned Gore, and one was a push. And she calls this an "80 percent inaccuracy rate" that pollsters "explain... away with that deus ex machina, the margin of error." Yeesh.

7 out of 9 errors in the same direction is still a bit unusual, but probably doesn't rise to the level of an "anomaly" (the one-tailed probability is about 9%). The 1996 case is more interesting, although she

massacres it about as badly:

>As proof of this year's sterling achievement, the [National Council on  
>Public Polls] study touts the fact that while seven out of 10 polls  
>"overstated" Bush's vote, "four years ago, all nine polls erred in  
>favor of overstating Democrat Clinton."

The NCPP press release ( [http://www.ncpp.org/poll\\_perform.htm](http://www.ncpp.org/poll_perform.htm) ) does say that, although it also says, "In the 1996 election, 8 out of 9 polls overstated Democrat Clinton." (It's not at all accurate to say that the study "touts" these facts.) Basically, the 1996 polls showed Clinton beating Dole by an average of 12 points, with a range from 8 to 18; he actually won by 8 points.

Mark Lindeman  
Bard College

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Fri, 23 May 2003 11:15:06 -0400  
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <[cporter@HP.UFL.EDU](mailto:cporter@HP.UFL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Colleen Porter <[cporter@HP.UFL.EDU](mailto:cporter@HP.UFL.EDU)>  
Subject: additional conference notes  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

A few other random observations on the AAPOR conference....

It seemed to me that there were a higher-than usual number of invited addresses from folks who may not have been to AAPOR in years, or at all before. This, along with the Huffington plenary, gave one the impression that the conference committee thought it was time for us to stretch a little and reach for something new.

Although I heard mixed results from other folks on the invited papers, one that I attended was sensational. This was "Enhancing the Validity and Cross-Cultural Comparability of Measurement in Survey Research" by Gary King. Since I do a lot of cross-cultural work without leaving my state (a lot of our work is in the ethnically diverse area of Miami-Dade), this was fascinating to me. And he has a copy of the paper on the web at

<http://gking.harvard.edu/preprints.shtml>

Another wonderful surprise was the really

excellent presentation, "Parsing th Polls," by Gary Langer and Daniel Merkle from ABC News. I had assumed that they would be speaking about polls they conducted. Well, no. This was about their role in vetting survey data for the reporters and editors at ABC news, deciding whether survey results were reliable enough to be reported as news. Their war stories are fascinating. One of the examples concerned a study about marriage, and how the data presentation had been manipulated by a zealous pro-family advocacy group. As it turns out, our state has commissioned a big survey about marriage, and I am informally consulting. When I got home, I printed out the ABC transcript, and passed it on to the PI for that project, who was appreciative and intrigued.

I would very much like to hear more on this topic in the future. I also think that there is a flip side to the issue that concerns many of us, and that is how we make \*our\* study information readily available. There were a few years when I was just writing, not working as a researcher. As an end-user, I was so frustrated by the lack of critical methodological information in survey reports people issued that I determined that if I ever worked as a researcher again, I would do it up right. Our documentation is pretty thorough, and I hope readable, and I believe we give people like Langer and Merkle enough information to figure out what we really did. (Not that the health insurance rate in Kansas would make ABC news, mind you, but if we ever did something newsworthy, the information would be there.)

Then, Sunday morning brought an excellent discussion about IRB issues. As a survey researcher in a medical center, I especially appreciated the presentation by Stephen J. Blumberg, co-chair of the IRB at the Nat'l Center for Health Statistics. He offered to send the powerpoint to anyone who wanted it, and he is at [SBlumberg@cdc.gov](mailto:SBlumberg@cdc.gov)

Finally, I was struck at the selection for the AAPOR award. For years, it has been interesting to watch the two major wings of AAPOR emerge, survey methodologists versus those who have a keen interest in the substantive findings of public opinion research. In a sense, having two awards, and the choice of those two particular individuals, was both an acknowledgement of the two factions but also an affirmation that there is room for both.

Finally, I just can't resist a comment on Huffington's comments. One of the discussants, I think Rich

Morin, talked about the "collateral damage" of a poll-free America, including unemployment data from the CPS. She responded that, "Nobody cares about your economic surveys." Well, in a 2004 presidential election that is shaping up to be about the economy, stupid, I think some policymakers may actually care a great deal about those numbers.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter  
Project Coordinator, University of Florida  
cporter@hp.ufl.edu  
\*\*\*AT OUR NEW OFFICE & PHONE NUMBER\*\*  
phone: 352/273-6068, fax: 273-6075  
Department of Health Services Administration  
Location: 101 Newell Drive, Rm. 4136  
US Mail: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Fri, 23 May 2003 11:44:56 -0400  
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <cporter@HP.UFL.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jay Mattlin <JMattlin@MEDIAMARK.NOPWORLD.COM>  
Subject: Re: additional conference notes  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

I just wanted to add that I appreciated that none of the sessions contained no more than four papers. Personally, I would like this precedent to hold for the future. I always found the five-paper sessions to be too crammed full of information to be memorable and to not allow sufficient time (just 12 minutes) for individual speakers.

Anybody violently disagree?

Jay Mattlin

-----Original Message-----  
From: Colleen Porter  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Sent: 5/23/2003 11:15 AM  
Subject: additional conference notes

A few other random observations on the AAPOR conference....

It seemed to me that there were a higher-than usual number of invited addresses from folks who may not have been to AAPOR in years, or at all before. This, along with the Huffington plenary, gave one the impression that the conference committee thought it was time for us to stretch a little and reach for something new.

Although I heard mixed results from other folks on the invited papers, one that I attended was sensational. This was "Enhancing the Validity and Cross-Cultural Comparability of Measurement in Survey Research" by Gary King. Since I do a lot of cross-cultural work without leaving my state (a lot of our work is in the ethnically diverse area of Miami-Dade), this was fascinating to me. And he has a copy of the paper on the web at

<http://gking.harvard.edu/preprints.shtml>

Another wonderful surprise was the really excellent presentation, "Parsing th Polls," by Gary Langer and Daniel Merkle from ABC News. I had assumed that they would be speaking about polls they conducted. Well, no. This was about their role in vetting survey data for the reporters and editors at ABC news, deciding whether survey results were reliable enough to be reported as news. Their war stories are fascinating. One of the examples concerned a study about marriage, and how the data presentation had been manipulated by a zealous pro-family advocacy group. As it turns out, our state has commissioned a big survey about marriage, and I am informally consulting. When I got home, I printed out the ABC transcript, and passed it on to the PI for that project, who was appreciative and intrigued.

I would very much like to hear more on this topic in the future. I also think that there is a flip side to the issue that concerns many of us, and that is how we make *our* study information readily available. There were a few years when I was just writing, not working as a researcher. As an end-user, I was so frustrated by the lack of critical methodological information in survey reports people issued that I determined that if I ever worked as a researcher again, I would do it up right. Our documentation is pretty thorough, and I hope readable, and I believe we give people like Langer and Merkle enough information to figure out what we really did. (Not that the health insurance rate in Kansas would make ABC news, mind you, but if we ever did something newsworthy, the information would be there.)

Then, Sunday morning brought an excellent discussion about IRB issues. As a survey researcher in a medical center, I especially appreciated the presentation by Stephen J. Blumberg, co-chair of the IRB at the Nat'l Center for Health Statistics. He offered to send the powerpoint to anyone who wanted it, and he is at SBlumberg@cdc.gov

Finally, I was struck at the selection for the AAPOR award. For years, it has been interesting to watch the two major wings of AAPOR emerge, survey methodologists versus those who have a keen interest in the substantive findings of public opinion research. In a sense, having two awards, and the choice of those two particular individuals, was both an acknowledgement of the two factions but also an affirmation that there is room for both.

Finally, I just can't resist a comment on Huffington's comments. One of the discussants, I think Rich Morin, talked about the "collateral damage" of a poll-free America, including unemployment data from the CPS. She responded that, "Nobody cares about your economic surveys." Well, in a 2004 presidential election that is shaping up to be about the economy, stupid, I think some policymakers may actually care a great deal about those numbers.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter  
Project Coordinator, University of Florida  
cporter@hp.ufl.edu  
\*\*\*AT OUR NEW OFFICE & PHONE NUMBER\*\*  
phone: 352/273-6068, fax: 273-6075  
Department of Health Services Administration  
Location: 101 Newell Drive, Rm. 4136  
US Mail: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Fri, 23 May 2003 12:10:10 -0400  
Reply-To: "Beatty, Paul C." <pbb5@CDC.GOV>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Beatty, Paul C." <pbb5@CDC.GOV>  
Subject: Re: additional conference notes  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Well, certainly not violently... but I would like to note that more goes on at the conference than one-way transmission of information out to attendees. For many members, it's also a very important outlet to present their new work and receive feedback and commentary. I know that I personally would rather be the fifth paper (with limited presentation time) than be relegated to an "interactive paper session."

It is nice to have a little more time to talk, but there are tradeoffs. When five quality papers can be accommodated in a session, I think that's sometimes the right way to go.

Paul

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

From: Jay Mattlin [mailto:JMattlin@MEDIAMARK.NOPWORLD.COM]  
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2003 11:45 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: additional conference notes

I just wanted to add that I appreciated that none of the sessions contained no more than four papers. Personally, I would like this precedent to hold for the future. I always found the five-paper sessions to be too crammed full of information to be memorable and to not allow sufficient time (just 12 minutes) for individual speakers.

Anybody violently disagree?

Jay Mattlin

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

From: Colleen Porter  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Sent: 5/23/2003 11:15 AM  
Subject: additional conference notes

A few other random observations on the AAPOR conference....

It seemed to me that there were a higher-than usual number of invited addresses from folks who may not have been to AAPOR in years, or at all before. This, along with the Huffington plenary, gave one the impression that the conference committee thought it was time for us to stretch a little and reach for



something new.

Although I heard mixed results from other folks on the invited papers, one that I attended was sensational. This was "Enhancing the Validity and Cross-Cultural Comparability of Measurement in Survey Research" by Gary King. Since I do a lot of cross-cultural work without leaving my state (a lot of our work is in the ethnically diverse area of Miami-Dade), this was fascinating to me. And he has a copy of the paper on the web at

<http://gking.harvard.edu/preprints.shtml>

Another wonderful surprise was the really excellent presentation, "Parsing th Polls," by Gary Langer and Daniel Merkle from ABC News. I had assumed that they would be speaking about polls they conducted. Well, no. This was about their role in vetting survey data for the reporters and editors at ABC news, deciding whether survey results were reliable enough to be reported as news. Their war stories are fascinating. One of the examples concerned a study about marriage, and how the data presentation had been manipulated by a zealous pro-family advocacy group. As it turns out, our state has commissioned a big survey about marriage, and I am informally consulting. When I got home, I printed out the ABC transcript, and passed it on to the PI for that project, who was appreciative and intrigued.

I would very much like to hear more on this topic in the future. I also think that there is a flip side to the issue that concerns many of us, and that is how we make \*our\* study information readily available. There were a few years when I was just writing, not working as a researcher. As an end-user, I was so frustrated by the lack of critical methodological information in survey reports people issued that I determined that if I ever worked as a researcher again, I would do it up right. Our documentation is pretty thorough, and I hope readable, and I believe we give people like Langer and Merkle enough information to figure out what we really did. (Not that the health insurance rate in Kansas would make ABC news, mind you, but if we ever did something newsworthy, the information would be there.)

Then, Sunday morning brought an excellent discussion about IRB issues. As a survey researcher in a medical center, I especially appreciated the presentation by Stephen J. Blumberg, co-chair of the IRB at the Nat'l Center for Health Statistics.

He offered to send the powerpoint to anyone who wanted it, and he is at SBlumberg@cdc.gov

Finally, I was struck at the selection for the AAPOR award. For years, it has been interesting to watch the two major wings of AAPOR emerge, survey methodologists versus those who have a keen interest in the substantive findings of public opinion research. In a sense, having two awards, and the choice of those two particular individuals, was both an acknowledgement of the two factions but also an affirmation that there is room for both.

Finally, I just can't resist a comment on Huffington's comments. One of the discussants, I think Rich Morin, talked about the "collateral damage" of a poll-free America, including unemployment data from the CPS. She responded that, "Nobody cares about your economic surveys." Well, in a 2004 presidential election that is shaping up to be about the economy, stupid, I think some policymakers may actually care a great deal about those numbers.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter  
Project Coordinator, University of Florida  
cporter@hp.ufl.edu  
\*\*\*AT OUR NEW OFFICE & PHONE NUMBER\*\*  
phone: 352/273-6068, fax: 273-6075  
Department of Health Services Administration  
Location: 101 Newell Drive, Rm. 4136  
US Mail: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Fri, 23 May 2003 12:35:35 -0700

Reply-To: "Dr. Thomas Lamatsch" <lamatsch@UNLV.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Dr. Thomas Lamatsch" <lamatsch@UNLV.EDU>  
Subject: Conference dates  
In-Reply-To: <sece02d2.033@fuji.hp.ufl.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

There were several discussions at AAPOR about the conference days and I just wanted to start a discussion on AAPORnet. For a lot of the academic members this is the worst week-end to go to a conference. It's finals week, grade are due and for those of us with Saturday graduations we'll miss graduation.

I know the next couple of conferences are already planned but could we move AAPOR by one week (or two if we want to stay out of memorial day week-end)?

\*\*\*\*\*

Thomas Lamatsch, Ph.D.  
Director - Cannon Center for Survey Research  
Ast. Professor - Dept of Political Science  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
4505 Maryland Pkwy - Box 455008  
Las Vegas, NV 89154-5008  
phone: (702)895-0167  
fax (702)895-0165  
lamatsch@unlv.edu

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Fri, 23 May 2003 16:23:37 -0400  
Reply-To: "Goldenberg, Karen - BLS" <Goldenberg.Karen@BLS.GOV>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Goldenberg, Karen - BLS" <Goldenberg.Karen@BLS.GOV>  
Subject: Re: Conference dates  
Comments: To: "Dr. Thomas Lamatsch" <lamatsch@UNLV.EDU>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Council has addressed this issue in the past, and the sense then was that both Mother's Day and Memorial Day weekends were inappropriate for the conference. Most years AAPOR falls on the one weekend between them. Some years there are two weekends between the holidays.

Should we be asking Council to consider meeting at a different time of year? Or to poll the membership about alternative dates? With a membership as professionally diverse as ours, there will never be any one time that works for everyone--including our academic members. The question is, do we want to change the tradition?

Karen Goldenberg

\*\*\*\*\*

Karen L. Goldenberg  
U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics  
2 Massachusetts Ave. NE, Room 4985  
Washington, DC 20212  
Voice: 202-691-6358 Fax: 202-691-5999  
Goldenberg.Karen@bls.gov

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

From: Dr. Thomas Lamatsch [mailto:lamatsch@UNLV.EDU]  
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2003 3:36 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Conference dates

There were several discussions at AAPOR about the conference days and I just wanted to start a discussion on AAPORnet. For a lot of the academic members this is the worst week-end to go to a conference. It's finals week, grade are due and for those of us with Saturday graduations we'll miss graduation.

I know the next couple of conferences are already planned but could we move AAPOR by one week (or two if we want to stay out of memorial day week-end)?

\*\*\*\*\*

Thomas Lamatsch, Ph.D.  
Director - Cannon Center for Survey Research  
Ast. Professor - Dept of Political Science  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
4505 Maryland Pkwy - Box 455008  
Las Vegas, NV 89154-5008  
phone: (702)895-0167  
fax (702)895-0165  
lamatsch@unlv.edu

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Date: Fri, 23 May 2003 16:36:33 -0400  
Reply-To: "Mariolis, Peter" <pxm1@CDC.GOV>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Mariolis, Peter" <pxm1@CDC.GOV>  
Subject: On Huffington and AAPOR  
MIME-version: 1.0

In my opinion, the most important part of Ms Huffington's appearance occurred in the discussion that followed her presentation and the responses.

Thanks largely to Mary Losch, Ms Huffington got the point that there is a difference between good polls and bad polls. She asked Mary to send her something in writing about how to distinguish between the two, which Mary has already done. My sense is that Ms Huffington will start saying that it's OK to respond positively to some polls/surveys and here's how to tell the difference between one that you might want to respond positively to and one that you should hang up on.

Unfortunately, in my judgment, we didn't listen as openly to her as she did to us. I agree with those who say that she made many misstatements of fact but I also believe that she made two more general points worth hearing and that most of us did not hear them.

Her first point was that polls reflect shallow, surface opinion but that they are usually treated at face value by the lay public and pollsters alike. Her second point was that we should take more responsibility for how polls are misused and make more of an effort to educate people about their appropriate uses. I think that there is merit in both of those points.

Peter Mariolis

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Fri, 23 May 2003 17:04:14 -0400  
Reply-To: "Donelan, Karen" <KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Donelan, Karen" <KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG>  
Subject: Re: On Huffington and AAPOR  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

It would be great to see what Mary wrote about good polls and bad polls...this could be a useful summary for all of us to have on hand

Karen Donelan

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

From: Mariolis, Peter [mailto:[pxm1@CDC.GOV](mailto:pxm1@CDC.GOV)]  
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2003 4:37 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: On Huffington and AAPOR

In my opinion, the most important part of Ms Huffington's appearance occurred in the discussion that followed her presentation and the responses.

Thanks largely to Mary Losch, Ms Huffington got the point that there is a difference between good polls and bad polls. She asked Mary to send her something in writing about how to distinguish between the two, which Mary has already done. My sense is that Ms Huffington will start saying that it's OK to respond positively to some polls/surveys and here's how to tell the difference between one that you might want to respond positively to and one that you should hang up on.

Unfortunately, in my judgment, we didn't listen as openly to her as she did to us. I agree with those who say that she made many misstatements of fact but I also believe that she made two more general points worth hearing and that most of us did not hear them.

Her first point was that polls reflect shallow, surface opinion but that they are usually treated at face value by the lay public and pollsters alike. Her second point was that we should take more responsibility for how polls are misused and make more of an effort to educate people about their appropriate uses. I think that there is merit in both of those points.

Peter Mariolis

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Fri, 23 May 2003 16:54:27 -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: On Huffington and AAPOR  
Comments: cc: losch@csbr.csbs.uni.edu  
In-Reply-To:  
<57531340B9FDD611A8580008026158F1010985CC@phsexch26.mgh.harvard.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Colleagues,  
Before you all get too excited about my being able to determine exactly what a "good" or "bad" survey is, I should clarify what I conveyed to Ms. Huffington. This is long so be warned...

First, I thought the plenary was very good. I was impressed with Ms. Huffington overall and thought the panelists did a fine job illuminating the important problems in her "crusade." What struck me (and got my adrenals activated) was the inconsistency in her underlying premise concerning poll data.

She argued fairly convincingly that the public and some journalists don't make important distinctions in polling information when reading/hearing about it or reporting it, respectively. She does this while she lumps all survey research under the heading of "polling" and encourages readers to say "no" to all of it. She clearly understands that there is more out there than political polling but fails to do the very thing that she demands in others. This was alluded to by one questioner but did not seem to get through to her. So, because I have a hard time letting things go sometimes and because I have a thing about fairness, I decided to follow up after the session.

Don Feree was already moving in this direction when I walked up and I jumped in and pushed quite a bit harder on the following points: 1) she doesn't make appropriate distinctions any better than others she criticizes, 2) she knows better and as a visible member of the media should hold to the standards she espouses for others, 3) a better approach for the public would be to advocate asking questions of those requesting interviews so that a reasonable determination can be made about whether or not they wish to participate, and 4) if she wants help with advocating quality survey research and condemning poorly designed survey research, then AAPOR is her friend and not her enemy in the crusade.

Her quote after my tirade was "I get it." She then asked me to email her to follow up and gave me her card with her personal contact information on it. On Tuesday, I composed a letter to her basically reiterating the points I made Friday night and imploring her to direct her criticisms specifically at poorly designed/conducted surveys and to encourage her readers NOT to hang up on telephone interviewers (or refuse to participate in other types of surveys) but to ask questions such as: who is conducting/sponsoring the research?, how will the information be used? and, where will the findings be reported/published? I argued that by asking questions, the public could make a considered decision about participation and such a modified crusade would do far less harm to survey projects important to the health and general welfare of the nation.

In short, while agreeing with some of her premises, I pointed out what I viewed as problems in her own behavior and asked her to exhibit the leadership that she notes is often lacking.

The proof will be in the pudding -- if we see changes on the website (e.g., no more Partnership for a Poll-Free America) and a turnabout in her columns, then we'll know her time with us was well-spent. If not, we took a shot and for my part, my adrenals are better for having done so. Best, Mary

Date sent: Fri, 23 May 2003 17:04:14 -0400  
From: "Donelan, Karen" <KDONELAN@PARTNERS.org>  
Subject: Re: On Huffington and AAPOR  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Send reply to: "Donelan, Karen" <KDONELAN@PARTNERS.org>

> It would be great to see what Mary wrote about  
> good polls and bad polls...this could be  
> a useful summary for all of us to have on hand

> Karen Donelan

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

> From: Mariolis, Peter [mailto:pxm1@CDC.GOV]

> Sent: Friday, May 23, 2003 4:37 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: On Huffington and AAPOR

> In my opinion, the most important part of Ms Huffington's  
> appearance occurred in the discussion that followed her  
> presentation and the responses.

> Thanks largely to Mary Losch, Ms Huffington got the point  
> that there is a difference between good polls and bad polls.  
> She asked Mary to send her something in writing about how  
> to distinguish between the two, which Mary has already done.  
> My sense is that Ms Huffington will start saying that it's  
> OK to respond positively to some polls/surveys and here's  
> how to tell the difference between one that you might want  
> to respond positively to and one that you should hang up on.

> Unfortunately, in my judgment, we didn't listen as openly to  
> her as she did to us. I agree with those who say that she  
> made many misstatements of fact but I also believe that she  
> made two more general points worth hearing and that most of  
> us did not hear them.

> Her first point was that polls reflect shallow, surface  
> opinion but that they are usually treated at face value by  
> the lay public and pollsters alike. Her second point was  
> that we should take more responsibility for how polls are  
> misused and make more of an effort to educate people about  
> their appropriate uses. I think that there is merit in both  
> of those points.

> Peter Mariolis

> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

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

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

> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>



> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Fri, 23 May 2003 20:04:00 -0400  
Reply-To: [RSSIPresMelodyR@AOL.COM](mailto:RSSIPresMelodyR@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Melody Rodriguez <[RSSIPresMelodyR@AOL.COM](mailto:RSSIPresMelodyR@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: On Huffington and AAPOR  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I agree completely, Peter. Ms. Huffington gave us as much to consider as we did her. I also fear that we might have been so ready to defend ourselves that we weren't really listening but merely awaiting the next opportunity to speak. I'm looking forward to the continuation of this dialogue on both her part and that of the members of AAPOR.

Melody Rodriguez

---

...Unfortunately, in my judgment, we didn't listen as openly to her as she did to us. I agree with those who say that she made many misstatements of fact but I also believe that she made two more general points worth hearing and that most of us did not hear them.

Her first point was that polls reflect shallow, surface opinion but that they are usually treated at face value by the lay public and pollsters alike. Her second point was that we should take more responsibility for how polls are misused and make more of an effort to educate people about their appropriate uses. I think that there is merit in both of those points.

Peter Mariolis

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Fri, 23 May 2003 20:13:41 -0500  
Reply-To: [alisku@email.com](mailto:alisku@email.com)

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: =?iso-8859-1?Q?Alis=FA\_Schoua-Glusberg?= <Alisu@EMAIL.COM>  
Subject: Cantonese-speaking focus group moderator?  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Can anyone recommend a Cantonese language focus group moderator?  
Preferably someone with experience in health research. Location within  
the US not necessarily an issue. I can find the agencies that provide  
the service, but am really looking for a free-lance moderator.

=20

Referrals will be appreciated.

Thanks!

=20

Alis=FA

=20

\*\*\*\*\*

Alis=FA Schoua-Glusberg, Ph.D.

General Partner

Research Support Services

906 Ridge Ave. Evanston, IL 60202

847.971.9068 - fax: 208.728.3064

Alisu@email.com

=20

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====

Date: Sat, 24 May 2003 15:09:47 -0400

Reply-To: Corinne Kirchner <corinne@AFB.NET>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Corinne Kirchner <corinne@AFB.NET>

Subject: Re: [Re: additional conference notes]

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Paul raises another topic that I think deserves post-conference  
discussion/evaluation, i.e., the new feature of "interactive papers." Fir=  
st,  
there's the question of whether that option is a matter of being "relegat=  
ed",  
and the 2nd-class status that implies. I did an "interactive paper" and h=  
ad  
not felt "relegated" -- I had been disappointed that the whole panel I ha=  
d  
proposed could not be accepted, but for the individual paper option versu=  
s  
being in a set of not-that-closely-related papers, I found the "interacti=  
ve  
paper" session advantageous for the precise reason of allowing me to get

feedback and commentary from people who specifically came because of interest in the topic of my paper, and also gave me the chance to get individual's names and emails for further networking.  
(No, Paul, I am not taking personal offense; just using your labeling to sound out how others felt about the option.)

So, while I felt it was a valuable way to present (and for my paper, at least, more appropriate than a poster), I do have some critique -- specifically, the room was too small; the noise level was a problem; and there could have been a clearer structure as to where specific presenters were located.

What do others think?

Best,  
Corinne

Corinne Kirchner, Ph.D.  
Director of Policy Research & Program Evaluation  
American Foundation for the Blind

"Beatty, Paul C." <pbb5@CDC.GOV> wrote:  
Well, certainly not violently... but I would like to note that more goes on at the conference than one-way transmission of information out to attendees. For many members, it's also a very important outlet to present their new work and receive feedback and commentary. I know that I personally would rather be the fifth paper (with limited presentation time) than be relegated to an "interactive paper session."

It is nice to have a little more time to talk, but there are tradeoffs. When five quality papers can be accommodated in a session, I think that's sometimes the right way to go.

Paul

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

From: Jay Mattlin [mailto:JMattlin@MEDIAMARK.NOPWORLD.COM]  
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2003 11:45 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: additional conference notes

I just wanted to add that I appreciated that none of the sessions contained

no more than four papers. Personally, I would like this precedent to hold for the future. I always found the five-paper sessions to be too crammed full of information to be memorable and to not allow sufficient time (just 12 minutes) for individual speakers.

Anybody violently disagree?

Jay Mattlin

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

From: Colleen Porter

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Sent: 5/23/2003 11:15 AM

Subject: additional conference notes

A few other random observations on the AAPOR conference....

It seemed to me that there were a higher-than usual number of invited addresses from folks who may not have been to AAPOR in years, or at all before. This, along with the Huffington plenary, gave one the impression that the conference committee thought it was time for us to stretch a little and reach for something new.

Although I heard mixed results from other folks on the invited papers, one that I attended was sensational. This was "Enhancing the Validity and Cross-Cultural Comparability of Measurement in Survey Research" by Gary King. Since I do a lot of cross-cultural work without leaving my state (a lot of our work is in the ethnically diverse area of Miami-Dade), this was fascinating to me. And he has a copy of the paper on the web at

<http://gking.harvard.edu/preprints.shtml>

Another wonderful surprise was the really excellent presentation, "Parsing the Polls," by Gary Langer and Daniel Merkle from ABC News. I had assumed that they would be speaking about polls they conducted. Well, no. This was about their role in vetting survey data for the reporters and editors at ABC news, deciding whether survey results were reliable enough to be reported as news. Their war stories are fascinating. One of the examples concerned a study about marriage, and how the data presentation had been manipulated by a zealous pro-family advocacy group. As it turns out, our state has commissioned a big survey about marriage, and I

am informally consulting. When I got home, I printed out the ABC transcript, and passed it on to the PI for that project, who was appreciative and intrigued.

I would very much like to hear more on this topic in the future. I also think that there is a flip side to the issue that concerns many of us, and that is how we make \*our\* study information readily available. There were a few years when I was just writing, not working as a researcher. As an end-user, I was so frustrated by the lack of critical methodological information in survey reports people issued that I determined that if I ever worked as a researcher again, I would do it up right. Our documentation is pretty thorough, and I hope readable, and I believe we give people like Langer and Merkle enough information to figure out what we really did. (Not that the health insurance rate in Kansas would make ABC news, mind you, but if we ever did something newsworthy, the information would be there.)

Then, Sunday morning brought an excellent discussion about IRB issues. As a survey researcher in a medical center, I especially appreciated the presentation by Stephen J. Blumberg, co-chair of the IRB at the Nat'l Center for Health Statistics. He offered to send the powerpoint to anyone who wanted it, and he is at [SBlumberg@cdc.gov](mailto:SBlumberg@cdc.gov)

Finally, I was struck at the selection for the AAPOR award. For years, it has been interesting to watch the two major wings of AAPOR emerge, survey methodologists versus those who have a keen interest in the substantive findings of public opinion research. In a sense, having two awards, and the choice of those two particular individuals, was both an acknowledgement of the two factions but also an affirmation that there is room for both.

Finally, I just can't resist a comment on Huffington's comments. One of the discussants, I think Rich Morin, talked about the "collateral damage" of a poll-free America, including unemployment data from the CPS. She responded that, "Nobody cares about your economic surveys." Well, in a 2004 presidential election that is shaping up to be about the economy, stupid, I think some policymakers may actually care a great deal about those numbers.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter  
Project Coordinator, University of Florida  
cporter@hp.ufl.edu  
\*\*\*AT OUR NEW OFFICE & PHONE NUMBER\*\*  
phone: 352/273-6068, fax: 273-6075  
Department of Health Services Administration  
Location: 101 Newell Drive, Rm. 4136  
US Mail: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)=

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)=

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Sun, 25 May 2003 08:18:57 -0400  
Reply-To: "Lavrakas, Paul" <[Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM](mailto:Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <[Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM](mailto:Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM)>  
Subject: Re: [Re: additional conference notes]  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

I chaired one of the interactive sessions; (although there really wasn't anything for me to do -- since no fights broke out -- other than announce when the time was up).

I thought the interaction between presenters and those who engaged them in conversations was impressive. It took about 10-15 minutes for the conversation level in the room to "warm up" but once that happened it was sustained through the end of the session. Corrine is correct that more space with better sound-suppressing acoustics would have helped.

I'm not one to want to add to structure with needless bureaucracy, but if the floor plan of where presenters are to set up is assigned in advance, a "map" of where the different presenters are located could be posted near the entrance into the room (this possibility also holds for helping attendees negotiate poster sessions).

PJL

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

From: Corinne Kirchner [mailto:corinne@AFB.NET]

Sent: Saturday, May 24, 2003 3:10 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: [Re: additional conference notes]

Paul raises another topic that I think deserves post-conference discussion/evaluation, i.e., the new feature of "interactive papers." First, there's the question of whether that option is a matter of being "relegated", and the 2nd-class status that implies. I did an "interactive paper" and had not felt "relegated" -- I had been disappointed that the whole panel I had proposed could not be accepted, but for the individual paper option versus being in a set of not-that-closely-related papers, I found the "interactive paper" session advantageous for the precise reason of allowing me to get feedback and commentary from people who specifically came because of interest in the topic of my paper, and also gave me the chance to get individual's names and emails for further networking. (No, Paul, I am not taking personal offense; just using your labeling to sound out how others felt about the option.)

So, while I felt it was a valuable way to present (and for my paper, at least, more appropriate than a poster), I do have some critique -- specifically, the room was too small; the noise level was a problem; and there could have been a clearer structure as to where specific presenters were located.

What do others think?

Best,  
Corinne

Corinne Kirchner, Ph.D.  
Director of Policy Research & Program Evaluation  
American Foundation for the Blind

"Beatty, Paul C." <pbb5@CDC.GOV> wrote:  
Well, certainly not violently... but I would like to note that more goes on at the conference than one-way transmission of information out to attendees. For many members, it's also a very important outlet to present their new work and receive feedback and commentary. I know that I personally would rather be the fifth paper (with limited presentation time) than be relegated to an "interactive paper session."

It is nice to have a little more time to talk, but there are tradeoffs. When five quality papers can be accommodated in a session, I think that's

sometimes the right way to go.

Paul

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

From: Jay Mattlin [mailto:JMattlin@MEDIAMARK.NOPWORLD.COM]

Sent: Friday, May 23, 2003 11:45 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: additional conference notes

I just wanted to add that I appreciated that none of the sessions contained no more than four papers. Personally, I would like this precedent to hold for the future. I always found the five-paper sessions to be too crammed full of information to be memorable and to not allow sufficient time (just 12 minutes) for individual speakers.

Anybody violently disagree?

Jay Mattlin

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

From: Colleen Porter

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Sent: 5/23/2003 11:15 AM

Subject: additional conference notes

A few other random observations on the AAPOR conference....

It seemed to me that there were a higher-than usual number of invited addresses from folks who may not have been to AAPOR in years, or at all before. This, along with the Huffington plenary, gave one the impression that the conference committee thought it was time for us to stretch a little and reach for something new.

Although I heard mixed results from other folks on the invited papers, one that I attended was sensational. This was "Enhancing the Validity and Cross-Cultural Comparability of Measurement in Survey Research" by Gary King. Since I do a lot of cross-cultural work without leaving my state (a lot of our work is in the ethnically diverse area of Miami-Dade), this was fascinating to me. And he has a copy of the paper on the web at

<http://gking.harvard.edu/preprints.shtml>

Another wonderful surprise was the really excellent presentation, "Parsing th Polls," by Gary Langer and Daniel Merkle from ABC News. I had



assumed that they would be speaking about polls they conducted. Well, no. This was about their role in vetting survey data for the reporters and editors at ABC news, deciding whether survey results were reliable enough to be reported as news. Their war stories are fascinating. One of the examples concerned a study about marriage, and how the data presentation had been manipulated by a zealous pro-family advocacy group. As it turns out, our state has commissioned a big survey about marriage, and I am informally consulting. When I got home, I printed out the ABC transcript, and passed it on to the PI for that project, who was appreciative and intrigued.

I would very much like to hear more on this topic in the future. I also think that there is a flip side to the issue that concerns many of us, and that is how we make \*our\* study information readily available. There were a few years when I was just writing, not working as a researcher. As an end-user, I was so frustrated by the lack of critical methodological information in survey reports people issued that I determined that if I ever worked as a researcher again, I would do it up right. Our documentation is pretty thorough, and I hope readable, and I believe we give people like Langer and Merkle enough information to figure out what we really did. (Not that the health insurance rate in Kansas would make ABC news, mind you, but if we ever did something newsworthy, the information would be there.)

Then, Sunday morning brought an excellent discussion about IRB issues. As a survey researcher in a medical center, I especially appreciated the presentation by Stephen J. Blumberg, co-chair of the IRB at the Nat'l Center for Health Statistics. He offered to send the powerpoint to anyone who wanted it, and he is at [SBlumberg@cdc.gov](mailto:SBlumberg@cdc.gov)

Finally, I was struck at the selection for the AAPOR award. For years, it has been interesting to watch the two major wings of AAPOR emerge, survey methodologists versus those who have a keen interest in the substantive findings of public opinion research. In a sense, having two awards, and the choice of those two particular individuals, was both an acknowledgement of the two factions but also an affirmation that there is room for both.

Finally, I just can't resist a comment on Huffington's comments. One of the discussants, I think Rich Morin, talked about the "collateral damage" of a poll-free America, including unemployment data from

the CPS. She responded that, "Nobody cares about your economic surveys." Well, in a 2004 presidential election that is shaping up to be about the economy, stupid, I think some policymakers may actually care a great deal about those numbers.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter  
Project Coordinator, University of Florida  
cporter@hp.ufl.edu  
\*\*\*AT OUR NEW OFFICE & PHONE NUMBER\*\*  
phone: 352/273-6068, fax: 273-6075  
Department of Health Services Administration  
Location: 101 Newell Drive, Rm. 4136  
US Mail: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Sun, 25 May 2003 08:43:51 -0500  
Reply-To: [alisu@email.com](mailto:alisu@email.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: =?iso-8859-1?Q?Alis=FA\_Schoua-Glusberg?= <[Alisu@EMAIL.COM](mailto:Alisu@EMAIL.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Interactive Papers  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I failed to see real differences with the posters, and actually heard comments that it seemed the 'poor', posterless version of the former.

=20

Alis=FA

=20

\*\*\*\*\*

Alis=FA Schoua-Glusberg, Ph.D.

General Partner

Research Support Services

906 Ridge Ave. Evanston, IL 60202

847.971.9068 - fax: 208.728.3064

Alisu@email.com

=20

MailFiler <<http://www.mailfiler.com>> [ASG-9NUKSM2]

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Date: Sun, 25 May 2003 23:48:21 -0400

Reply-To: RSSIPresMelodyR@AOL.COM

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Melody Rodriguez <RSSIPresMelodyR@AOL.COM>

Subject: (no subject)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I chaired one of the sessions as well. Three of the presenters were "no shows" and two expressed that this wasn't a very helpful forum - that one was unable to really get any large-scale feedback or engage in meaningful dialogue due to the space restrictions and the acoustics of the room.

I had signs on the tables for everyone, grouped as close to subject topic as I could, but I agree that a map of who is where would be helpful for conference attendees. We had virtually no attendance until 20+ minutes into the session time but once people did come, it was difficult, at times, for the "presenters" to be able to "present" as they were constantly interrupted, joined by others and had to either start over again or make the new arrivals wait until the others were finished...many chose not to wait and left.

As an attendee, I went to 2 interactive sessions late into the session only to find the room full, very loud and consequently, uninviting. I would prefer to see a MUCH LARGER venue for the poster sessions and let everyone not chosen to participate in a panel, be able to present this way. Maps for this would also be helpful.

Melody Rodriguez  
~~~~~

I chaired one of the interactive sessions; (although there really wasn't anything for me to do -- since no fights broke out -- other than announce

when the time was up).

I thought the interaction between presenters and those who engaged them in conversations was impressive. It took about 10-15 minutes for the conversation level in the room to "warm up" but once that happened it was sustained through the end of the session. Corrine is correct that more space with better sound-suppressing acoustics would have helped.

I'm not one to want to add to structure with needless bureaucracy, but if the floor plan of where presenters are to set up is assigned in advance, a "map" of where the different presenters are located could be posted near the entrance into the room (this possibility also holds for helping attendees negotiate poster sessions).

PJL

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

From: Corinne Kirchner [mailto:corinne@AFB.NET]

Sent: Saturday, May 24, 2003 3:10 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: [Re: additional conference notes]

Paul raises another topic that I think deserves post-conference discussion/evaluation, i.e., the new feature of "interactive papers." First, there's the question of whether that option is a matter of being "relegated", and the 2nd-class status that implies. I did an "interactive paper" and had not felt "relegated" -- I had been disappointed that the whole panel I had proposed could not be accepted, but for the individual paper option versus being in a set of not-that-closely-related papers, I found the "interactive paper" session advantageous for the precise reason of allowing me to get feedback and commentary from people who specifically came because of interest in the topic of my paper, and also gave me the chance to get individual's names and emails for further networking. (No, Paul, I am not taking personal offense; just using your labeling to sound out how others felt about the option.)

So, while I felt it was a valuable way to present (and for my paper, at least, more appropriate than a poster), I do have some critique -- specifically, the room was too small; the noise level was a problem; and there could have been a clearer structure as to where specific presenters were located.

What do others think?

Best,  
Corinne

Corinne Kirchner, Ph.D.

Director of Policy Research & Program Evaluation  
American Foundation for the Blind

"Beatty, Paul C." <pbb5@CDC.GOV> wrote:

Well, certainly not violently... but I would like to note that more goes on at the conference than one-way transmission of information out to attendees. For many members, it's also a very important outlet to present their new work and receive feedback and commentary. I know that I personally would rather be the fifth paper (with limited presentation time) than be relegated to an "interactive paper session."

It is nice to have a little more time to talk, but there are tradeoffs. When five quality papers can be accomodated in a session, I think that's sometimes the right way to go.

Paul

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

From: Jay Mattlin [mailto:JMattlin@MEDIAMARK.NOPWORLD.COM]  
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2003 11:45 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: additional conference notes

I just wanted to add that I appreciated that none of the sessions contained no more than four papers. Personally, I would like this precedent to hold for the future. I always found the five-paper sessions to be too crammed full of information to be memorable and to not allow sufficient time (just 12 minutes) for individual speakers.

Anybody violently disagree?

Jay Mattlin

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

From: Colleen Porter  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Sent: 5/23/2003 11:15 AM  
Subject: additional conference notes

A few other random observations on the AAPOR conference....

It seemed to me that there were a higher-than usual number of invited addresses from folks who may not have been to AAPOR in years, or at all before. This, along with the Huffington plenary, gave one the impression that the conference committee thought it was time for us to stretch a little and reach for something new.

Although I heard mixed results from other folks on the invited papers, one that I attended was

sensational. This was "Enhancing the Validity and Cross-Cultural Comparability of Measurement in Survey Research" by Gary King. Since I do a lot of cross-cultural work without leaving my state (a lot of our work is in the ethnically diverse area of Miami-Dade), this was fascinating to me. And he has a copy of the paper on the web at

<http://gking.harvard.edu/preprints.shtml>

Another wonderful surprise was the really excellent presentation, "Parsing th Polls," by Gary Langer and Daniel Merkle from ABC News. I had assumed that they would be speaking about polls they conducted. Well, no. This was about their role in vetting survey data for the reporters and editors at ABC news, deciding whether survey results were reliable enough to be reported as news. Their war stories are fascinating. One of the examples concerned a study about marriage, and how the data presentation had been manipulated by a zealous pro-family advocacy group. As it turns out, our state has commissioned a big survey about marriage, and I am informally consulting. When I got home, I printed out the ABC transcript, and passed it on to the PI for that project, who was appreciative and intrigued.

I would very much like to hear more on this topic in the future. I also think that there is a flip side to the issue that concerns many of us, and that is how we make \*our\* study information readily available. There were a few years when I was just writing, not working as a researcher. As an end-user, I was so frustrated by the lack of critical methodological information in survey reports people issued that I determined that if I ever worked as a researcher again, I would do it up right. Our documentation is pretty thorough, and I hope readable, and I believe we give people like Langer and Merkle enough information to figure out what we really did. (Not that the health insurance rate in Kansas would make ABC news, mind you, but if we ever did something newsworthy, the information would be there.)

Then, Sunday morning brought an excellent discussion about IRB issues. As a survey researcher in a medical center, I especially appreciated the presentation by Stephen J. Blumberg, co-chair of the IRB at the Nat'l Center for Health Statistics. He offered to send the powerpoint to anyone who wanted it, and he is at [SBlumberg@cdc.gov](mailto:SBlumberg@cdc.gov)

Finally, I was struck at the selection for the AAPOR

award. For years, it has been interesting to watch the two major wings of AAPOR emerge, survey methodologists versus those who have a keen interest in the substantive findings of public opinion research. In a sense, having two awards, and the choice of those two particular individuals, was both an acknowledgement of the two factions but also an affirmation that there is room for both.

Finally, I just can't resist a comment on Huffington's comments. One of the discussants, I think Rich Morin, talked about the "collateral damage" of a poll-free America, including unemployment data from the CPS. She responded that, "Nobody cares about your economic surveys." Well, in a 2004 presidential election that is shaping up to be about the economy, stupid, I think some policymakers may actually care a great deal about those numbers.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter  
Project Coordinator, University of Florida  
cporter@hp.ufl.edu  
\*\*\*AT OUR NEW OFFICE & PHONE NUMBER\*\*  
phone: 352/273-6068, fax: 273-6075  
Department of Health Services Administration  
Location: 101 Newell Drive, Rm. 4136  
US Mail: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

Date: Mon, 26 May 2003 11:51:19 -0500  
Reply-To: [slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu](mailto:slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Susan Carol Losh <[slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU](mailto:slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU)>  
Subject: Poster Sessions  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain  
Content-transfer-encoding: binary

I want to put in a plug in favor of the poster sessions.

Our room on late Saturday morning filled up quickly. "Visitors" seemed to very much enjoy looking at the diverse displays. People stop to chat, exchange cards to exchange more information later, take handouts when available. I met and spoke with far more individuals than I would have in a more traditional panel presentation. The informality is delightful.

I have done two poster sessions at AAPOR as well as traditional panels. I am not really sure what the interactive sessions add to posters other than the chance to sit down, but I know I enjoy the poster sessions.

Susan

On Sun, 25 May 2003 23:48:21 -0400 Melody Rodriguez wrote:

> I chaired one of the sessions as well. Three of the presenters were "no  
> shows" and two expressed that this wasn't a very helpful forum - that  
> one was  
> unable to really get any large-scale feedback or engage in meaningful  
> dialogue due  
> to the space restrictions and the acoustics of the room.  
>  
> I had signs on the tables for everyone, grouped as close to subject  
> topic as  
> I could, but I agree that a map of who is where would be helpful for  
> conference attendees. We had virtually no attendance until 20+  
> minutes into the session  
> time but once people did come, it was difficult, at times, for the  
> "presenters" to be able to "present" as they were constantly  
> interrupted, joined by  
> others and had to either start over again or make the new arrivals  
> wait until the  
> others were finished...many chose not to wait and left.  
>  
> As an attendee, I went to 2 interactive sessions late into the  
> session only  
> to find the room full, very loud and consequently, uninviting. I



> would prefer  
> to see a MUCH LARGER venue for the poster sessions and let everyone  
> not chosen  
> to participate in a panel, be able to present this way. Maps for  
> this would  
> also be helpful.  
>  
> Melody Rodriguez  
> ~~~~~  
> I chaired one of the interactive sessions; (although there really wasn't  
> anything for me to do -- since no fights broke out -- other than announce  
> when the time was up).  
>  
> I thought the interaction between presenters and those who engaged them in  
> conversations was impressive. It took about 10-15 minutes for the  
> conversation level in the room to "warm up" but once that happened it was  
> sustained through the end of the session. Corrine is correct that  
> more space  
> with better sound-suppressing acoustics would have helped.  
>  
> I'm not one to want to add to structure with needless bureaucracy, but if  
> the floor plan of where presenters are to set up is assigned in advance, a  
> "map" of where the different presenters are located could be posted  
> near the  
> entrance into the room (this possibility also holds for helping attendees  
> negotiate poster sessions).  
>  
> PJL  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Corinne Kirchner [mailto:corinne@AFB.NET]  
> Sent: Saturday, May 24, 2003 3:10 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: [Re: additional conference notes]  
>  
>  
> Paul raises another topic that I think deserves post-conference  
> discussion/evaluation, i.e., the new feature of "interactive papers."  
> First,  
> there's the question of whether that option is a matter of being  
> "relegated",  
> and the 2nd-class status that implies. I did an "interactive paper"  
> and had  
> not felt "relegated" -- I had been disappointed that the whole panel I had  
> proposed could not be accepted, but for the individual paper option versus  
> being in a set of not-that-closely-related papers, I found the  
> "interactive  
> paper" session advantageous for the precise reason of allowing me to get  
> feedback and commentary from people who specifically came because of  
> interest  
> in the topic of my paper, and also gave me the chance to get individual's  
> names and emails for further networking.  
> (No, Paul, I am not taking personal offense; just using your labeling to  
> sound

> out how others felt about the option.)  
>  
> So, while I felt it was a valuable way to present (and for my paper, at  
> least,  
> more appropriate than a poster), I do have some critique -- specifically,  
> the  
> room was too small; the noise level was a problem; and there could  
> have been  
> a  
> clearer structure as to where specific presenters were located.  
>  
> What do others think?  
>  
> Best,  
> Corinne  
>  
> Corinne Kirchner, Ph.D.  
> Director of Policy Research & Program Evaluation  
> American Foundation for the Blind  
>  
> "Beatty, Paul C." <pbb5@CDC.GOV> wrote:  
> Well, certainly not violently... but I would like to note that more  
> goes on  
> at the conference than one-way transmission of information out to  
> attendees.  
> For many members, it's also a very important outlet to present their new  
> work and receive feedback and commentary. I know that I personally would  
> rather be the fifth paper (with limited presentation time) than be  
> relegated  
> to an "interactive paper session."  
>  
> It is nice to have a little more time to talk, but there are tradeoffs.  
> When five quality papers can be accomodated in a session, I think that's  
> sometimes the right way to go.  
>  
> Paul  
>  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Jay Mattlin [mailto:JMattlin@MEDIAMARK.NOPWORLD.COM]  
> Sent: Friday, May 23, 2003 11:45 AM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: additional conference notes  
>  
>  
> I just wanted to add that I appreciated that none of the sessions  
> contained  
> no more than four papers. Personally, I would like this precedent to hold  
> for the future. I always found the five-paper sessions to be too crammed  
> full of information to be memorable and to not allow sufficient time (just  
> 12 minutes) for individual speakers.  
>  
>  
> Anybody violently disagree?  
>

> Jay Mattlin

>

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

> From: Colleen Porter

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Sent: 5/23/2003 11:15 AM

> Subject: additional conference notes

>

> A few other random observations on the AAPOR

> conference....

>

> It seemed to me that there were a higher-than usual  
> number of invited addresses from folks who may not  
> have been to AAPOR in years, or at all before. This,  
> along with the Huffington plenary, gave one the  
> impression that the conference committee thought it  
> was time for us to stretch a little and reach for  
> something new.

>

> Although I heard mixed results from other folks on  
> the invited papers, one that I attended was  
> sensational. This was "Enhancing the Validity and  
> Cross-Cultural Comparability of Measurement in Survey  
> Research" by Gary King. Since I do a lot of cross-  
> cultural work without leaving my state (a lot of our  
> work is in the ethnically diverse area of Miami-  
> Dade), this was fascinating to me. And he has a copy  
> of the paper on the web at

>

> <http://gking.harvard.edu/preprints.shtml>

>

> Another wonderful surprise was the really  
> excellent presentation, "Parsing th Polls," by  
> Gary Langer and Daniel Merkle from ABC News. I had  
> assumed that they would be speaking about polls  
> they conducted. Well, no. This was about their role  
> in vetting survey data for the reporters and editors  
> at ABC news, deciding whether survey results were  
> reliable enough to be reported as news. Their war  
> stories are fascinating. One of the examples  
> concerned a study about marriage, and how the data  
> presentation had been manipulated by a zealous pro-  
> family advocacy group. As it turns out, our state  
> has commissioned a big survey about marriage, and I  
> am informally consulting. When I got home, I printed  
> out the ABC transcript, and passed it on to the PI  
> for that project, who was appreciative and  
> intrigued.

>

> I would very much like to hear more on this topic in  
> the future. I also think that there is a flip side  
> to the issue that concerns many of us, and that is  
> how we make \*our\* study information readily available.  
> There were a few years when I was just writing, not

> working as a researcher. As an end-user, I was so  
> frustrated by the lack of critical methodological  
> information in survey reports people issued that I  
> determined that if I ever worked as a researcher again,  
> I would do it up right. Our documentation is pretty  
> thorough, and I hope readable, and I believe we give  
> people like Langer and Merkle enough information to  
> figure out what we really did. (Not that the health  
> insurance rate in Kansas would make ABC news, mind you,  
> but if we ever did something newsworthy, the information  
> would be there.)

>  
> Then, Sunday morning brought an excellent  
> discussion about IRB issues. As a survey researcher  
> in a medical center, I especially appreciated the  
> presentation by Stephen J. Blumberg, co-chair of  
> the IRB at the Nat'l Center for Health Statistics.  
> He offered to send the powerpoint to anyone who  
> wanted it, and he is at SBlumberg@cdc.gov

>  
> Finally, I was struck at the selection for the AAPOR  
> award. For years, it has been interesting to watch  
> the two major wings of AAPOR emerge, survey  
> methodologists versus those who have a keen  
> interest in the substantive findings of public opinion  
> research. In a sense, having two awards, and the  
> choice of those two particular individuals, was both  
> an acknowledgement of the two factions but also an  
> affirmation that there is room for both.

>  
> Finally, I just can't resist a comment on Huffington's  
> comments. One of the discussants, I think Rich  
> Morin, talked about the "collateral damage" of a  
> poll-free America, including unemployment data from  
> the CPS. She responded that, "Nobody cares about  
> your economic surveys." Well, in a 2004 presidential  
> election that is shaping up to be about the economy,  
> stupid, I think some policymakers may actually care  
> a great deal about those numbers.

>  
> Colleen

>  
>  
>  
>  
> Colleen K. Porter  
> Project Coordinator, University of Florida  
> cporter@hp.ufl.edu  
> \*\*\*AT OUR NEW OFFICE & PHONE NUMBER\*\*  
> phone: 352/273-6068, fax: 273-6075  
> Department of Health Services Administration  
> Location: 101 Newell Drive, Rm. 4136  
> US Mail: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

>

> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>  
> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>  
> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>  
> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>  
> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>  
> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <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 info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Tue, 27 May 2003 10:12:02 -0400  
Reply-To: Jay Mattlin <[JMattlin@MEDIAMARK.NOPWORLD.COM](mailto:JMattlin@MEDIAMARK.NOPWORLD.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jay Mattlin <[JMattlin@MEDIAMARK.NOPWORLD.COM](mailto:JMattlin@MEDIAMARK.NOPWORLD.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Interactive Papers  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Suggestion: If there is going to be a post-conference assessment = survey of attendees (which I hope there will be), questions about these issues -- poster sessions, interactive papers, four-paper sessions vs. five-paper sessions -- should be included. There appear to be a range of opinions = on these issues (and the factors related to them).

Jay

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

From: Alis=FA Schoua-Glusberg [mailto:Alisu@EMAIL.COM]  
Sent: Sunday, May 25, 2003 9:44 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Interactive Papers

I failed to see real differences with the posters, and actually heard comments that it seemed the 'poor', posterless version of the former.

=20

Alis=FA

=20

\*\*\*\*\*

Alis=FA Schoua-Glusberg, Ph.D.  
General Partner  
Research Support Services  
906 Ridge Ave. Evanston, IL 60202  
847.971.9068 - fax: 208.728.3064  
Alisu@email.com

=20

MailFiler <<http://www.mailfiler.com>> [ASG-9NUKSM2]

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Tue, 27 May 2003 10:39:52 -0500  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>  
Subject: FW: Need Telephone Manger  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Please respond directly to: Elham-Eid Alldredge =  
[[alldredg@redainternational.com](mailto:alldredg@redainternational.com)]

=20

=20

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

From: Elham-Eid Alldredge [mailto:alldredg@redainternational.com]

Sent: Friday, May 23, 2003 9:37 AM

To: AAPOR-INFO

Subject: Need Telephone Manger

Importance: High

Hello: I am a member of AAPOR and would like to send this announcement =  
to the list. Can you help?

IMMEDIATE OPENING!!!! TELEPHONE RESEARCH CENTER MANAGER

REDA International, Inc. is a growing women-owned business specializing =  
in applied social science research. We now have an immediate opening for =  
a telephone research center manager. The center has projects dealing =  
with health, social services, and education. We are looking for an =  
individual with a college degree and 3-5 years of experience. Foreign =  
language skills are a plus. This is a full-time position. We are located =  
in Wheaton, Maryland, outside Washington, DC.

Send your resume via e-mail to: alldredg@redainternational.com or fax it =  
to:

(301) 946-1911.

REDA is an equal opportunity employer.

Elham-Eid Alldredge, Ph.D.  
REDA International, Inc.  
11141 Georgia Avenue, Suite 517  
Wheaton, MD 20902-4680  
Tel: (301) 946-9790  
Fax: (301) 946-1911  
www.redainternational.com

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 28 May 2003 11:43:38 -0400  
Reply-To: Lee Miringoff <Lee.Miringoff@MARIST.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Lee Miringoff <Lee.Miringoff@MARIST.EDU>  
Subject: New Position  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

PROJECT COORDINATOR/SURVEY OPERATIONS MANAGER  
Administrative

The Marist Institute for Public Opinion (MIPO), a nationally recognized  
survey research center at Marist College, is seeking a motivated and  
organized individual to assist in the planning and development of survey  
projects and to direct the daily operations of the survey call center.

Reporting to the director of the Marist Poll, the responsibilities of this individual will be divided between assisting in the research and writing associated with survey projects and managing the survey call center including the recruitment and training of interviewers and supervisors. There is potential for growth and advancement.

Requirements include a Bachelors degree in social science, communications, or a related field; experience in survey research is preferred. A flexible work schedule is needed and the successful applicant must be willing to work evening hours.

Review of applicants will begin June 9, 2003 and continue until the position is filled. Please submit a cover letter, resume, and the names of three professional references to Eva J. Jackson, Assistant Director of Human Resources, MPO-905, Marist College, Poughkeepsie, New York 12601

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYER

Lee M. Miringoff, Ph.D.  
Director, Marist Institute for Public Opinion  
Marist College  
845.575.5050

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====  
Date: Wed, 28 May 2003 09:41:52 -0700  
Reply-To: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>  
Subject: Response Rate experiment  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

A few months ago, I promised to share with the list the results of the experiment I conducted on salutations and response rates to online surveys. Ever true to my word, I have put the paper -- entitled, strangely enough, "Salutations and Response Rates to Online Surveys" -- on my web site for your delectation. A link to it is right on the homepage (URL below).

The paper, which was written with Roger Levine from the American Institutes for Research, will be delivered at the Association for Survey Computing conference at Warwick University in September. So please understand that, until then, it is a draft: Please do not quote, attribute, or disseminate it. We are sharing it now as a courtesy to the list (and to momentarily distract you from more important things, like Arianna Huffington).

Enjoy.

Jerold Pearson, '75  
Director of Market Research  
Stanford Alumni Association



650-723-9186

jpearson@stanford.edu

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

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

---

Date: Wed, 28 May 2003 14:28:23 -0400

Reply-To: Dan Hagan <dhagan@PARTNERSINC.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Dan Hagan <dhagan@PARTNERSINC.COM>

Subject: Arianna May Be Bending

MIME-version: 1.0

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

After Nashville I signed up to get Arianna's article by email. I was hoping to see if she wrote to the Nashville experience and if it had an impact. Well she hasn't addressed the experience as yet but look what she included in her most recent article bashing the Democrats for not challenging Bush and his administration on Iraq and Tax Cuts/deficits. I haven't read much of her previous articles - has she ever quoted polls before? If not, I think we should all send her a note of thanks for her not so subtle concession!

"For example, only one out of four Americans believe the latest round of tax cuts will significantly reduce their taxes, and just 29 percent think the cuts are the best way to help stimulate the economy. Yet Democrats seem congenitally incapable of challenging a president whose entire domestic agenda consists of more and more tax cuts for the wealthy.

The numbers also favor the Democrats on the foreign policy front. According to the latest Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll, 57 percent of Americans are opposed to investing the time and money needed to rebuild Iraq. But the Democrats sit idly by, their thumbs otherwise engaged, while the administration's Iraqi tar baby grows stickier by the day.

And on and on it goes: On protecting the environment, safeguarding Social Security, greater access to affordable health care, gun control and abortion, the majority of the American people are with the Democrats."

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

---

Date: Wed, 28 May 2003 13:59:17 -0500

Reply-To: Linda Owens <lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Linda Owens <lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU>

Subject: Re: Arianna May Be Bending

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I just finished reading her book "How to Overthrow the Government." She = uses poll data (and survey data) throughout to justify her arguments that = our elected officials aren't doing what we elected them to do. I sent her = an email as well, pointing out this inconsistency and telling her that she = is undermining her own evidence by encouraging people to hang up on = pollsters. So far, no response, but I'll post something if I hear from = her.

Linda Owens, Ph.D.  
Assistant Director  
University of Illinois Survey Research Lab  
505 E. Green St. Ste 3  
Champaign, IL 61820  
Phone: 217-333-4422  
Fax: 217-244-4408  
Email: lindao@srl.uic.edu

>>> Dan Hagan <dhagan@PARTNERSINC.COM> 05/28 1:28 PM >>>  
After Nashville I signed up to get Arianna's article by email. I was = hoping to see if she wrote to the Nashville experience and if it had an impact. Well she hasn't addressed the experience as yet but look what she included in her most recent article bashing the Democrats for not challenging Bush and his administration on Iraq and Tax Cuts/deficits. I haven't read much of her previous articles - has she ever quoted polls before? If not, I think we should all send her a note of thanks for her not so subtle concession!

"For example, only one out of four Americans believe the latest round of tax cuts will significantly reduce their taxes, and just 29 percent think the cuts are the best way to help stimulate the economy. Yet Democrats seem congenitally incapable of challenging a president whose entire domestic agenda consists of more and more tax cuts for the wealthy.

The numbers also favor the Democrats on the foreign policy front. According to the latest Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll, 57 percent of Americans are opposed to investing the time and money needed to rebuild Iraq. But the Democrats sit idly by, their thumbs otherwise engaged, while the administration's Iraqi tar baby grows stickier by the day.

And on and on it goes: On protecting the environment, safeguarding Social Security, greater access to affordable health care, gun control and abortion, the majority of the American people are with the Democrats."

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>=20  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

Date: Wed, 28 May 2003 14:18:23 -0500  
Reply-To: Mary Losch <losch@CSBR.CSBS.UNI.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mary Losch <losch@CSBR.CSBS.UNI.EDU>  
Organization: Center for Social & Behav Research  
Subject: Re: Arianna May Be Bending  
In-Reply-To: <sed4c0c5.078@srl.uic.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

By way of update, I did hear back from Ms. Huffington regarding the letter I sent last week. She was appreciative and indicated that she would address the distinction (all polls are not alike) in a future column. I am cautiously optimistic. I noticed today that Ms. Huffington had placed me on her email list -- like you all, I anxiously await her response. Best, Mary L.

> I just finished reading her book "How to Overthrow the Government." She uses poll data (and survey data) throughout to justify her arguments that our elected officials aren't doing what we elected them to do. I sent her an email as well, pointing out this inconsistency and telling her that she is undermining her own evidence by encouraging people to hang up on pollsters. So far, no response, but I'll post something if I hear from her.

>  
> Linda Owens, Ph.D.  
> Assistant Director  
> University of Illinois Survey Research Lab  
> 505 E. Green St. Ste 3  
> Champaign, IL 61820  
> Phone: 217-333-4422  
> Fax: 217-244-4408  
> Email: lindao@srl.uic.edu

>  
> >>> Dan Hagan <dhagan@PARTNERSINC.COM> 05/28 1:28 PM >>>  
> After Nashville I signed up to get Arianna's article by email. I was hoping  
> to see if she wrote to the Nashville experience and if it had an impact.  
> Well she hasn't addressed the experience as yet but look what she included  
> in her most recent article bashing the Democrats for not challenging Bush  
> and his administration on Iraq and Tax Cuts/deficits. I haven't read much  
> of her previous articles - has she ever quoted polls before? If not, I  
> think we should all send her a note of thanks for her not so subtle  
> concession!

>  
>  
>  
> "For example, only one out of four Americans believe the latest round of  
> tax cuts will significantly reduce their taxes, and just 29 percent think  
> the cuts are the best way to help stimulate the economy. Yet Democrats  
> seem congenitally incapable of challenging a president whose entire  
> domestic agenda consists of more and more tax cuts for the wealthy.

>

> The numbers also favor the Democrats on the foreign policy front.  
> According to the latest Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll, 57 percent of  
> Americans are opposed to investing the time and money needed to rebuild  
> Iraq. But the Democrats sit idly by, their thumbs otherwise engaged, while  
> the administration's Iraqi tar baby grows stickier by the day.

>  
> And on and on it goes: On protecting the environment, safeguarding Social  
> Security, greater access to affordable health care, gun control and  
> abortion, the majority of the American people are with the Democrats."

>  
> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>  
> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Wed, 28 May 2003 15:53:10 -0400  
Reply-To: Melissa Marcello <[mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM](mailto:mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Melissa Marcello <[mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM](mailto:mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Issues that Drive Votes  
In-Reply-To: <[3ED4C52D.31269.24262894@localhost](mailto:3ED4C52D.31269.24262894@localhost)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Her question, in my mind anyway, is less about how people feel towards a variety of different issues, but more so how that sentiment drives = behavior at the ballot box. And (I suppose) in non-election cycles, is their a = swell of grassroots activity, a public outcry, aimed at pressing elected = officials in a particular direction?

Candidates, as the folks on this list know, routinely poll on the issues = and determine whether the issue has legs. Will their stance on an issue = cause a voter to pull a different lever or not, lose favor in their district, = etc? =20

Beyond the "how opinion shapes behavior" question is also the other = issue that we public opinion folks grapple with, which is that the public = often holds opinions that are contradictory. Many polls are short and do not capture nuances in opinions towards a particular issue area. Sadly, =

some  
are also contain "loaded" or softball questions which makes the findings  
suspect. =20

A complex issue to be sure... I'm sure this group can name a dozen or =  
more  
other factors too numerous to list here. =20

Melissa Marcello  
Pursuant, Inc.  
p 202.887.0070=20  
f 800.567.1723  
c 202.352.7462

Visit our website at [www.pursuantresearch.com](http://www.pursuantresearch.com)

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Mary Losch  
Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2003 3:18 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Arianna May Be Bending

By way of update, I did hear back from Ms. Huffington regarding the  
letter I sent last week. She was appreciative and indicated that  
she would address the distinction (all polls are not alike) in a future  
column. I am cautiously optimistic. I noticed today that Ms.  
Huffington had placed me on her email list -- like you all, I  
anxiously await her response. Best, Mary L.

> I just finished reading her book "How to Overthrow the Government." =  
She  
uses poll data (and survey data) throughout to justify her arguments =  
that  
our elected officials aren't doing what we elected them to do. I sent =  
her  
an email as well, pointing out this inconsistency and telling her that  
she is undermining her own evidence by encouraging people to hang up on  
pollsters. So far, no response, but I'll post something if I hear from =  
her.

>  
> Linda Owens, Ph.D.  
> Assistant Director  
> University of Illinois Survey Research Lab  
> 505 E. Green St. Ste 3  
> Champaign, IL 61820  
> Phone: 217-333-4422  
> Fax: 217-244-4408  
> Email: [lindao@srl.uic.edu](mailto:lindao@srl.uic.edu)

>  
> >>> Dan Hagan <[dhagan@PARTNERSINC.COM](mailto:dhagan@PARTNERSINC.COM)> 05/28 1:28 PM >>>  
> After Nashville I signed up to get Arianna's article by email. I was  
hoping

> to see if she wrote to the Nashville experience and if it had an =  
impact.  
> Well she hasn't addressed the experience as yet but look what she =  
included  
> in her most recent article bashing the Democrats for not challenging =  
Bush  
> and his administration on Iraq and Tax Cuts/deficits. I haven't read =  
much  
> of her previous articles - has she ever quoted polls before? If not, =  
I  
> think we should all send her a note of thanks for her not so subtle  
> concession!  
>  
>  
>  
> "For example, only one out of four Americans believe the latest round =  
of  
> tax cuts will significantly reduce their taxes, and just 29 percent =  
think  
> the cuts are the best way to help stimulate the economy. Yet Democrats  
> seem congenitally incapable of challenging a president whose entire  
> domestic agenda consists of more and more tax cuts for the wealthy.  
>  
> The numbers also favor the Democrats on the foreign policy front.  
> According to the latest Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll, 57 percent =  
of  
> Americans are opposed to investing the time and money needed to =  
rebuild  
> Iraq. But the Democrats sit idly by, their thumbs otherwise engaged, =  
while  
> the administration's Iraqi tar baby grows stickier by the day.  
>  
> And on and on it goes: On protecting the environment, safeguarding =  
Social  
> Security, greater access to affordable health care, gun control and  
> abortion, the majority of the American people are with the Democrats."  
>  
> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>  
> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

---

Date: Wed, 28 May 2003 21:40:07 -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: Huffing about Ariana  
In-Reply-To: <3ED4C52D.31269.24262894@localhost>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear All:

As a non-attender of the AAPOR meeting permit a moment of "I told you so."  
It appears that many members found Huffington more interesting and engaging  
than they had suspected she would be.

So should we now commend those who arranged this?

I think so!

Andy

Andrew A. Beveridge  
Professor of Sociology  
Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY  
209 Kissena Hall  
64-19 Kissena Blvd  
Flushing, NY 11367  
Phone: 718-997-2837  
FAX: 718-997-2820  
email: andrew\_beveridge@qc.edu  
web: www.socialexplorer.com

>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

=====

Date: Wed, 28 May 2003 22:58:47 -0400  
Reply-To: ande271@attglobal.net  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jeanne Anderson Research <ande271@ATTGLOBAL.NET>  
Subject: Re: Arianna May Be Bending  
Comments: To: Dan Hagan <dhagan@PARTNERSINC.COM>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Once more I come in after the most interesting part of the thread has been  
produced. Or perhaps the message below is the best part. I wonder if someone  
who is in communication with Ariana would be willing to point out to her that  
if  
opposition political leaders (that is, Democratic congressmen) were to speak  
out, they might use language and arguments that would lead to different survey

questions and possibly even more interesting/relevant survey results. As it stands now, responses to the tax question (however that was worded) show only disagreement with the administration's positions, not agreement with (any hypothetical) plans to stimulate the economy/adjust taxation that Democrats might have. Therefore, we really don't have survey data that show what people would prefer to what the administration has put forward, and are not likely to have any such data until someone in the public sphere articulates alternatives to the present tax legislation. For which survey researcher is going to formulate alternatives? We are not authorized to put forward our own views in the form of survey questions. Public opinion polls work toward more effective representative government only to the extent that they present balanced alternatives that members of the public learn about or could learn about from diverse political leaders.

Jeanne Anderson

Dan Hagan wrote:

> After Nashville I signed up to get Arianna's article by email. I was hoping  
> to see if she wrote to the Nashville experience and if it had an impact.  
> Well she hasn't addressed the experience as yet but look what she included  
> in her most recent article bashing the Democrats for not challenging Bush  
> and his administration on Iraq and Tax Cuts/deficits. I haven't read much  
> of her previous articles - has she ever quoted polls before? If not, I  
> think we should all send her a note of thanks for her not so subtle  
> concession!  
>  
> "For example, only one out of four Americans believe the latest round of  
> tax cuts will significantly reduce their taxes, and just 29 percent think  
> the cuts are the best way to help stimulate the economy. Yet Democrats  
> seem congenitally incapable of challenging a president whose entire  
> domestic agenda consists of more and more tax cuts for the wealthy.  
>  
> The numbers also favor the Democrats on the foreign policy front.  
> According to the latest Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll, 57 percent of  
> Americans are opposed to investing the time and money needed to rebuild  
> Iraq. But the Democrats sit idly by, their thumbs otherwise engaged, while  
> the administration's Iraqi tar baby grows stickier by the day.  
>  
> And on and on it goes: On protecting the environment, safeguarding Social  
> Security, greater access to affordable health care, gun control and  
> abortion, the majority of the American people are with the Democrats."  
>  
> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Thu, 29 May 2003 09:33:26 -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>  
Subject: Dick Morris accuses the NY Times of unbalanced weighting  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Chatterbox Exonerates New York Times!  
Does Howell Raines' Times weight polls to favor Democrats? Nope.  
By Timothy Noah  
Posted Wednesday, May 28, 2003, at 7:17 PM PT  
<http://slate.msn.com/id/2083681/>

In his forthcoming book, *Off With Their Heads*, Dick Morris levels the sensational accusation that the New York Times has been rigging its national polls in order to favor Democrats. The attack is well-timed, coming as it does when the Times is already reeling from the Jayson Blair affair and the suspension and subsequent resignation of star prose jock Rick Bragg. Like many others, Morris is convinced that Howell Raines is ruining the New York Times, and for a moment Chatterbox wondered whether Morris had the goods. Morris was, after all, the political magician who revived Bill Clinton's presidency after the Democrats lost control of the House and Senate in 1994. "I polled every week for Clinton," he writes in the book. Surely, Chatterbox thought, Morris knew what he was talking about.

Morris levels many accusations at the Times polling operation, most of them too intemperate and unconvincing to warrant discussion here. (He really hates the Times.) The charge that stimulated Chatterbox's curiosity concerned a technical practice known as "weighting." After pollsters collect raw survey results from around the country, they compare certain characteristics of the people polled to those of the population at large, as measured by the Census. If the percentage of people with any particular characteristic—say, those who live in rural areas—is lower than the national percentage, then rural people will typically be weighted "up," i.e., their answers to the survey must be attributed to a larger percentage. Alternatively, if rural people are overrepresented in the raw survey results, as compared to the national percentage, they must be weighted "down."

Morris has no quarrel with weighting per se. It is, he writes, "often a valid way to correct for errors in the sampling." But he maintains that the Times "weights its data artificially, tilting its numbers to the left."

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 info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Thu, 29 May 2003 10:07:07 -0400  
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <[cporter@HP.UFL.EDU](mailto:cporter@HP.UFL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Colleen Porter <[cporter@HP.UFL.EDU](mailto:cporter@HP.UFL.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Conference dates, posters, etc.  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

As far as conference dates, there are two issues. First is whether the conference needs to be at a narrowly defined time of year, year in and year out. Only when we answer that question affirmatively need we move on to ask WHEN the week should be.

My husband chairs a section for the Entomological Society of America, and their organization has decided in recent years not to commit to a particular week. Last year the conference started November 17. This year it is October 26. The next year will be in December. It's always during football season, but one certainly can't count on a particular week or month, the way you can expect AAPOR to be after Mother's Day. I personally prefer the regularity of AAPOR, but the ESA does this because they think it is fairest to their diverse membership with differing high-stress times of year. (Of course, it's easy for me to be happy with our mid-May date, because our university's graduation was May 3, unlike UNLV.)

About the posters--I also really enjoy doing them, and think the interaction is helpful. I also think that a system of finding them is needed, now that we are having 40 posters per session. Simply numbering each presentation in the poster and then sequentially numbering the poster boards would work fine.

And while I don't mean to call for creation of the AAPOR Poster Police, I would like to see some slightly more strict guidelines. I don't think anyone should be allowed to have type fonts smaller than 48-pt (kudos to Battelle for having some of the most readable and easy-to-follow displays this year). And it was clear that a lot of the posters that were supposed to be in my session did not show. (At one of the dental conferences where we present, if you fail to have both a poster AND a person there throughout the session, the penalty is a life-long ban on presenting research, which I think is extreme.)

Also, a comment about the meals: Would it be possible to take one of the meals that does not involve a program--in this case Friday dinner would have worked--and have people sign up in advance for "special interest" tables where we could meet folks with similar research

interests. This would be a great thing for newcomers, as well as for some of us who have been around for a few years but still not managed to meet certain folks in person (Sandie!). We could have tables for health care, K-12 education, election polling, journalism, teaching college methodology courses, survey center management, establishment surveys, etc. So if you expressed an interest in a particular area, you might have a green ticket for that meal, and would find one of the tables with a green balloon (or whatever) to hook up with people of a similar interests. This would be entirely voluntary, and the other two-thirds or whatever who don't have a particular interest or don't care to participate would not be involved. They would just eat at a non-designated table as usual. And it would only be for one meal, so it wouldn't interfere much with the chance to track down friends, etc.

(If anyone wonders where my little schizophrenic self would sit, it would have to be with health care, since they pay for the trip. Being an editorial writer feeds my soul, but the research position feeds my children.)

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter  
Project Coordinator, University of Florida  
cporter@hp.ufl.edu  
\*\*\*AT OUR NEW OFFICE & PHONE NUMBER\*\*  
phone: 352/273-6068, fax: 273-6075  
Department of Health Services Administration  
Location: 101 Newell Drive, Rm. 4136  
US Mail: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Thu, 29 May 2003 11:05:49 -0400  
Reply-To: Christopher Fleury <cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Christopher Fleury <cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG>  
Organization: Center for the Study of Services  
Subject: Re: Interactive Papers  
In-Reply-To: <3D7AFB69443A2B40983B8A8935F41B0F96639F@MAILSRVR>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Further suggestion: such a survey should include non-attendees, and include questions about the date of the conference. That way those of us who do not attend because of the timing can be heard, too.

Chris

Jay Mattlin wrote:

> Suggestion: If there is going to be a post-conference assessment survey of  
> attendees (which I hope there will be), questions about these issues --  
> poster sessions, interactive papers, four-paper sessions vs. five-paper  
> sessions -- should be included. There appear to be a range of opinions on  
> these issues (and the factors related to them).

>  
> Jay  
>

---

Christopher J. Fleury, Ph.D.  
Survey Director  
Center for the Study of Services  
733 15th Street N.W., Suite 820  
Washington, DC 20005

Voice: 202-454-3031  
Fax: 202-347-4000

E-mail: cfleury@cssresearch.org

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 29 May 2003 08:54:12 -0700  
Reply-To: Eleanor Hall <eleahall@YAHOO.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Eleanor Hall <eleahall@YAHOO.COM>  
Subject: Re: Corporate Headquarters  
Comments: To: Mark Lamias <Mark.Lamias@GRIZZARD.COM>  
In-Reply-To: <16484F90DE05BB478A0CA3336AE307B1025BCC68@atl\_mail.griz-  
main.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Another approach to finding the number of corporate headquarters in large cities:

The data base, ReferenceUSA, has information on 10 million businesses. You can search for businesses using a number of criteria. To get the number of corporate headquarters in a single large city, search for that city or SMA and "headquarters" in the Headquarters/Branch field.

This procedure also gives you nonprofits and other things you wouldn't want to include. You'd need to do a search of the same city for the SIC codes you wanted to eliminate, then subtract the number you got from

that search from the number you got in your first search.

This sounds involved, but it shouldn't take too long if you don't have a lot of cities. It would be interesting to compare these results with the results you got with the BLS procedure.

I use ReferenceUSA in my main city library and have found it generally accurate although inevitably it is not perfectly up-to-date.

Eleanor Hall  
RCF Economic and Financial Consulting  
333 N. Michigan Ave., Suite 804  
Chicago, IL 60601  
(312)431-1540  
ehall@rcfecon.com

--- Mark Lamias <Mark.Lamias@GRIZZARD.COM> wrote:

> Since this list seems to have great success at  
> directing others toward data  
> sources (i.e. number of internet users, etc.), I  
> thought I'd ask my own  
> challenging question. I'm looking for the number of  
> corporate headquarters  
> in the largest U.S. cities. Does anyone know where  
> I can find this type of  
> information?

> Thanks, in advance, for your help.

> Sincerely yours,

> Mark J. Lamias  
> Statistical Consultant  
> 229 Peachtree Street - 12th Floor  
> Atlanta, GA 30303

> -----  
> Conference info and final program:

> <http://www.aapor.org/>

> Archives:

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

---

Do you Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Calendar - Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).

<http://calendar.yahoo.com>

---

Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

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

---

Date: Thu, 29 May 2003 12:07:56 -0400  
Reply-To: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Conference dates, posters, etc.  
Comments: To: Colleen Porter <cporter@HP.UFL.EDU>  
In-Reply-To: <sed5dbd4.011@fuji.hp.ufl.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

This is to endorse Colleen's new idea -- which is also an old idea!

"Also, a comment about the meals: Would it be possible to take one of the meals that does not involve a program--in this case Friday dinner would have worked--and have people sign up in advance for "special interest" tables where we could meet folks with similar research interests ..."

AAPOR did that routinely 30 years or so ago when we were smaller. Would be fun to try again. I don't remember when or why we stopped, but size might have had something to do with it. c, p.

---

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

---

On Thu, 29 May 2003, Colleen Porter wrote:

> Date: Thu, 29 May 2003 10:07:07 -0400  
> From: Colleen Porter <cporter@HP.UFL.EDU>  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: Conference dates, posters, etc.  
>  
> As far as conference dates, there are two issues. First is whether the  
> conference needs to be at a narrowly defined time of year, year in and  
> year out. Only when we answer that question affirmatively need we move  
> on to ask WHEN the week should be.  
>  
> My husband chairs a section for the Entomological Society of America,  
> and their organization has decided in recent years not to commit to a  
> particular week. Last year the conference started November 17. This  
> year it is October 26. The next year will be in December. It's always  
> during football season, but one certainly can't count on a particular  
> week or month, the way you can expect AAPOR to be after Mother's Day. I  
> personally prefer the regularity of AAPOR, but the ESA does this because  
> they think it is fairest to their diverse membership with differing  
> high-stress times of year. (Of course, it's easy for me to be happy  
> with our mid-May date, because our university's graduation was May 3,

> unlike UNLV.)  
>  
> About the posters--I also really enjoy doing them, and think the  
> interaction is helpful. I also think that a system of finding them is  
> needed, now that we are having 40 posters per session. Simply numbering  
> each presentation in the poster and then sequentially numbering the  
> poster boards would work fine.  
>  
> And while I don't mean to call for creation of the AAPOR Poster Police,  
> I would like to see some slightly more strict guidelines. I don't think  
> anyone should be allowed to have type fonts smaller than 48-pt (kudos to  
> Battelle for having some of the most readable and easy-to-follow  
> displays this year). And it was clear that a lot of the posters that  
> were supposed to be in my session did not show. (At one of the dental  
> conferences where we present, if you fail to have both a poster AND a  
> person there throughout the session, the penalty is a life-long ban on  
> presenting research, which I think is extreme.)  
>  
> Also, a comment about the meals: Would it be possible to take one of  
> the meals that does not involve a program--in this case Friday dinner  
> would have worked--and have people sign up in advance for "special  
> interest" tables where we could meet folks with similar research  
> interests. This would be a great thing for newcomers, as well as for  
> some of us who have been around for a few years but still not managed to  
> meet certain folks in person (Sandie!). We could have tables for health  
> care, K-12 education, election polling, journalism, teaching college  
> methodology courses, survey center management, establishment surveys,  
> etc. So if you expressed an interest in a particular area, you might  
> have a green ticket for that meal, and would find one of the tables with  
> a green balloon (or whatever) to hook up with people of a similar  
> interests. This would be entirely voluntary, and the other two-thirds  
> or whatever who don't have a particular interest or don't care to  
> participate would not be involved. They would just eat at a  
> non-designated table as usual. And it would only be for one meal, so it  
> wouldn't interfere much with the chance to track down friends, etc.  
>  
> (If anyone wonders where my little schizophrenic self would sit, it  
> would have to be with health care, since they pay for the trip. Being  
> an editorial writer feeds my soul, but the research position feeds my  
> children.)  
>  
> Colleen  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> Colleen K. Porter  
> Project Coordinator, University of Florida  
> cporter@hp.ufl.edu  
> \*\*\*AT OUR NEW OFFICE & PHONE NUMBER\*\*  
> phone: 352/273-6068, fax: 273-6075  
> Department of Health Services Administration  
> Location: 101 Newell Drive, Rm. 4136

> US Mail: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195  
>  
> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Thu, 29 May 2003 11:13:57 -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: request for information  
Comments: cc: [bkaplan@vermontlaw.edu](mailto:bkaplan@vermontlaw.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Please respond directly to Mr. Kaplan at: =  
<<mailto:bkaplan@vermontlaw.edu>> [bkaplan@vermontlaw.edu](mailto:bkaplan@vermontlaw.edu)

[Mike Flanagan]=20  
=20

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

From: Bruce Kaplan [<mailto:bkaplan@vermontlaw.edu>]  
Sent: Thursday, May 29, 2003 10:51 AM  
To: AAPOR-INFO  
Subject: request for information

Hi,  
I'm a market research professional with 18 years experience in primary =  
research. I'm attempting to move from my area of previous expertise =  
(media audience research) to environmental and natural resource =  
management and policy research. Are you aware of any websites that =  
list research suppliers that specialize in this field, or more generally =  
in social policy or socially responsible market research?  
Thanks for any help you can provide.

=20  
Bruce Kaplan

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Thu, 29 May 2003 09:26:49 -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>  
Subject: "Arianna Rates A Response"  
In-Reply-To: <Pine.A41.4.44+UNC.0305291203090.18832-100000@login8.isis.unc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Here's the "Poll Position" column by Allan Rivlin in today's National Journal. If you want the active links, go to:

<http://nationaljournal.com/members/buzz/pollposition.htm#>

## Arianna Rates A Response

By Allan Rivlin  
NationalJournal.com  
Thursday, May 29, 2003

The American Association for Public Opinion Research held its annual conference in Nashville, Tenn., last week. Well, that's almost a true statement.

The conference was held at the Sheraton Music City, which doesn't have any music -- and it's not really in the city. Let's just say it is within the margin of error (and a \$20 cab ride) of Nashville, and for this collection of academic researchers, vendors, media poll-takers and political pollsters, that was close enough.

Response rates are indeed declining, but evidence suggests that the people being polled think and act a lot like the ones who are not.

The conference was somewhat like a two-course meal, with mornings and afternoons full of academic presentations from researchers bent on figuring out how accurate today's polls are and how they can be made better.

The treat was the peccant and effervescent after-dinner address from Arianna Huffington with three tart -- but not overbearing -- rebuttals from the deans of statistical correctness, Robert Shapiro of Columbia University, Roger Tourangeau of the universities of Maryland and Michigan, and Richard Morin of the Washington Post. Given the tone she takes in several of her columns, as well as her "Partnership For A Poll-Free America," a "crusade" to encourage readers to pledge to hang up on pollsters, Huffington wasn't the only one asking who was braver (or crazier) -- AAPOR for inviting her or Huffington for accepting.

Regular readers know "Poll Position" has a soft spot for Huffington despite her overly broad criticisms of the polling industry. She raises important issues, asks good questions and makes good points -- sometimes. If a .333 batting average gets you into Cooperstown, then it is worth listening to two of her pointless rants to ensure that you don't miss a pearl of wisdom. (And if you have seen her act on late-night cable TV, you know that, at least, you will be entertained.)

And this time, Huffington is raising worthy questions about response rates. She has learned (it must have been from the same researchers that populate the AAPOR conference because only they would have the data to prove it) that response rates to national political polls are falling to the point where only certain segments of the population (she casts aspersions on their basic intelligence) are answering the pollsters, thus invalidating a poll's claim to represent the views of the whole population.

Huffington's response to this dropping response rate is not to try to improve the polls by encouraging people to participate. It is just the opposite. She wants her readers to opt out and drive response rates down further because she believes (separate and apart from any accuracy issues) that polls have bred the leadership gene out of the current crop of politicians.

### The Definition Problem

AAPOR can't deny that falling response rates are an issue -- it was a major focus of the conference -- but like anything in the academic world, it is a bit more complicated than it seems.

Indeed, AAPOR has only recently settled on a common definition -- well, actually six separate definitions -- for a "response rate" from a single random-digit-dialed survey. And six is a big improvement on the multitudes of possible definitions they rejected to get to the common set. (For a little light reading on why the subject of response rates is so complicated, check out Gary Langer's article (PDF) in Public Perspective.)

The basic idea is that a response rate measures how many interviews you complete for each 100 valid working telephones in the homes of people who would qualify for the survey. Call 100 numbers from a properly drawn random sample, and if 50 people agree to talk -- assuming none of the other 50 numbers had been disconnected -- you've got a response rate of 50 percent.

But what do you do with all those telephone numbers (a lot in a RDD survey) where you never find out if it is a valid home number of a person who would qualify for the survey? Think about it for six or eight years, as these researchers have done, and you realize that there is something a bit unsatisfying about counting all of these telephone numbers of unknown eligibility against the efficiency measure for the survey. But counting none of them has problems, too, which leads us to "Poll Position"'s personal favorite, Response Rate No. 3, which has a formula for counting some of the the numbers of unknown eligibility based on educated guesswork and some statistics from the calls where the eligibility could be determined.

The six definitions allowed several papers at the conference to address basic issues about response rates from a common perspective. The first question is whether response rates are indeed falling, and the evidence clearly suggests they are. The cumulative effect of changes in technology, including cell phones, Caller ID and answering machines, have aided the increasing desire of consumers to block the most intrusive marketing

efforts. The current system was designed for a world where households have a telephone and when it rings someone answers it, but that world is certainly changing. Surveys that have a long history behind them show a clear downward trend in response rates.

The second question is whether higher response rates are achievable, and the answer is that time and money can raise response rates. If it were just the money (for more experienced interviewers or paying incentives to participants), this would be a simple business problem. Time, however, is the real concern for political polls and media polls on current events. Many government polls are done over a period of months where phone numbers are called and called again (upward of 20 times) until a respondent is reached. But neither political surveys for the news media nor surveys for candidates themselves can afford a three-month field time. Not if you want to know whether Americans support a potential war before that war is over.

In the real world of political and media polls, including almost all of the polls you see in The Hotline and Poll Track, surveys are in the field for four days when possible and just one night when necessary. Getting to make three attempts at the number often seems like a luxury.

The third basic question is whether response rates matter all that much in terms of accuracy. Here the evidence seems to say clearly that declining response rates are not yet affecting the accuracy of polls, but there are still questions about whether this begins to be a bigger problem if response rates fall further. So far, evidence from surveys where extreme efforts are made to reach respondents for comparison to more typical surveys shows that the people who are being polled think and act a lot like the ones who are not. This may not hold at lower response rates than we are now seeing, and if this is the case, then the problems will show up first in political polls because they are nearer the bottom when it comes to response rates.

The AAPOR crowd thinks it has a strong response to critics, but there is need for real caution here. No one was arguing that there is a theoretical reason why falling response rates would not affect survey results; they are making the empirical observation that so far surveys are as accurate (or inaccurate) as they would be with higher response rates. But that is a hypothesis that can be refuted with evidence of inaccurate polls. Rightly or wrongly, Huffington thinks she can make that case right now.

### Ships Passing In The Night

Other than the joking genial atmosphere, there was not a lot of common ground in the exchanges between Huffington and her rebutters, and this was largely because they have such different roles in society. Arianna Huffington is not an academic researcher. She is joining other comedians like Bill Maher, Dennis Miller, Jon Stewart and Rush Limbaugh to create a new caste of political entertainers.

Huffington attacks "the polls" without defining her terms, leaving herself open to academic inquiry and correction, because if she prefaced her remarks and defined her terms every time she spoke, she would never have been invited back on "Politically Incorrect." She faults polls for having a statistical margin of error (an issue that she seems completely unable

to understand) and she faults them for falling response rates, a central issue if not a central problem with the political polls she is really addressing.

Her counterparts in the debate are the leading academic researchers and top practitioners trying to improve surveys. Maybe they're not molecular biologists finding a cure for cancer, but they believe democracy works better when voters have a voice. And while they are fully aware that their tools are not as sharp as a laser scalpel, they are smart people who are dedicated to making the tools as accurate as possible.

#### A Vote-Counting Scandal At 'American Idol'?

Speaking of entertainment, can it be true that Ruben Studdard beat Clay Aiken by chance and not by votes? "Poll Position" has no more inside information than what Jefferson Graham reported in USA Today on Tuesday, but it looks like that is exactly what happened.

"Poll Position" started to get suspicious a week before the final, when Clay and Ruben edged out Kimberly Locke by no more than 2 percentage points. (She should never have been that close.) But the final tally, with about one half of one percentage point separating the two finalists, was too strange and probably was purely an artifact of the vote-counting mechanism rather than the votes themselves.

The fans of each contestant had a telephone number to dial, and both lines were running at capacity from the start of the vote-counting window to the end. The vote was close because identical machines were counting the calls that got through on each line as fast as they could. By all accounts, most of the fans of each contestant reached nothing but busy signals, but there is no way of knowing (without conducting a survey -- sorry, Arianna) whether two out of three of Ruben's fans got a busy signal while nine out of ten of Clay's fans were turned away -- or it could have been the reverse.

In other words, not only we do not know who would have won if all the votes were counted, we do not even know if it would have been close. Clay Aiken and Al Gore should do lunch sometime and compare notes.

Allan Rivlin, a NationalJournal.com contributing editor, is a senior vice president of Peter D. Hart Research Associates, a Democratic polling firm. His e-mail address is [arivlin@nationaljournal.com](mailto:arivlin@nationaljournal.com).

[ Poll Position Archives ]

#### Need A Reprint?

National Journal Group offers both print and electronic reprint services, as well as permissions for academic use, photocopying and republication. Click here to order, or call us at 202-266-7230.

Copyright 2001 by National Journal Group Inc.  
1501 M St., NW #300 Washington, DC 20005  
202-739-8400 fax 202-833-8069

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

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Thu, 29 May 2003 09:37:52 -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: Arianna May Be Bending  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

> We are not authorized to put forward our own views in  
> the form of survey questions. Public opinion polls work toward more  
effective  
> representative government only to the extent that they present balanced  
> alternatives that members of the public learn about or could learn about  
from  
> diverse political leaders.

I respectfully disagree. Professional ethics require us to measure and report opinion as honestly and accurately as possible. I do not think they require us to only measure opinions about ideas expressed by national politicians.

We could for example ask questions such as "Which do you feel is more important: robust profits for private health insurance companies and HMOs or universal health care for all Americans?" or "Do you feel that health insurance should be tied to employment, or should it be a right for all Americans, the same way a high school education is a right?"

I am not suggesting that either of those questions are ideally phrased. I just present them as examples of questions I think we can ask - policy-related questions that present alternatives that national politicians may have not presented in identical form or at all.

Measuring opinions about questions or trade-offs politicians might not have thought to or might not dared to ask or present can be another way of helping representative government become more effective.

Hank Zucker

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

From: "Jeanne Anderson Research" <ande271@ATTGLOBAL.NET>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2003 7:58 PM

Subject: Re: Arianna May Be Bending

> Once more I come in after the most interesting part of the thread has been  
> produced. Or perhaps the message below is the best part. I wonder if  
someone  
> who is in communication with Arianna would be willing to point out to her  
that if  
> opposition political leaders (that is, Democratic congressmen) were to  
speak  
> out, they might use language and arguments that would lead to different  
survey  
> questions and possibly even more interesting/relevant survey results. As  
it  
> stands now, responses to the tax question (however that was worded) show  
only  
> disagreement with the administration's positions, not agreement with (any  
> hypothetical) plans to stimulate the economy/adjust taxation that  
Democrats  
> might have. Therefore, we really don't have survey data that show what  
people  
> would prefer to what the administration has put forward, and are not  
likely to  
> have any such data until someone in the public sphere articulates  
alternatives  
> to the present tax legislation. For which survey researcher is going to  
> formulate alternatives? We are not authorized to put forward our own  
views in  
> the form of survey questions. Public opinion polls work toward more  
effective  
> representative government only to the extent that they present balanced  
> alternatives that members of the public learn about or could learn about  
from  
> diverse political leaders.  
>  
> Jeanne Anderson  
>  
> Dan Hagan wrote:  
>  
>> After Nashville I signed up to get Arianna's article by email. I was  
hoping  
>> to see if she wrote to the Nashville experience and if it had an impact.  
>> Well she hasn't addressed the experience as yet but look what she  
included  
>> in her most recent article bashing the Democrats for not challenging  
Bush  
>> and his administration on Iraq and Tax Cuts/deficits. I haven't read  
much  
>> of her previous articles - has she ever quoted polls before? If not, I  
>> think we should all send her a note of thanks for her not so subtle

>> concession!  
>>  
>> "For example, only one out of four Americans believe the latest round of  
>> tax cuts will significantly reduce their taxes, and just 29 percent  
think  
>> the cuts are the best way to help stimulate the economy. Yet Democrats  
>> seem congenitally incapable of challenging a president whose entire  
>> domestic agenda consists of more and more tax cuts for the wealthy.  
>>  
>> The numbers also favor the Democrats on the foreign policy front.  
>> According to the latest Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll, 57 percent of  
>> Americans are opposed to investing the time and money needed to rebuild  
>> Iraq. But the Democrats sit idly by, their thumbs otherwise engaged,  
while  
>> the administration's Iraqi tar baby grows stickier by the day.  
>>  
>> And on and on it goes: On protecting the environment, safeguarding  
Social  
>> Security, greater access to affordable health care, gun control and  
>> abortion, the majority of the American people are with the Democrats."  
>>  
>> -----  
>> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>  
> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>  
>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Thu, 29 May 2003 16:40:42 -0400  
Reply-To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>  
Subject: Apologies for missing the conference  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="ISO-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

The planets were not properly aligned for me to make the Nashville=20  
conference, much as I was loathe to miss it.=A0 Many have contacted me about=  
getting a=20  
copy of the paper I was to present, "Can You Trust Your Data when Response R=  
ates=20  
are so Low?"=A0 I've cut and pasted the paper after the following summary. =20  
Sorry AAPORNET won't allow attachments, which would have kept the tables in=  
tact. =20  
If you would still like the PowerPoint presentation that walks through the=20

analysis, just let me know. =20

The upshot of the paper is this:=A0 My firm was commissioned by the Newspaper=20 Association of America to conduct a study of the relationship between data=20 quality and the data collection method employed.=A0 We mounted the same stud=20 y (a=20 short questionnaire about media use, attitudes toward telephone interviewing=20 and=20 telemarketing, and demographicis) in the same market at the same time using=20 five methods:=A0 RDD telephone (with a response rate of 18-20%), traditional=20 mail=20 (with household names as available and an overall response rate of 27%), a m=20 ail=20 panel, an Internet panel, and an in-paper snip-and-send ballot.=A0 In the fi=20 nal=20 analysis, telephone yielded a respondent pool that best matched the Census,=20 followed by traditional mail.=A0 The two panel studies (conducted by leading=20 vendors in these areas) skewed higher on education and income.=A0 The in-pap=20 er=20 survey was wildly skewed by age (with a median age of 62).=A0 I'm sure you'r=20 e all=20 nodding--those methods that employ probability samples best reflect the mark=20 et.=A0=20 The paper has more details, but in light of this industry's near obsession=20 with the topic, I thought this information would add to the mix.=A0 JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
Selzer & Company, Inc.  
Des Moines, Iowa 50312  
515.271.5700  
visit our website: <A HREF=3D"www.SelzerCo.com">www.SelzerCo.com</A>

E-mail address for purposes of this list: JAnnSelzer@aol.com; otherwise,=20 contact JASelzer@SelzerCo.com.

Can you Trust your Data when Telephone Response Rates are So Low?  
J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D., Dana N. Birnberg, M.A., SELZER & COMPANY, INC.

## The Problem

Increasing non-response is a crucial issue facing survey research. As more=20 people refuse to participate or terminate interviews prior to completion, fi=20 eld=20 costs increase, interviews lengthen, and more sample is needed for the=20 desired number of completes. However, perhaps most troubling is that increa=20 sing=20 non-response rates cause concerns about overall data quality.  
=20

As a step toward understanding the relationship between response rates and=20 data quality, the Newspaper Association of America (NAA) commissioned a stud=



y=20  
from Selzer & Company to test how well five data collection methods perform.=  
=20  
The same study—a short five-minute survey—was conducted in the same  
market,=20=  
at=20  
the same time, using substantially the same instrument, but five different d=  
ata=20  
collection methods.

## Methodology

All five studies were designed to represent the same universe: residents of=  
=20  
the six-county Columbus Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), age 18 and olde=  
r,=20  
who did not themselves, nor any member of their household, work for a media=20  
or research firm. For each of the five surveys, we adhered to the best=20  
practices for each methodology. With panel vendors, we asked them to help u=  
s reflect=20  
market (detailed methodology table listed in the appendix).

=BE Telephone contact, based on a sample of random-digit telephone numbers=  
=20  
(which assures that both listed and unlisted phone numbers stand an equal ch=  
ance=20  
of being contacted for participation in the study);

=BE Traditional mail contact, based on a sample of all post-office=20  
deliverable addresses applying householder name where available (including=20  
addressed, postage-paid return envelopes, a reminder postcard, and a \$1 ince=  
ntive in=20  
half the envelopes);

=BE A pre-recruited Internet panel, through a contract with a leading=20  
vendor with a request to match the panel to market demographics;

=BE A pre-recruited mail panel, through a contract with a leading vend=  
or,=20  
again with a request to match the panel to market demographics; and=20

=BE An in-newspaper survey, published in a Sunday edition of The Colum=  
bus=20  
Dispatch, which readers are invited to clip, complete, and return, with=20  
return postage paid by the research company.

The telephone and mail surveys represent probability samples as all=20  
households in the population have an equal chance of being selected. The pa=  
nel surveys=20  
and the in-newspaper survey are not probability samples. =20

## Response Rates

Telephone survey. Using AAPOR standards, the phone survey response rate ranges from 18% to 20% depending on whether partial completes are included or not.

The cooperation rate, the percent of contacts that complete the interview, ranges between 32% and 37%.

Traditional mail survey. The overall response rate for the mail survey is slightly higher than the phone survey, with 27% of delivered packets being completed and returned. As explained earlier, the traditional mail survey sample is a 2 x 2 design based on those who receive an envelope with a householder name and those who do not, and those who receive a dollar incentive and those who do not. As expected, the best response rate (38.3%) is from those who have a householder name and a dollar incentive. The lowest response rate (15.4%) is from those who received neither. Response rates for the subgroups are:

#### MAIL SURVEY: RESPONSE RATE IN DETAIL

|                           |      |
|---------------------------|------|
| Response rate             | %    |
| Overall response rate     | 27.3 |
| Name and incentive        | 38.3 |
| Without name or incentive | 15.4 |
| Name                      | 30.6 |
| No name                   | 22.3 |
| Incentive                 | 34.9 |
| No incentive              | 19.6 |

The only demographic characteristic affected to any degree is income. Using unweighted data, the median income for those with household names on the envelope is \$43,000. In contrast, the median income for those without a name on the envelope is \$36,600. A higher proportion of low-income earners respond when their envelopes do not list their household name.

Mail panel survey. Of the 1,176 surveys sent to selected mail panel members, 847, or 72%, are completed and returned.

Internet panel survey. In the first fielding of the survey, the vendor issues 7,291 invitations to panel members. As standard practice, the survey site is shut down after the number of desired completes (plus a certain overrun)

are obtained, in this case totaling 850. However, a demographic analysis reveals that these data are not reflective of market demographics. The survey is refiled and the second wave yields an additional 274 completes from 4,229 invitations.

Note: The practice of shutting down the survey after obtaining the desired number of completes biases the final respondent pool toward early responders. If asked, Internet panel vendors would probably consent to leave the survey site open for a specified period of time such as two weeks. However, this is not a standard practice with the vendor used and one would have to know to ask for such a condition. In this case, the initial data age distribution does not reflect the market. Consequently, the vendor agreed to reopen the survey site and send more invitations to participate. This proved not to be productive in balancing the sample. Together, we worked out a de-selection process to rebalance the sample.

In-newspaper survey. A quarter-page survey was published in the Sunday edition of The Columbus Dispatch, circulation 373, 399. One thousand (1,002) questionnaires are completed and returned.

## Quality Assessment

The most important factor in evaluating data quality is how closely the resulting data resemble the market it is designed to measure. Therefore, we compared the unweighted distribution of six demographic variables-age, sex, race, children in the household, income, and education to the 2000 Census, using the absolute value of the difference between the data set and the Census.

For example, our phone study yields 39% males while the Census documents that males comprise 48% of the adult market in Columbus, Ohio. The absolute value of the difference is nine points. We calculate this score for each segment within each demographic, added the scores, then divide by the total number of segments to control for the fact that some demographics have more segments than others (for example, age has six segments, education has three). The following table sums the percentage point deviation from the Census in absolute value for each demographic area:

=20

## SUMMARY ACROSS METHODS DEMOGRAPHIC DEVIATION FROM CENSUS DATA1

|                  |      |     |            |                       |         |       |
|------------------|------|-----|------------|-----------------------|---------|-------|
|                  | Age2 | Sex | Education3 | Children in household | Income4 | Race5 |
| Telephone        | 18   | 9   | 14         | 1                     | 3       | 3     |
| Mail             | 29   | 9   | 34         | 4                     | 15      | 7     |
| Mail panel       | 23   | 6   | 28         | 6                     | 27      | 10    |
| Internet panel   | 54   | 5   | 54         | 5                     | 23      | 9     |
| Internet refield | 12   | 1   | 56         | 3                     | 25      | 8     |
| In-newspaper     | 88   | 12  | 42         | 20                    | 13      | 11    |

1 Unweighted data  
 2 Six age ranges in age category  
 3 Three age ranges in education category  
 4 Three age ranges in income category  
 5 Race category divided into white and non-white

We then sum the standardized scores for each method and those raw scores give us a comparison to judge how well each method fits the market. The following table shows both weighted and unweighted scores for each of the five data collection methods tested:

## ANALYSIS OF DEVIATION BY DATA COLLECTION METHOD

|                |    |     |
|----------------|----|-----|
|                |    | =20 |
| Unweighted     |    |     |
| Points         |    | =20 |
| Weighted       | 2  |     |
| Points         |    |     |
|                | %  | %   |
| Telephone      | 21 | 3   |
| Mail           | 38 | 16  |
| Mail panel     | 46 | 31  |
| Internet panel | 40 | 38  |
| In-newspaper   | 78 | 36  |

1 Sum of absolute value of deviation from Census segments, standardized to control for number of segments.  
 2 Weighted by age and sex.

As expected, the studies using probability samples yield a lower score, meaning there is less overall deviation from Census data than is found for non-probability samples. Specifically, the data from the telephone and standard mail surveys depict a far more accurate picture of the market than mail panel, Internet panel or in-newspaper studies. The phone survey produces the overall

best fit of data to the market. The traditional mail study yields about the same overall response rate, but results skew toward more education and higher incomes.

In contrast, the two panel studies, with samples theoretically matched to the market, generate far worse response rates. For the Internet panel, basic sampling difficulties are compounded by site managers closing down the survey after the desired number of respondents complete surveys, biasing the respondent pool in favor of early responders. In fact, as previously stated, the Internet portion of the study had to be revised because the age distribution of those who responded early was far off of the Census numbers. Even with an elaborate system to correct for this problem post-hoc by a backward, step-wise de-selection of respondents achieving what could have been done with quotas, results are still far off the mark. While the mail panel data is not biased towards early completions, as respondents are given a three or four week window to return surveys, the resulting respondent pool of the mail panel is still strongly biased toward those with more education and higher incomes.

### Telemarketing vs. Telephone Survey Research

Even though these data show that falling response rates may not impact the reliability of probability sampling. Response rates are in fact falling. Therefore, we deemed this project to be a perfect opportunity to gain insight on attitudes toward telemarketing and telephone survey research from those willing to participate in a survey. What we found is fairly good news. Across all surveys, respondents differentiate between telemarketing calls and survey research. Additionally, respondents generally demonstrate good will towards survey research efforts.

We asked respondents about common ways people avoid telemarketing calls including hanging-up, asking to be removed from a telemarketing list, and screening calls with caller identification devices (Caller ID) or answering machines.

The most commonly cited method of screening, across all surveys, is hanging up the telephone upon delay after answering the telephone. At least three-fifths (60%) of respondents in all surveys say they avoid telemarketin

g calls this=20  
way. While all five surveys reveal similar levels of screening by method, t=  
he=20  
mail panel data shows a slightly higher incidence of screening for all=20  
techniques presented. The following table shows the incidence of  
telephone=20=  
survey=20  
respondents engaging in call screening methods:

## WAYS PEOPLE AVOID TELEMARKETING CALLS TELEPHONE SURVEY RESULTS

=20  
%  
Hung up upon delay after answering 65  
Asked to be removed from list 44  
Answering machine 40  
Caller ID 34  
Set caller ID not to accept unidentified calls 5  
Installed device to reject telemarketing calls 3

While these respondents admit to avoiding telemarketing calls, the good news=  
=20  
is that participants differentiate between those calls and survey interviews=  
. =20  
An overwhelming majority of all respondents say they completely or mostly=20  
agree with the statement "they are more bothered by calls asking them to buy=  
=20  
something than calls asking their opinions." =20

## I AM MORE BOTHERED BY CALLS ASKING ME TO BUY SOMETHING THAN CALLS ASKING MY=20 OPINION ON ISSUES.

|                | Completely agree | Mostly agree |
|----------------|------------------|--------------|
|                | %                | %            |
| Telephone      | 64               | 24           |
| Mail           | 62               | 29           |
| Mail panel     | 67               | 28           |
| Internet panel | 77               | 20           |

These results suggest those presently participating in surveys possess=20  
feelings of good will toward survey research.

Nonetheless, the proliferation of telemarketing calls should cause=20  
researchers pause. Even if good will presently exists among respondents, it=  
could erode=20  
over time as lines between the two types of calls blur. Consequently, new=20  
approaches to encourage participation may be warranted. We presented two=20

proposals to respondents: 1) if they would be more likely to participate in=20  
interviews if they were given a report of the findings or 2) they were given=  
=20  
something of value for their time. Respondents express moderate interest in=  
such=20  
practices. The following charts show those who completely or mostly agreed w=  
ith=20  
these two proposals:

I MIGHT BE MORE WILLING TO PARTICIPATE IN SURVEY INTERVIEWS IF I WERE  
GIVEN=20=  
A=20  
REPORT OF THE FINDINGS.

|                | Completely agree | Mostly agree |
|----------------|------------------|--------------|
|                | %                | %            |
| Telephone      | 22               | 35           |
| Mail           | 21               | 38           |
| Mail panel     | 19               | 43           |
| Internet panel | 21               | 39           |

I MIGHT BE MORE WILLING TO PARTICIPATE IN SURVEY INTERVIEWS IF I WERE GIVEN=20  
SOMETHING OF VALUE FOR MY TIME.

|                | Completely agree | Mostly agree |
|----------------|------------------|--------------|
|                | %                | %            |
| Telephone      | 18               | 25           |
| Mail           | 30               | 33           |
| Mail panel     | 40               | 36           |
| Internet panel | 43               | 34           |

Overall, these data present a positive view of survey interviewing among=20  
those willing to participate. It suggests that negative opinions of telemar=  
keters=20  
have not wholly permeated the perception of survey interviewers, and they ar=  
e=20  
more willing to participate in survey interviews than listen to telemarketin=  
g=20  
promotions. However, researchers must continue to be vigilant in=20  
differentiating themselves from solicitors and be open to changing their tac=  
tics if=20  
response rates drop.

Conclusions

We acknowledge that no survey method is perfect; however, probability=20 sampling remains the most reliable way to best reflect a market. We know th= at phone=20 surveys tend to skew female and slightly older, since those are the people=20 most apt to answer the phone or be at home. The same holds true with mail=20 surveys. However, while panel research typically controls for these variabl= es, the=20 panel methods we tested still under-represent the 18-to-24 age bracket. =20

Additionally, our research confirms that response rates, as commonly=20 calculated, are not an adequate predictor of overall quality of survey data.= This=20 means that declining response rates may not result in lower data quality, as= =20 commonly thought. In fact, if we opted only for methods that produce high=20 response rates in mail surveys, such as using only households with names, lo= wer=20 income groups would be under-represented and overall data quality would be h= urt.

This study supports traditional survey research practices. How the sample i= s=20 drawn is still the most important element in predicting quality data and=20 randomness is still the same remarkable phenomenon it has always been. =20 Consequently, in spite of differences in sex and age, the phone survey- with=20= a randomly=20 generated sample-yields the closest overall match to the population. =20

These findings do not suggest this industry can stop worrying about response= =20 rates or quality data. But, this research, along with other studies, sugges= t=20 the angst in public media over declining response rates making telephone=20 surveys all but invalid, are exaggerated. =20

The study also underscores that while the proliferation of telemarketing may= =20 have hurt overall response rates, it has probably had less of an effect on o= ur=20 research's perceived value than we might have thought.

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

=====  
Date: Fri, 30 May 2003 09:08:07 -0400  
Reply-To: [ande271@attglobal.net](mailto:ande271@attglobal.net)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jeanne Anderson Research <[ande271@ATTGLOBAL.NET](mailto:ande271@ATTGLOBAL.NET)>  
Subject: Re: Arianna May Be Bending  
Comments: To: Hank Zucker <[hank@surveysystem.com](mailto:hank@surveysystem.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0



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

It was I who wrote the words below! (I'm Jeanne Anderson).

I still maintain that researchers cannot present really balanced responses on issues when there has been no public articulation of alternatives to one position on a given issue.

The first question you cite appears to me to be biased since no one has publicly advocated ensuring robust profits for insurance companies and HMO's. The second instance also is biased since there appears to be reinforcement of the second alternative written into the question. However, tying health insurance to employment \*is\* an alternative that is public recognized (it is actually in practice), and universal health insurance had been advocated publicly.

I could modify my earlier statement by allowing people other than legislators to formulate positions on issues, but they should be people of some substance intellectually or politically, and their views should have been aired publicly so that people can have had the chance to learn them (even if they haven't in reality).

We really do risk becoming participants in public affairs \*as professional researchers\* in a way that compromises our independent posture if we take the initiative in defining issues independently.

Jeanne Anderson  
(formerly) Principal  
Jeanne Anderson Research

Hank Zucker wrote:

>> We are not authorized to put forward our own views in  
>> the form of survey questions. Public opinion polls work toward more  
> effective  
>> representative government only to the extent that they present balanced  
>> alternatives that members of the public learn about or could learn about  
> from  
>> diverse political leaders.  
>  
> I respectfully disagree. Professional ethics require us to measure and  
> report opinion as honestly and accurately as possible. I do not think they  
> require us to only measure opinions about ideas expressed by national  
> politicians.  
>  
> We could for example ask questions such as "Which do you feel is more  
> important: robust profits for private health insurance companies and HMOs  
> or universal health care for all Americans?" or "Do you feel that health  
> insurance should be tied to employment, or should it be a right for all

> Americans, the same way a high school education is a right?"  
>  
> I am not suggesting that either of those questions are ideally phrased. I  
> just present them as examples of questions I think we can ask -  
> policy-related questions that present alternatives that national politicians  
> may have not presented in identical form or at all.  
>  
> Measuring opinions about questions or trade-offs politicians might not have  
> thought to or might not dared to ask or present can be another way of  
> helping representative government become more effective.  
>  
> Hank Zucker  
>  
> ----- Original Message -----  
> From: "Jeanne Anderson Research" <ande271@ATTGLOBAL.NET>  
> To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
> Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2003 7:58 PM  
> Subject: Re: Arianna May Be Bending  
>  
>> Once more I come in after the most interesting part of the thread has been  
>> produced. Or perhaps the message below is the best part. I wonder if  
>> someone  
>> who is in communication with Ariana would be willing to point out to her  
>> that if  
>> opposition political leaders (that is, Democratic congressmen) were to  
>> speak  
>> out, they might use language and arguments that would lead to different  
>> survey  
>> questions and possibly even more interesting/relevant survey results. As  
>> it  
>> stands now, responses to the tax question (however that was worded) show  
>> only  
>> disagreement with the administration's positions, not agreement with (any  
>> hypothetical) plans to stimulate the economy/adjust taxation that  
>> Democrats  
>> might have. Therefore, we really don't have survey data that show what  
>> people  
>> would prefer to what the administration has put forward, and are not  
>> likely to  
>> have any such data until someone in the public sphere articulates  
>> alternatives  
>> to the present tax legislation. For which survey researcher is going to  
>> formulate alternatives? We are not authorized to put forward our own  
>> views in  
>> the form of survey questions. Public opinion polls work toward more  
>> effective  
>> representative government only to the extent that they present balanced  
>> alternatives that members of the public learn about or could learn about  
>> from  
>> diverse political leaders.  
>>  
>> Jeanne Anderson  
>>  
>> Dan Hagan wrote:

>>  
>>> After Nashville I signed up to get Arianna's article by email. I was  
> hoping  
>>> to see if she wrote to the Nashville experience and if it had an impact.  
>>> Well she hasn't addressed the experience as yet but look what she  
> included  
>>> in her most recent article bashing the Democrats for not challenging  
> Bush  
>>> and his administration on Iraq and Tax Cuts/deficits. I haven't read  
> much  
>>> of her previous articles - has she ever quoted polls before? If not, I  
>>> think we should all send her a note of thanks for her not so subtle  
>>> concession!  
>>>  
>>> "For example, only one out of four Americans believe the latest round of  
>>> tax cuts will significantly reduce their taxes, and just 29 percent  
> think  
>>> the cuts are the best way to help stimulate the economy. Yet Democrats  
>>> seem congenitally incapable of challenging a president whose entire  
>>> domestic agenda consists of more and more tax cuts for the wealthy.  
>>>  
>>> The numbers also favor the Democrats on the foreign policy front.  
>>> According to the latest Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll, 57 percent of  
>>> Americans are opposed to investing the time and money needed to rebuild  
>>> Iraq. But the Democrats sit idly by, their thumbs otherwise engaged,  
> while  
>>> the administration's Iraqi tar baby grows stickier by the day.  
>>>  
>>> And on and on it goes: On protecting the environment, safeguarding  
> Social  
>>> Security, greater access to affordable health care, gun control and  
>>> abortion, the majority of the American people are with the Democrats."  
>>>  
>>> -----  
>>> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>>>  
>>> -----  
>>> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>> -----  
>>> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Fri, 30 May 2003 08:46:03 -0400  
Reply-To: [SKIPCAMP@AOL.COM](mailto:SKIPCAMP@AOL.COM)

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Skip Camp <SKIPCAMP@AOL.COM>  
Subject: sampling statistician & analysis help  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

Hi Group,

We are a social science research firm and need some consulting help with sampling and analysis. If you provide these services please forward your resume or information about your firm to [scamp@emcallc.com](mailto:scamp@emcallc.com). Once received, I will give you a call to discuss. If you prefer to call, please use the telephone number noted below. Thanks, Skip

Skip Camp  
Camp & Associates, LLC  
Bethesda, MD 20814  
301-657-8426  
[scamp@emcallc.com](mailto:scamp@emcallc.com)  
[www.camp-and-associates.com](http://www.camp-and-associates.com)  
\*E-mail address for this list: [skipcamp@aol.com](mailto:skipcamp@aol.com); otherwise, please contact [scamp@emcallc.com](mailto:scamp@emcallc.com).

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
=====

Date: Fri, 30 May 2003 11:30:08 -0400  
Reply-To: [elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV)  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Elizabeth Martin <[elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV)>  
Subject: Transcript of Huffington Plenary  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Greetings AAPORites--

I just wanted to let you know that transcription and editing of the videotape of the plenary session with Arianna Huffington is underway (thanks to Nancy Belden and Patricia Moy) so we hope to have it posted to the AAPOR website in the not too distant future.

Unfortunately, the sound quality apparently is not good enough for the videotape itself to be made available, as many of you requested.

We're glad the session has attracted so much interest and lively discussion!

Betsy Martin, Pres.

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>

Date: Fri, 30 May 2003 12:11:04 -0400  
Reply-To: [ande271@attglobal.net](mailto:ande271@attglobal.net)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jeanne Anderson Research <[ande271@ATTGLOBAL.NET](mailto:ande271@ATTGLOBAL.NET)>  
Subject: Re: Arianna May Be Bending  
Comments: To: [Robert\\_Manchin@gallup.com](mailto:Robert_Manchin@gallup.com)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Yes, there can be what we can agree is an organized opinion on a topic when there has been public discussion. You may believe that non-profit organizations ought to provide health insurance, I may believe that each individual should be responsible for his/her own health costs. However, there cannot be one public opinion question for each of us, and then one representing other points of view. If we were to phrase a question so that the alternatives were

Government-sponsored  
Employer-sponsored  
Non-profit sponsored  
Each individual's responsibility

Few people would endorse the third and fourth, and most people would wonder who had sponsored the survey, and what that meant. The first two responses are the only ones that have been discussed generally.

(Hope I'm correct on this!)

Jeanne Anderson

Robert\_Manchin@gallup.com wrote:

> Jeanne,  
> are you seriously argue that the public have an opinion only on issues that  
> are filtered thru the media "in order to learn them"?  
> Robert Manchin  
> Gallup Europe  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Jeanne Anderson Research [<mailto:ande271@ATTGLOBAL.NET>]  
> Sent: Friday, May 30, 2003 8:08 AM  
> To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
> Subject: Re: Arianna May Be Bending  
>  
> It was I who wrote the words below! (I'm Jeanne Anderson).  
>  
> I still maintain that researchers cannot present really balanced responses  
> on

> issues when there has been no public articulation of alternatives to one  
> position on a given issue.  
>  
> The first question you cite appears to me to be biased since no one has  
> publicly  
> advocated ensuring robust profits for insurance companies and HMO's. The  
> second  
> instance also is biased since there appears to be reinforcement of the  
> second  
> alternative written into the question. However, tying health insurance to  
> employment \*is\* an alternative that is public recognized (it is actually in  
> practice), and universal health insurance had been advocated publicly.  
>  
> I could modify my earlier statement by allowing people other than  
> legislators to  
> formulate positions on issues, but they should be people of some substance  
> intellectually or politically, and their views should have been aired  
> publicly  
> so that people can have had the chance to learn them (even if they haven't  
> in  
> reality).  
>  
> We really do risk becoming participants in public affairs \*as professional  
> researchers\* in a way that compromises our independent posture if we take  
> the  
> initiative in defining issues independently.  
>  
> Jeanne Anderson  
> (formerly) Principal  
> Jeanne Anderson Research  
>  
> Hank Zucker wrote:  
>  
>>> We are not authorized to put forward our own views in  
>>> the form of survey questions. Public opinion polls work toward more  
>>> effective  
>>> representative government only to the extent that they present balanced  
>>> alternatives that members of the public learn about or could learn about  
>> from  
>>> diverse political leaders.  
>>  
>> I respectfully disagree. Professional ethics require us to measure and  
>> report opinion as honestly and accurately as possible. I do not think  
>> they  
>> require us to only measure opinions about ideas expressed by national  
>> politicians.  
>>  
>> We could for example ask questions such as "Which do you feel is more  
>> important: robust profits for private health insurance companies and HMOs  
>> or universal health care for all Americans?" or "Do you feel that health  
>> insurance should be tied to employment, or should it be a right for all  
>> Americans, the same way a high school education is a right?"  
>>  
>> I am not suggesting that either of those questions are ideally phrased. I

>> just present them as examples of questions I think we can ask -  
>> policy-related questions that present alternatives that national  
> politicians  
>> may have not presented in identical form or at all.  
>>  
>> Measuring opinions about questions or trade-offs politicians might not  
> have  
>> thought to or might not dared to ask or present can be another way of  
>> helping representative government become more effective.  
>>  
>> Hank Zucker  
>>  
>> ----- Original Message -----  
>> From: "Jeanne Anderson Research" <ande271@ATTGLOBAL.NET>  
>> To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
>> Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2003 7:58 PM  
>> Subject: Re: Arianna May Be Bending  
>>  
>>> Once more I come in after the most interesting part of the thread has  
> been  
>>> produced. Or perhaps the message below is the best part. I wonder if  
>> someone  
>>> who is in communication with Ariana would be willing to point out to her  
>> that if  
>>> opposition political leaders (that is, Democratic congressmen) were to  
>> speak  
>>> out, they might use language and arguments that would lead to different  
>> survey  
>>> questions and possibly even more interesting/relevant survey results.  
> As  
>> it  
>>> stands now, responses to the tax question (however that was worded) show  
>> only  
>>> disagreement with the administration's positions, not agreement with  
> (any  
>>> hypothetical) plans to stimulate the economy/adjust taxation that  
>> Democrats  
>>> might have. Therefore, we really don't have survey data that show what  
>> people  
>>> would prefer to what the administration has put forward, and are not  
>> likely to  
>>> have any such data until someone in the public sphere articulates  
>> alternatives  
>>> to the present tax legislation. For which survey researcher is going to  
>>> formulate alternatives? We are not authorized to put forward our own  
>> views in  
>>> the form of survey questions. Public opinion polls work toward more  
>> effective  
>>> representative government only to the extent that they present balanced  
>>> alternatives that members of the public learn about or could learn about  
>> from  
>>> diverse political leaders.  
>>>  
>>> Jeanne Anderson

>>>  
>>> Dan Hagan wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> After Nashville I signed up to get Arianna's article by email. I was  
>> hoping  
>>>> to see if she wrote to the Nashville experience and if it had an  
> impact.  
>>>> Well she hasn't addressed the experience as yet but look what she  
>> included  
>>>> in her most recent article bashing the Democrats for not challenging  
>> Bush  
>>>> and his administration on Iraq and Tax Cuts/deficits. I haven't read  
>> much  
>>>> of her previous articles - has she ever quoted polls before? If not,  
> I  
>>>> think we should all send her a note of thanks for her not so subtle  
>>>> concession!  
>>>>  
>>>> "For example, only one out of four Americans believe the latest round  
> of  
>>>> tax cuts will significantly reduce their taxes, and just 29 percent  
>> think  
>>>> the cuts are the best way to help stimulate the economy. Yet Democrats  
>>>> seem congenitally incapable of challenging a president whose entire  
>>>> domestic agenda consists of more and more tax cuts for the wealthy.  
>>>>  
>>>> The numbers also favor the Democrats on the foreign policy front.  
>>>> According to the latest Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll, 57 percent  
> of  
>>>> Americans are opposed to investing the time and money needed to  
> rebuild  
>>>> Iraq. But the Democrats sit idly by, their thumbs otherwise engaged,  
>> while  
>>>> the administration's Iraqi tar baby grows stickier by the day.  
>>>>  
>>>> And on and on it goes: On protecting the environment, safeguarding  
>> Social  
>>>> Security, greater access to affordable health care, gun control and  
>>>> abortion, the majority of the American people are with the Democrats."  
>>>>  
>>>> -----  
>>>> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>>>>  
>>>> -----  
>>>> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> -----  
>>>> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
>>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>>>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)



>  
> -----  
> Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Fri, 30 May 2003 14:57:45 -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: Usability design and voting  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

I really enjoyed Don Dillman's coverage of the Florida butterfly ballot in his AAPOR short course. When I received this newsletter today, it reminded me of that.

For those of you interested in ballot design, and other usability issues relating to voting, here is a link to that newsletter.

<http://www.humanfactors.com/downloads/may03.asp>

(fran)  
Fran Featherston  
[ffeather@nsf.gov](mailto:ffeather@nsf.gov)  
National Science Foundation  
4201 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, Virginia 22230  
Phone: 703-292-4221

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

---

Date: Sat, 31 May 2003 11:52:52 -0400  
Reply-To: Bruce Gale <[bgale@LOUISVILLE.EDU](mailto:bgale@LOUISVILLE.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Bruce Gale <[bgale@LOUISVILLE.EDU](mailto:bgale@LOUISVILLE.EDU)>  
Subject: Polling - Now More Accurate than the Election Itself  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

In considering lower response rates and election predictions, note that Kentucky just had a gubernatorial primary with an 18% turnout. Then remember our 2001 conference slogan: Polling - Now More Accurate than the Election Itself. I wonder if any of the candidates would have settled for an 18% response from his pollster.

Bruce S. Gale  
Urban Studies Institute  
University of Louisville

-----  
Conference info and final program: <http://www.aapor.org/>  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>