

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 LOG0306"

Date: Mon, 2 Jun 2003 11:05:34 -0400
Reply-To: Phillip Downs <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Phillip Downs <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>
Subject: Canadian Interviewing Firms
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Can anyone recommend a Canada-based firm for telephone interviewing? 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

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

Date: Mon, 2 Jun 2003 14:09:48 -0500
Reply-To: Greg Casey <caseyg@missouri.edu>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Greg Casey <greg@TRANQUILITY.NET>
Subject: Arianna again
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Isn't this Huffington's problem with polls? Let's posit a policy =
discussion limited to the
two alternatives of government and employer sponsored health insurance.
Leave out the problem that some undetermined proportion of the =
population
has not tuned into this debate. But open up the attitudinal space =
somewhat,
and other alternatives, of which Jeanne has listed two, might appeal. =
So
the proportion of the population that reacts might rise (of course, we =
would
not want this increase to be an artifact of question wording, but we =
would
not want a lower reading of respondent interest to be an artifact of

question wording either, would we?)

Where Huffington comes into this is that she maintains that the =
inaudible
alternatives remain inaudible because leadership elements don't use the
opinion-making resources at their beck and call to convert unspoken =
concerns
into issues. If they did, the public would have available more takes on
more issues, there would be a wider range of public reasoning and a =
larger
involvement of the public, and leaders could be more creative.

Listening to Huffington and her interlocutors made for a very enjoyable =
evening,=20
in my opinion. I'm glad the officers of AAPOR invited her, and believe =
she was=20
well worth the relatively small amount of money she sopped up. I agree =
with Melody
Rodriguez that the supposed debate format didn't gel; one reason
was that Huffington spoke of the forest, while Tourangeau et al spoke of =
the
trees; Huffington was not able to address their points, and they =
weren't
interested in addressing her key point. Another reason was that =
Huffington
backed off her original script to make her presentation more palatable, =
but the
discussants didn't let her get away with this elusive strategy, and so
addressed what she didn't say more than what she did. So it wasn't =
quite a classic
debate -- in which the first presenter sets the terms of argument.

As for Huffington's point about not cooperating with pollsters, =
obviously
this is a poisonous gospel; it's a form of boycott, and may actually
constitute a restraint of trade in violation of law. The equivalent =
would
be for polling firms to spread the idea that people should disregard all =
columnists=20
and talking heads; don't read them, don't listen, pay them no mind. =
And that
would be absurd for an industry dedicated not only to the free exchange=20
of opinion but also to registering those exchanges and the shifts upon=20
which they are based.

Greg Casey

Research Director, Casey and Co, C.P.A.

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

From: "Jeanne Anderson Research" <ande271@ATTGLOBAL.NET>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Friday, May 30, 2003 11:11 AM

Subject: Re: Arianna May Be Bending

> 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

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

Date: Mon, 2 Jun 2003 17:43:07 -0400
Reply-To: ande271@attglobal.net
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jeanne Anderson Research <ande271@ATTGLOBAL.NET>
Subject: Re: Arianna again
Comments: To: Greg Casey <caseyg@missouri.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I'm afraid, not ever having followed Huffington closely, that I misunderstood. I thought she was critical of polls, not the way they are used by those in public office or otherwise in leadership positions. Instead, if I understand Greg correctly, she believes (or used to) in "throwing the baby out with the bath," by encouraging people not to participate in public opinion studies (that are misused by leaders).

Is that the way it is? If so, from the little I have read about her, she really does have the courage and the clout to chastise leaders for not using poll data wisely. She should state her case more clearly, it seems.

Jeanne Anderson

Greg Casey wrote:

- > Isn't this Huffington's problem with polls? Let's posit a policy discussion limited to the
- > two alternatives of government and employer sponsored health insurance.
- > Leave out the problem that some undetermined proportion of the population
- > has not tuned into this debate. But open up the attitudinal space somewhat,
- > and other alternatives, of which Jeanne has listed two, might appeal. So
- > the proportion of the population that reacts might rise (of course, we would
- > not want this increase to be an artifact of question wording, but we would
- > not want a lower reading of respondent interest to be an artifact of
- > question wording either, would we?)
- >
- > Where Huffington comes into this is that she maintains that the inaudible
- > alternatives remain inaudible because leadership elements don't use the
- > opinion-making resources at their beck and call to convert unspoken concerns
- > into issues. If they did, the public would have available more takes on
- > more issues, there would be a wider range of public reasoning and a larger
- > involvement of the public, and leaders could be more creative.
- >
- > Listening to Huffington and her interlocutors made for a very enjoyable
- evening,
- > in my opinion. I'm glad the officers of AAPOR invited her, and believe she
- was
- > well worth the relatively small amount of money she sopped up. I agree with
- Melody
- > Rodriguez that the supposed debate format didn't gel; one reason
- > was that Huffington spoke of the forest, while Tourangeau et al spoke of the
- > trees; Huffington was not able to address their points, and they weren't
- > interested in addressing her key point. Another reason was that Huffington
- > backed off her original script to make her presentation more palatable, but
- the
- > discussants didn't let her get away with this elusive strategy, and so
- > addressed what she didn't say more than what she did. So it wasn't quite a
- classic
- > debate -- in which the first presenter sets the terms of argument.
- >
- > As for Huffington's point about not cooperating with pollsters, obviously
- > this is a poisonous gospel; it's a form of boycott, and may actually
- > constitute a restraint of trade in violation of law. The equivalent would
- > be for polling firms to spread the idea that people should disregard all
- columnists
- > and talking heads; don't read them, don't listen, pay them no mind. And
- that
- > would be absurd for an industry dedicated not only to the free exchange

> of opinion but also to registering those exchanges and the shifts upon
> which they are based.

>
> Greg Casey

>
> Research Director, Casey and Co, C.P.A.

>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: "Jeanne Anderson Research" <ande271@ATTGLOBAL.NET>
> To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
> Sent: Friday, May 30, 2003 11:11 AM
> Subject: Re: Arianna May Be Bending

>
>> 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

>
> -----
> 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, 2 Jun 2003 19:29:07 -0400
Reply-To: Claudia Deane <deanec@WASHPOST.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Claudia Deane <deanec@WASHPOST.COM>
Subject: Upcoming AAPOR newsletter-- ideas??
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

If you have a burning piece of survey-research news, an interesting polling tidbit, or a blackmail-worthy photo of a fellow aapor-ite "getting down" at the Nashville hoe-down, please message me off-list by the end of the week.

Would love to have your input for the next issue of the AAPOR newsletter.

Thanks,

Claudia Deane
AAPOR Publications Chair

deanec@washpost.com

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

Date: Mon, 2 Jun 2003 22:40:22 -0400
Reply-To: "Jon A. Krosnick" <krosnick@OSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Jon A. Krosnick" <krosnick@OSU.EDU>
Subject: Terrorism-Related Survey Data
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

I am on a hunt for surveys that have explored American public opinion about terrorism generally, efforts to prevent terrorist attacks, and preparedness to deal with such attacks if/when they occur.

A search of the Roper Center database through Lexis/Nexis has turned up lots of questions asked by the news media (which are very helpful) and little else.

I would be grateful if you all could please point me toward any other studies I should know about in this regard, especially in-depth investigations of the issue.

Thanks in advance for your help.

Jon Krosnick

Jon A. Krosnick
Professor of Psychology and Political Science
Ohio State University
1885 Neil Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Phone: 614-292-3496
Fax: 614-292-5601

Webpage: <http://www.psy.ohio-state.edu/social/krosnick.htm>

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

Date: Tue, 3 Jun 2003 08:39:11 -0700
Reply-To: Kristi Hagen <Kristi.Hagen@NAU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Kristi Hagen <Kristi.Hagen@NAU.EDU>
Subject: Refusal conversions
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Does any one have information on what kinds of increases you get in response rates for each attempt at "refusal conversion" for a telephone RDD study? What percentage or approximate increase do you get when calling back a second time and then a third time? Please respond directly to me. I will then post a summary of the responses back to the listserv. Thanks!

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

Date: Wed, 4 Jun 2003 10:10:26 -0400
Reply-To: Michael Dimock <dimockm@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Michael Dimock <dimockm@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG>
Subject: Pew Research Center Global Attitudes Project
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

For those interested, the Pew Research Center has just released the second of two major studies of global attitudes.

The study focuses on data from two major multinational surveys:

- * A post-war survey conducted in 20 countries plus the Palestinian Authority--16,000 interviews focusing on the war in Iraq, situation in the Middle East, the United States, President Bush and other world leaders, the United Nations and the transatlantic alliance
- * A 44-nation survey of 38,000 people exploring attitudes toward Islam and public policy, democracy, globalization, nationalism, international institutions, and more

A more detailed description follows.
The report and full topline are available at our website:
<http://people-press.org>

Michael Dimock
Research Director

WAR WITH IRAQ FURTHER DIVIDES GLOBAL PUBLICS

* Public confidence in the United Nations is a major victim of the conflict in Iraq. Positive ratings for the world body have tumbled in nearly every country for which benchmark measures are available

* Majorities in five of seven NATO countries surveyed support a more independent relationship with the U.S. on diplomatic and security affairs. The percentage of Americans favoring continued close ties with Western Europe also has fallen.

* Since last summer, favorable opinions of the U.S. have slipped in nearly every country for which trend measures are available. Negative views of the U.S. among Muslims, which had been largely limited to countries in the Middle East, have spread to Muslim populations in Indonesia and Nigeria.

* A growing percentage of Muslims around the world see serious threats to Islam.

* Majorities in seven of eight Muslim populations surveyed express worries that the U.S. might become a military threat to their countries.

* Large majorities in the Palestinian Authority, Indonesia and Jordan - and nearly half of those in Morocco and Pakistan - say they have some confidence in Osama bin Laden to "do the right thing regarding world affairs."

* There is considerable appetite in the Muslim world for democratic freedoms. Most Muslim populations believe that Western-style democracy can work in their countries. Many of the Muslim publics polled expressed a stronger desire for democratic freedoms than the publics in some nations of Eastern Europe, notably Russia and Bulgaria.

Looking Forward

* Most non-Muslim publics believe that Iraqis will be better off now that Saddam Hussein has been removed from power. Even in countries that opposed the war, such as France and Germany, most people believe Iraqis' lives will improve.

* There is limited optimism for a surge of democratic reform in the Middle East. Substantial minorities of Muslims in many countries say the region will become somewhat more democratic, but only in Kuwait do as many as half say the region will become much more democratic.

* In 20 of 21 populations surveyed, majorities believe the United States favors Israel over the Palestinians too much. Americans disagree, but the Israelis themselves do not. Nearly half of Israelis think the U.S. favors Israel too much, while 38% say the policy is fair.

* Most Muslim populations doubt that a way can be found for the state of Israel to exist so that the needs of the Palestinian people are met. Eight-in-ten Palestinians are pessimistic about co-existence with Israel.

World Embraces Democratic Values and Free Markets

* Democratic principles and the free market model have been accepted by people all around the world. People embrace the increased interconnectedness that defines globalization. There is broad agreement that children need to learn English to succeed.

* Americans stand out for their strong endorsement of personal freedom and their more measured support the social safety net. People in the U.S. are more likely than most others to say that most people who fail in life have themselves to blame, rather than society.

* Globalization is credited for the increasing the availability of food and modern medicines. But globalization not is blamed for increased growing problems such as a scarcity of good jobs and the widening gap between rich and poor.

* Large corporations from other countries are viewed favorably in most places. So too are international financial organizations like the World Bank, IMF, and WTO. By contrast, anti-globalization protestors are viewed unfavorably in most countries.

Global Gaps On Social Issues

* Majorities in most countries say it is necessary to believe in God to be moral. This is the prevailing view in most developing countries - and the U.S. But Canadians and Europeans take the secular view that it is possible to be moral without believing in God.

* Acceptance of homosexuality divides the publics of the world in a similar way. People in Africa and the Middle East strongly object to society accepting homosexuality, while there is broad tolerance in Western Europe.

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, 5 Jun 2003 08:37:26 -0400
Reply-To: "Caplan, James R., DMDCEAST" <Caplanjr@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Caplan, James R., DMDCEAST" <Caplanjr@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL>
Subject: Position Open
MIME-version: 1.0

Dear fellow AAPORNETers

A local contractor has advised me of a vacancy for a Survey Analyst. This person would work on site with one of their customers providing assistance with all aspects of survey operations, especially the development and review of survey data collection and report production. Daily responsibilities would include designing coding schemes, reviewing and validating data, and producing SAS runs to compare local with remote results. The job requires attention to detail, and statistical expertise. Additional data quality experience is desirable. This individual will eventually have lead responsibility for one or more surveys per year. Salary: \$70k. Job is in the Rosslyn, VA area. Successful candidate must be able to pass security clearance process.

I have agreed to pass along resumes, which you can e-mail to me at caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil <<mailto:caplanjr@osd.pentagon.mil>> .

Regards,

Jim Caplan

Ref:

James R. Caplan, Ph.D.
Chief, Survey Technology Branch
Defense Manpower Data Center
1600 Wilson Blvd, Ste 400
Arlington, VA 22209-2593
703.696.5848
fax: 703.696.5822
DSN 426-5848

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

=====
Date: Thu, 5 Jun 2003 09:25:21 -0400
Reply-To: "Lavrakas, Paul" <Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>
Subject: Open Position in Methodological Research at Nielsen Media Research

h
Comments: cc: "Holden, Rosemary" <Rosemary.Holden@NielsenMedia.com>, "Feeney, Kelly" <Kelly.Feeney@NielsenMedia.com>

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

Open Position at Nielsen Media Research (NMR) in the Methodological Research department

This newly opened position, Lead Research Analyst, is responsible for designing and conducting highly complex research projects to improve the quality of the research methodologies used by Nielsen to gather television ratings data. The primary focus of these projects pertains to various aspects of survey nonresponse.

The main objectives of the position are to (1) contribute to the initiation of research ideas, design and plan research projects, (2) execute data collection, and data analysis activities for research projects, (3) monitor procedures for quality assurance, (4) provide cost detail on projects and (5) train associates in research methodology and procedures used to conduct research projects. Requirements include a B.S./B.A. (Masters preferred) in Social Sciences, Statistics, marketing research or equivalent, five years experience directly related to research, knowledge of the mechanics of research design for telephone, mail, internet, and in-person surveys including response rates and use of incentives, questionnaire construction and flowcharting, basic sampling methods, data collections procedures with in-person and telephone interviewing, data analysis (SPSS and/or SAS) including coding and editing of raw data, weighting, tabulation and summary measures for research data (mean, median, standard deviation, etc), and basic multivariate analyses. Additional requirements include equipment and software skills such as PC, spreadsheets, word processing, statistical analysis software and presentation software. General media industry knowledge desirable. In addition, the position provides opportunity to engage in the preparation of conference papers and manuscripts for journal submissions. The position also requires occasional domestic travel.

The position is based in the Tampa area, and reports to Rosemary Holden, Director of Methodological Research. That department reports to Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D. (NMR's Senior Research Methodologist).

NMR is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

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

Date: Thu, 5 Jun 2003 10:23:06 -0400
Reply-To: "Hueber, Graham" <Graham.Hueber@KETCHUM.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Hueber, Graham" <Graham.Hueber@KETCHUM.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I am posting this question for a colleague. Please respond directly to =
Delia Congram at dcongram@courant.com.

We're in the market here for some survey software. We've been using a =
version of Survey Pro, which is pretty simplistic and can't do the =
detailed crosstabs we want. I'm evaluating two right now, StatPac and =
SNAP. Any information from people familiar with these programs would be =
appreciated. We basically need to be able to easily design a survey =
graphically, and also be able to do detailed statistical tables.=20

Please respond directly to Delia Congram at dcongram@courant.com.

Thank you

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

Date: Thu, 5 Jun 2003 14:49:01 -0400
Reply-To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: Pew Research Center Global Attitudes Project
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

This may be as good a time as any to raise a question about the use of "somewhat" in the second position on a four-point scale, with the first position representing the most of the attitude under scrutiny and the fourth position representing the least.

The idea of a four-point scale is for the first two positions to mean "more toward this end than not" so that the top two boxes can be added together. My semantic understanding of "somewhat," and I'd welcome those who think otherwise" is that it is unclear whether this means more of something than not.

With somewhat in the second position, the scale seems lopsided. The top box (often using the adjective "very") is far from "somewhat," which is close to the third box "only a little," which is close to the fourth box "not at all."

So, in the Pew study, they've added the top two boxes and say

"Majorities in seven of eight Muslim populations surveyed express worries that the U.S. might become a military threat to their countries.

" Large majorities in the Palestinian Authority, Indonesia and Jordan - and nearly half of those in Morocco and Pakistan - say they have some confidence in Osama bin Laden to "do the right thing regarding world affairs."

With "somewhat" as the second box, I just can't conclude what they conclude--that majorities are more worried than not, or that majorities are more confident than not.

That said, there are good reasons to use this scale when there is tracking data. But, can someone set me straight on the semantic advantage of this scale?

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines, Iowa 50312
515.271.5700

visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

E-mail address for purposes of this list: JAnnSelzer@aol.com; otherwise, contact JASelzer@SelzerCo.com.

In a message dated 6/4/2003 9:27:45 AM Central Daylight Time, dimockm@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG writes:

>
> For those interested, the Pew Research Center has just released the
> second of two major studies of global attitudes.
>
> The study focuses on data from two major multinational surveys:
>
> * A post-war survey conducted in 20 countries plus the Palestinian
> Authority--16,000 interviews focusing on the war in Iraq, situation in
> the Middle East, the United States, President Bush and other world
> leaders, the United Nations and the transatlantic alliance
>
> * A 44-nation survey of 38,000 people exploring attitudes toward
> Islam and public policy, democracy, globalization, nationalism,
> international institutions, and more
>
>
> A more detailed description follows.
> The report and full toplines are available at our website:
> <http://people-press.org>
>
> Michael Dimock
> Research Director
> The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press
>
>
> WAR WITH IRAQ FURTHER DIVIDES GLOBAL PUBLICS
>
> * Public confidence in the United Nations is a major victim of the
> conflict in Iraq. Positive ratings for the world body have tumbled in
> nearly every country for which benchmark measures are available
>
> * Majorities in five of seven NATO countries surveyed support a more
> independent relationship with the U.S. on diplomatic and security
> affairs. The percentage of Americans favoring continued close ties
> with Western Europe also has fallen.
>
> * Since last summer, favorable opinions of the U.S. have slipped in
> nearly every country for which trend measures are available. Negative
> views of the U.S. among Muslims, which had been largely limited to
> countries in the Middle East, have spread to Muslim populations in
> Indonesia and Nigeria.
>
> * A growing percentage of Muslims around the world see serious threats
> to Islam.
>
> * Majorities in seven of eight Muslim populations surveyed express
> worries that the U.S. might become a military threat to their countries.

- >
- > * Large majorities in the Palestinian Authority, Indonesia and Jordan -
- > and nearly half of those in Morocco and Pakistan - say they have some
- > confidence in Osama bin Laden to "do the right thing regarding world
- > affairs."
- >
- > * There is considerable appetite in the Muslim world for democratic
- > freedoms. Most Muslim populations believe that Western-style democracy
- > can work in their countries. Many of the Muslim publics polled expressed
- > a stronger desire for democratic freedoms than the publics in some
- > nations of Eastern Europe, notably Russia and Bulgaria.
- >
- > Looking Forward
- >
- > * Most non-Muslim publics believe that Iraqis will be better off now
- > that Saddam Hussein has been removed from power. Even in countries that
- > opposed the war, such as France and Germany, most people believe Iraqis'
- > lives will improve.
- >
- > * There is limited optimism for a surge of democratic reform in the
- > Middle East. Substantial minorities of Muslims in many countries say the
- > region will become somewhat more democratic, but only in Kuwait do as
- > many as half say the region will become much more democratic.
- >
- > * In 20 of 21 populations surveyed, majorities believe the United States
- > favors Israel over the Palestinians too much. Americans disagree, but
- > the Israelis themselves do not. Nearly half of Israelis think the U.S.
- > favors Israel too much, while 38% say the policy is fair.
- >
- > * Most Muslim populations doubt that a way can be found for the state of
- > Israel to exist so that the needs of the Palestinian people are met.
- > Eight-in-ten Palestinians are pessimistic about co-existence with
- > Israel.
- >
- >
- > World Embraces Democratic Values and Free Markets
- >
- > * Democratic principles and the free market model have been accepted by
- > people all around the world. People embrace the increased
- > interconnectedness that defines globalization. There is broad agreement
- > that children need to learn English to succeed.
- >
- > * Americans stand out for their strong endorsement of personal freedom
- > and their more measured support the social safety net. People in the
- > U.S. are more likely than most others to say that most people who fail
- > in life have themselves to blame, rather than society.
- >
- > * Globalization is credited for the increasing the availability of food
- > and modern medicines. But globalization not is blamed for increased
- > growing problems such as a scarcity of good jobs and the widening gap
- > between rich and poor.
- >
- > * Large corporations from other countries are viewed favorably in most
- > places. So too are international financial organizations like the World

- > Bank, IMF, and WTO. By contrast, anti-globalization protestors are
- > viewed unfavorably in most countries.
- >
- > Global Gaps On Social Issues
- >
- > * Majorities in most countries say it is necessary to believe in God to
- > be moral. This is the prevailing view in most developing countries - and
- > the U.S. But Canadians and Europeans take the secular view that it is
- > possible to be moral without believing in God.
- >
- > * Acceptance of homosexuality divides the publics of the world in a
- > similar way. People in Africa and the Middle East strongly object to
- > society accepting homosexuality, while there is broad tolerance in
- > Western Europe.
- >
- >

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

Date: Thu, 5 Jun 2003 14:53:34 -0400
Reply-To: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>
Subject: leaving messages
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/html; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

<html>
<body>

Dear aapornetters,

At the last conference, Jon Krosnick presented a paper (co-authored with Allyson Holbrook and Alison Pfent) that informed that 72% of the pollsters from which they had gathered data use to leave a message on answering machines. Besides, leaving a message was associated with higher response rates.

I would like to know from pollsters who use this practice what type of message they usually leave.
In short,
do the messages include - identification of the pollster, of the client, information on the survey topic, a phone number that can be used to call the pollster, etc.

Please, send your message directly to me;
I will send back a synthesis to the list.

Best,

<x-sigsep><p></x-sigsep>

Claire Durand

Claire.Durand@umontreal.ca

<a href=3D"http://www.fas.umontreal.ca/socio/durandc"=

eudora=3D"autourl">http://www.fas.umontreal.ca/socio/durandc

Professeur,

Responsable des cycles sup=E9rieurs,

d=E9partement de sociologie,

Universit=E9 de Montr=E9al

C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,

Montr=E9al, Qu=E9bec, H3C 3J7

</body>
</html>

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

Date: Thu, 5 Jun 2003 14:55:51 -0400
Reply-To: "Prisuta, Robert" <RPrisuta@AARP.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Prisuta, Robert" <RPrisuta@AARP.ORG>
Subject: Re: Pew Research Center Global Attitudes Project
Comments: To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I'm not familiar with all of the methods testing that has gone into scales like this since it is a long time since my graduate research methods classes, but the scales are widely used and tend to have face validity. Having said that is not to discount some of the potential cross cultural issues that could impact cross-national surveys- I don't think we can implicitly assume that the cultural context supporting what works in the US always works elsewhere. Secondly, breaking down the top-two box to get at the proporiton of extreme responses is always important, and in many cases provides more insight than looking at the net directional response.

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

From: J. Ann Selzer [mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM]=20
Sent: Thursday, June 05, 2003 2:49 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Pew Research Center Global Attitudes Project

This may be as good a time as any to raise a question about the use of "somewhat" in the second position on a four-point scale, with the first position representing the most of the attitude under scrutiny and the fourth position representing the least.

The idea of a four-point scale is for the first two positions to mean "more toward this end than not" so that the top two boxes can be added together. My semantic understanding of "somewhat," and I'd welcome those who think otherwise" is that it is unclear whether this means more of something than not.

With somewhat in the second position, the scale seems lopsided. The top box (often using the adjective "very") is far from "somewhat," which is close to the third box "only a little," which is close to the fourth box "not at all."

So, in the Pew study, they've added the top two boxes and say

"Majorities in seven of eight Muslim populations surveyed express worries that the U.S. might become a military threat to their countries.

" Large majorities in the Palestinian Authority, Indonesia and Jordan - and nearly half of those in Morocco and Pakistan - say they have some confidence in Osama bin Laden to "do the right thing regarding world affairs."

With "somewhat" as the second box, I just can't conclude what they conclude--that majorities are more worried than not, or that majorities are more confident than not.

That said, there are good reasons to use this scale when there is tracking data. But, can someone set me straight on the semantic advantage of this scale?

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines, Iowa 50312
515.271.5700

visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

E-mail address for purposes of this list: JAnnSelzer@aol.com;
otherwise, contact JASelzer@SelzerCo.com.

In a message dated 6/4/2003 9:27:45 AM Central Daylight Time,
dimockm@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG writes:

- >
- > For those interested, the Pew Research Center has just released the=20
- > second of two major studies of global attitudes.
- >
- > The study focuses on data from two major multinational surveys:
- >
- > * A post-war survey conducted in 20 countries plus the Palestinian
- > Authority--16,000 interviews focusing on the war in Iraq, situation in
- >
- > the Middle East, the United States, President Bush and other world=20
- > leaders, the United Nations and the transatlantic alliance
- >
- > * A 44-nation survey of 38,000 people exploring attitudes toward
- > Islam and public policy, democracy, globalization, nationalism,=20
- > international institutions, and more
- >
- >
- > A more detailed description follows.
- > The report and full topline are available at our website:=20
- > <http://people-press.org>
- >

- > Michael Dimock
- > Research Director
- > The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press
- >
- >
- > WAR WITH IRAQ FURTHER DIVIDES GLOBAL PUBLICS
- >
- > * Public confidence in the United Nations is a major victim of the=20
- > conflict in Iraq. Positive ratings for the world body have tumbled in=20
- > nearly every country for which benchmark measures are available
- >
- > * Majorities in five of seven NATO countries surveyed support a more=20
- > independent relationship with the U.S. on diplomatic and security=20
- > affairs. The percentage of Americans favoring continued close ties=20
- > with Western Europe also has fallen.
- >
- > * Since last summer, favorable opinions of the U.S. have slipped in=20
- > nearly every country for which trend measures are available. Negative=20
- > views of the U.S. among Muslims, which had been largely limited to=20
- > countries in the Middle East, have spread to Muslim populations in=20
- > Indonesia and Nigeria.
- >
- > * A growing percentage of Muslims around the world see serious threats
- >
- > to Islam.
- >
- > * Majorities in seven of eight Muslim populations surveyed express=20
- > worries that the U.S. might become a military threat to their=20
- > countries.
- >
- > * Large majorities in the Palestinian Authority, Indonesia and Jordan=20
- > - and nearly half of those in Morocco and Pakistan - say they have=20
- > some confidence in Osama bin Laden to "do the right thing regarding=20
- > world affairs."
- >
- > * There is considerable appetite in the Muslim world for democratic=20
- > freedoms. Most Muslim populations believe that Western-style democracy
- >
- > can work in their countries. Many of the Muslim publics polled=20
- > expressed a stronger desire for democratic freedoms than the publics=20
- > in some nations of Eastern Europe, notably Russia and Bulgaria.
- >
- > Looking Forward
- >
- > * Most non-Muslim publics believe that Iraqis will be better off now=20
- > that Saddam Hussein has been removed from power. Even in countries=20
- > that opposed the war, such as France and Germany, most people believe=20
- > Iraqis' lives will improve.
- >
- > * There is limited optimism for a surge of democratic reform in the=20
- > Middle East. Substantial minorities of Muslims in many countries say=20
- > the region will become somewhat more democratic, but only in Kuwait do
- >
- > as many as half say the region will become much more democratic.

>
> * In 20 of 21 populations surveyed, majorities believe the United=20
> States favors Israel over the Palestinians too much. Americans=20
> disagree, but the Israelis themselves do not. Nearly half of Israelis=20
> think the U.S. favors Israel too much, while 38% say the policy is=20
> fair.
>
> * Most Muslim populations doubt that a way can be found for the state=20
> of Israel to exist so that the needs of the Palestinian people are=20
> met. Eight-in-ten Palestinians are pessimistic about co-existence with
> Israel.
>
>
> World Embraces Democratic Values and Free Markets
>
> * Democratic principles and the free market model have been accepted=20
> by people all around the world. People embrace the increased=20
> interconnectedness that defines globalization. There is broad=20
> agreement that children need to learn English to succeed.
>
> * Americans stand out for their strong endorsement of personal freedom
> and their more measured support the social safety net. People in the=20
> U.S. are more likely than most others to say that most people who fail
> in life have themselves to blame, rather than society.
>
> * Globalization is credited for the increasing the availability of=20
> food and modern medicines. But globalization not is blamed for=20
> increased growing problems such as a scarcity of good jobs and the=20
> widening gap between rich and poor.
>
> * Large corporations from other countries are viewed favorably in most
> places. So too are international financial organizations like the=20
> World Bank, IMF, and WTO. By contrast, anti-globalization protestors=20
> are viewed unfavorably in most countries.
>
> Global Gaps On Social Issues
>
> * Majorities in most countries say it is necessary to believe in God=20
> to be moral. This is the prevailing view in most developing countries=20
> - and the U.S. But Canadians and Europeans take the secular view that=20
> it is possible to be moral without believing in God.
>
> * Acceptance of homosexuality divides the publics of the world in a=20
> similar way. People in Africa and the Middle East strongly object to=20
> society accepting homosexuality, while there is broad tolerance in=20
> Western Europe.
>
>

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, 6 Jun 2003 11:24:34 -0400
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Everyone is Frugging
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Republican, Democratic mailings tie issue surveys to fund raising

SHARON THEIMER, Associated Press Writer Thursday, June 5, 2003

<http://www.newsday.com/news/politics/wire/sns-ap-party-fund-raising,0,386745.story?coll=sns-ap-politics-headlines>

(06-05) 14:14 PDT WASHINGTON (AP) --

The Republican Party has sent voters a "GOP Census" seeking their views on issues such as abortion, anti-terrorism strikes and creation of an anti-missile defense system. The survey closes with an appeal for \$500 donations.

The letter, arriving in mailboxes nationwide this week, is meant primarily as a fund-raising tool rather than a scientific survey, though the party reviews the responses to gauge support for President Bush's agenda, Republican National Committee spokesman Jim Dyke said.

"Your answers will be used to develop a blueprint for the Republican Party for the next 10 years," GOP Chairman Marc Racicot wrote in the mailing.

The RNC letter asks recipients to donate \$500 so the committee can send the mailing to another 1,250 people, or \$250 so it can reach out to 625 more. It seeks contributions of any size to help the party for next year's elections, when the presidency and control of Congress will be at stake.

The RNC plans to spend at least \$2.2 million on the mailings, sending them to 5.5 million people to achieve a "statistically reliable sampling of our Party," the letter says.

Democrats, too, are using poll-style mailings to raise money.

The Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee sent a "Democratic Leadership Survey" last month urging recipients to let party leaders "benefit from your insights" and also seeking donations.

The mailing includes questions on the economy, the environment, education, abortion and foreign policy, and seeks contributions of \$25 or more.

"These are indeed trying times for Democrats here in Congress as well as in communities big and small across this great country of ours," House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, D-Calif., wrote, describing the GOP House majority as a "slim" 12-seat advantage. "But I assure you that there is no quit in any of us."

RNC spokesman Dyke said the GOP has used survey-style mailings to raise money in past years and updates the questionnaire periodically.

Among the questions seeking yes, no or undecided answers:

* Do you support the use of air strikes against any country that offers safe harbor or aid to individuals or organizations committed to further attacks on America?

* Should we build President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative defense shield against nuclear missile attack?

* Should the tax cuts passed in 2001 be made permanent?

RNC members who receive the letter are also asked to identify the news organization from which they receive most of their news and political information.

The Democratic survey asks recipients whether they favor or oppose efforts "to privatize Social Security"; what kind of job President Bush has done fighting terrorism; and whether they oppose, favor or are undecided about "Republican calls to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and other public lands to oil drilling," among other questions.

--
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: Fri, 6 Jun 2003 11:26:19 -0400
Reply-To: "Jon A. Krosnick" <krosnick@OSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Jon A. Krosnick" <krosnick@OSU.EDU>
Subject: Claire Durand's Posting About Answering Machines

MIME-version: 1.0

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

A small correction to Claire Durand's posting about our AAPOR conference presentation.

Claire mentioned that Holbrook, Pfent, and I found that "72% of the pollsters from which [we] had gathered data leave a message on answering machines."

In fact, we found the opposite.

For 72% of the surveys we gathered information about, the interviewers NEVER left a message on answering machines.

Messages were left sometimes or always in only 28% of the surveys we learned about. In only 2% of the surveys did the interviewers ALWAYS leave a message on answering machines that they reached.

Hope this is helpful,

Jon Krosnick

Jon A. Krosnick
Professor of Psychology and Political Science
Ohio State University
1885 Neil Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Phone: 614-292-3496

Fax: 614-292-5601

Webpage: <http://www.psy.ohio-state.edu/social/krosnick.htm>

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

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

Date: Fri, 6 Jun 2003 08:55:55 -0700

Reply-To: Steve Farkas <sfarkas@PUBLICAGENDA.ORG>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Steve Farkas <sfarkas@PUBLICAGENDA.ORG>

Subject: job opening - Research administrator

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Immediate Opening =96 Research Administrator
Public Agenda, a nonprofit nonpartisan research organization seeks an experienced Research Administrator for its research department. The organization conducts in-depth studies of public attitudes toward policy

and social issues. The Administrator will assist in all phases of these studies.

Responsibilities

Managerial: Scheduling projects, negotiating costs, supervising fielding of surveys and supervising production of reports

Administrative: Arranging hotels and travel; billing and expense reports; record keeping and archival of files and data

Editorial: Report editing, proofreading, checking facts and numbers, designing charts and tables

Required Skills

Excellent writing skills; proficiency with numbers; eye for detail; exceptionally organized; hard working; interested in public policy

Send cover letter and resume to:

Ann Duffett, Senior Vice President and Associate Director of Research
Research Administrator Position

Public Agenda

6 East 39th Street

New York, NY 10016

Fax: (212) 889-3461

e-mail: positions@publicagenda.org

www.publicagenda.org

No phone calls please. Our apologies in advance - only suitable candidates will be contacted.

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

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

Date: Fri, 6 Jun 2003 13:57:20 -0400

Reply-To: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>

Subject: Re: Claire Durand's Posting About Answering Machines

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

In-Reply-To: <5.2.0.9.2.20030606111920.03843288@pop.service.ohio-state.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

<html>

<body>

OUPS, thanks to Jon. I had effectively misread the information....However, on the Power Point presentation, I have 72.2% never, 9.3% Sometimes and 1.9% always, this adding to 83.4%. So there is a problem left... If I understand Jon's figures, the 9,3% is not ok and should be around 26%?

Best,

Claire

At 11:26 2003-06-06 -0400, Jon A. Krosnick wrote:

<blockquote type=3Dcite class=3Dcite cite>A small correction to Claire Durand's posting about our AAPOR conference

presentation.

Claire mentioned that Holbrook, Pfent, and I found that "72% of
the

pollsters from which [we] had gathered data leave a message on
answering

machines."

In fact, we found the opposite.

For 72% of the surveys we gathered information about, the
interviewers

NEVER left a message on answering machines.

Messages were left sometimes or always in only 28% of the surveys=20
we

learned about. In only 2% of the surveys did the interviewers
ALWAYS leave

a message on answering machines that they reached.

Hope this is helpful,

Jon Krosnick

Jon A. Krosnick

Professor of Psychology and Political Science

Ohio State University

1885 Neil Avenue

Columbus, Ohio 43210

Phone: 614-292-3496

Fax: 614-292-5601

Webpage:
<a href=3D"http://www.psy.ohio-state.edu/social/krosnick.htm"=
eudora=3D"autourl">http://www.psy.ohio-state.edu/social/krosnick.htm<br=
>

Conference info and final program:
<a href=3D"http://www.aapor.org/"=
eudora=3D"autourl">http://www.aapor.org/

Archives:
<a href=3D"http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html"=
eudora=3D"autourl">http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html</blockqu=
ote>

<x-sigsep><p></x-sigsep>
Claire Durand

Claire.Durand@umontreal.ca

<a href=3D"http://www.fas.umontreal.ca/socio/durandc"=
eudora=3D"autourl">http://www.fas.umontreal.ca/socio/durandc

Professeur,

Responsable des cycles sup=E9rieurs,

d=E9partement de sociologie,

Universit=E9 de Montr=E9al

C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,

Montr=E9al, Qu=E9bec, H3C 3J7

</body>
</html>

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

Date: Fri, 6 Jun 2003 15:01:33 -0600
Reply-To: Steve Wygant <saw36@EMAIL.BYU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Steve Wygant <saw36@EMAIL.BYU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Pew Research Center Global Attitudes Project
Comments: To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM
In-Reply-To: <108.238beeb2.2c10ea9d@aol.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Selzer raised a good question about the relative semantic values of scale points. This issue is addressed rather directly in psychometric research. One older study in particular looked at correlates between adjectival descriptors of frequency and amount (e.g. "sometimes" and "some") and corresponding numerical values.

The researchers had participants choose a number to represent what they perceived "sometimes" to mean in reference to the frequency of a particular event. Using that as a standard, they asked the participant to make comparative numerical assignments of frequency to other adjectival descriptors (e.g. "usually", "frequently", "rarely"). They followed the same procedure for assigning numerical equivalents to descriptors of amount -- including "somewhat".

Their findings suggested that "somewhat" fell towards the lower end of the middle range of descriptors. With "none" anchoring the bottom (mean = .15) of the range and "all" at the top (mean = 66.12), "somewhat" was assigned values averaging 11.75. This would suggest that there is far more semantic space between "somewhat" and the first position in a four point scale than between "somewhat" and the third point of such a scale, and that it might be a better choice as a label for the third point than the second. However, even if that is case, adding percentages of "somewhat" and "very" to claim that a proportion of respondents are "more concerned than not" might not be problematic. Doing the converse -- adding the percent of respondents in the lowest two spots of this scale and concluding that this total represented those who were "less concerned than concerned" would be more problematic.

This research was published in 1974, and may be outdated in terms of contemporary usage of language. However, it does suggest terms which can be selected based on empirically derived adjectival/numerical correspondence. There may also be more recent research which replicates or modifies these findings, but I am not aware of anything. The article reference follows:

Bass, B., Cascio, W., and O'Connor, E., (1974). "Magnitude Estimates of Expressions of Frequency and Amount". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 59, no. 3, 313-320.

Steven A. Wygant, Ph.D.

Institutional Assessment and Analysis
121D FOB
Brigham Young University
(801) 422-2258
Steve_wygant@byu.edu <mailto:Steve_wygant@byu.edu>

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of J. Ann Selzer
Sent: Thursday, June 05, 2003 12:49 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Pew Research Center Global Attitudes Project

This may be as good a time as any to raise a question about the use of "somewhat" in the second position on a four-point scale, with the first position representing the most of the attitude under scrutiny and the fourth position representing the least.

The idea of a four-point scale is for the first two positions to mean "more toward this end than not" so that the top two boxes can be added together. My semantic understanding of "somewhat," and I'd welcome those who think otherwise" is that it is unclear whether this means more of something than not.

With somewhat in the second position, the scale seems lopsided. The top box (often using the adjective "very") is far from "somewhat," which is close to the third box "only a little," which is close to the fourth box "not at all."

So, in the Pew study, they've added the top two boxes and say

"Majorities in seven of eight Muslim populations surveyed express worries that the U.S. might become a military threat to their countries.

" Large majorities in the Palestinian Authority, Indonesia and Jordan - and nearly half of those in Morocco and Pakistan - say they have some confidence in Osama bin Laden to "do the right thing regarding world affairs."

With "somewhat" as the second box, I just can't conclude what they conclude--that majorities are more worried than not, or that majorities are more confident than not.

That said, there are good reasons to use this scale when there is tracking data. But, can someone set me straight on the semantic advantage of this scale?

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines, Iowa 50312
515.271.5700

visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

E-mail address for purposes of this list: JAnnSelzer@aol.com;
otherwise, contact JASelzer@SelzerCo.com.

In a message dated 6/4/2003 9:27:45 AM Central Daylight Time,
dimockm@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG writes:

>
> For those interested, the Pew Research Center has just released the
> second of two major studies of global attitudes.
>
> The study focuses on data from two major multinational surveys:
>
> * A post-war survey conducted in 20 countries plus the Palestinian
> Authority--16,000 interviews focusing on the war in Iraq, situation in

> the Middle East, the United States, President Bush and other world
> leaders, the United Nations and the transatlantic alliance
>
> * A 44-nation survey of 38,000 people exploring attitudes toward
> Islam and public policy, democracy, globalization, nationalism,
> international institutions, and more
>
>
> A more detailed description follows.
> The report and full topline are available at our website:
> <http://people-press.org>
>
> Michael Dimock
> Research Director
> The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press
>
>
> WAR WITH IRAQ FURTHER DIVIDES GLOBAL PUBLICS
>
> * Public confidence in the United Nations is a major victim of the
> conflict in Iraq. Positive ratings for the world body have tumbled in
> nearly every country for which benchmark measures are available
>
> * Majorities in five of seven NATO countries surveyed support a more
> independent relationship with the U.S. on diplomatic and security
> affairs. The percentage of Americans favoring continued close ties
> with Western Europe also has fallen.
>
> * Since last summer, favorable opinions of the U.S. have slipped in
> nearly every country for which trend measures are available. Negative
> views of the U.S. among Muslims, which had been largely limited to
> countries in the Middle East, have spread to Muslim populations in
> Indonesia and Nigeria.
>
> * A growing percentage of Muslims around the world see serious threats

- > to Islam.
- >
- > * Majorities in seven of eight Muslim populations surveyed express
- > worries that the U.S. might become a military threat to their
- > countries.
- >
- > * Large majorities in the Palestinian Authority, Indonesia and Jordan
- > - and nearly half of those in Morocco and Pakistan - say they have
- > some confidence in Osama bin Laden to "do the right thing regarding
- > world affairs."
- >
- > * There is considerable appetite in the Muslim world for democratic
- > freedoms. Most Muslim populations believe that Western-style democracy

- > can work in their countries. Many of the Muslim publics polled
- > expressed a stronger desire for democratic freedoms than the publics
- > in some nations of Eastern Europe, notably Russia and Bulgaria.
- >
- > Looking Forward
- >
- > * Most non-Muslim publics believe that Iraqis will be better off now
- > that Saddam Hussein has been removed from power. Even in countries
- > that opposed the war, such as France and Germany, most people believe
- > Iraqis' lives will improve.
- >
- > * There is limited optimism for a surge of democratic reform in the
- > Middle East. Substantial minorities of Muslims in many countries say
- > the region will become somewhat more democratic, but only in Kuwait do

- > as many as half say the region will become much more democratic.
- >
- > * In 20 of 21 populations surveyed, majorities believe the United
- > States favors Israel over the Palestinians too much. Americans
- > disagree, but the Israelis themselves do not. Nearly half of Israelis
- > think the U.S. favors Israel too much, while 38% say the policy is
- > fair.
- >
- > * Most Muslim populations doubt that a way can be found for the state
- > of Israel to exist so that the needs of the Palestinian people are
- > met. Eight-in-ten Palestinians are pessimistic about co-existence with

- > Israel.
- >
- >
- > World Embraces Democratic Values and Free Markets
- >
- > * Democratic principles and the free market model have been accepted
- > by people all around the world. People embrace the increased
- > interconnectedness that defines globalization. There is broad
- > agreement that children need to learn English to succeed.
- >
- > * Americans stand out for their strong endorsement of personal freedom

- > and their more measured support the social safety net. People in the

- > U.S. are more likely than most others to say that most people who fail
- > in life have themselves to blame, rather than society.
- >
- > * Globalization is credited for the increasing the availability of
- > food and modern medicines. But globalization not is blamed for
- > increased growing problems such as a scarcity of good jobs and the
- > widening gap between rich and poor.
- >
- > * Large corporations from other countries are viewed favorably in most
- >
- > places. So too are international financial organizations like the
- > World Bank, IMF, and WTO. By contrast, anti-globalization protestors
- > are viewed unfavorably in most countries.
- >
- > Global Gaps On Social Issues
- >
- > * Majorities in most countries say it is necessary to believe in God
- > to be moral. This is the prevailing view in most developing countries
- > - and the U.S. But Canadians and Europeans take the secular view that
- > it is possible to be moral without believing in God.
- >
- > * Acceptance of homosexuality divides the publics of the world in a
- > similar way. People in Africa and the Middle East strongly object to
- > society accepting homosexuality, while there is broad tolerance in
- > Western Europe.
- >
- >

 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, 6 Jun 2003 21:12:47 -0500
 Reply-To: "Saad, Lydia" <Lydia_Saad@GALLUP.COM>
 Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
 From: "Saad, Lydia" <Lydia_Saad@GALLUP.COM>
 Subject: Re: Pew Research Center Global Attitudes Project
 Comments: To: Steve Wygant <saw36@EMAIL.BYU.EDU>
 MIME-version: 1.0
 Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Steve,

Do you know if the research you describe positioned "somewhat" in a scale relative to the other adjectival descriptors(e.g. rating an issue as either "very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not important at all"), or were perceptions about the value of each descriptor measured in isolation? Obviously, in the example I gave, the placement in the scale gives the respondent a strong clue about the value we intend it to have.

Thus, I would imagine the perceived numeric equivalent would be very different depending on which approach was used. (I'd be very surprised if the mean rating for "somewhat important" was 11.75 in my example, but...)

Lydia

Lydia Saad
Senior Editor, The Gallup Poll
502 Carnegie Center, Suite 300
Princeton, NJ 08540
(609) 924-9600
lydia_saad@gallup.com

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

From: Steve Wygant [mailto:saw36@EMAIL.BYU.EDU]
Sent: Friday, June 06, 2003 5:02 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Pew Research Center Global Attitudes Project

Selzer raised a good question about the relative semantic values of scale points. This issue is addressed rather directly in psychometric research. One older study in particular looked at correlates between adjectival descriptors of frequency and amount (e.g. "sometimes" and "some") and corresponding numerical values.

The researchers had participants choose a number to represent what they perceived "sometimes" to mean in reference to the frequency of a particular event. Using that as a standard, they asked the participant to make comparative numerical assignments of frequency to other adjectival descriptors (e.g. "usually", "frequently", "rarely"). They followed the same procedure for assigning numerical equivalents to descriptors of amount -- including "somewhat".

Their findings suggested that "somewhat" fell towards the lower end of the middle range of descriptors. With "none" anchoring the bottom (mean = .15) of the range and "all" at the top (mean = 66.12), "somewhat" was assigned values averaging 11.75. This would suggest that there is far more semantic space between "somewhat" and the first position in a four point scale than between "somewhat" and the third point of such a scale, and that it might be a better choice as a label for the third point than the second. However, even if that is case, adding percentages of "somewhat" and "very" to claim that a proportion of respondents are "more concerned than not" might not be problematic. Doing the converse -- adding the percent of respondents in the lowest two spots of this scale and concluding that this total represented those who were "less concerned than concerned" would be more problematic.

This research was published in 1974, and may be outdated in terms of contemporary usage of language. However, it does suggest terms which can be selected based on empirically derived adjectival/numerical

correspondence. There may also be more recent research which replicates or modifies these findings, but I am not aware of anything. The article reference follows:

Bass, B., Cascio, W., and O'Connor, E., (1974). "Magnitude Estimates of Expressions of Frequency and Amount". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 59, no. 3, 313-320.

Steven A. Wygant, Ph.D.
Institutional Assessment and Analysis
121D FOB
Brigham Young University
(801) 422-2258
Steve_wygant@byu.edu <mailto:Steve_wygant@byu.edu>

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of J. Ann Selzer
Sent: Thursday, June 05, 2003 12:49 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Pew Research Center Global Attitudes Project

This may be as good a time as any to raise a question about the use of "somewhat" in the second position on a four-point scale, with the first position representing the most of the attitude under scrutiny and the fourth position representing the least.

The idea of a four-point scale is for the first two positions to mean "more toward this end than not" so that the top two boxes can be added together. My semantic understanding of "somewhat," and I'd welcome those who think otherwise" is that it is unclear whether this means more of something than not.

With somewhat in the second position, the scale seems lopsided. The top box (often using the adjective "very") is far from "somewhat," which is close to the third box "only a little," which is close to the fourth box "not at all."

So, in the Pew study, they've added the top two boxes and say

"Majorities in seven of eight Muslim populations surveyed express worries that the U.S. might become a military threat to their countries.

" Large majorities in the Palestinian Authority, Indonesia and Jordan - and nearly half of those in Morocco and Pakistan - say they have some confidence in Osama bin Laden to "do the right thing regarding world affairs."

With "somewhat" as the second box, I just can't conclude what they conclude--that majorities are more worried than not, or that majorities are more confident than not.

That said, there are good reasons to use this scale when there is tracking data. But, can someone set me straight on the semantic advantage of this scale?

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines, Iowa 50312
515.271.5700

visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

E-mail address for purposes of this list: JAnnSelzer@aol.com;
otherwise, contact JASelzer@SelzerCo.com.

In a message dated 6/4/2003 9:27:45 AM Central Daylight Time,
dimockm@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG writes:

>
> For those interested, the Pew Research Center has just released the
> second of two major studies of global attitudes.
>
> The study focuses on data from two major multinational surveys:
>
> * A post-war survey conducted in 20 countries plus the Palestinian
> Authority--16,000 interviews focusing on the war in Iraq, situation in

> the Middle East, the United States, President Bush and other world
> leaders, the United Nations and the transatlantic alliance
>
> * A 44-nation survey of 38,000 people exploring attitudes toward
> Islam and public policy, democracy, globalization, nationalism,
> international institutions, and more
>
>
> A more detailed description follows.
> The report and full topline are available at our website:
> <http://people-press.org>
>
> Michael Dimock
> Research Director
> The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press
>
>
> WAR WITH IRAQ FURTHER DIVIDES GLOBAL PUBLICS
>
> * Public confidence in the United Nations is a major victim of the
> conflict in Iraq. Positive ratings for the world body have tumbled in
> nearly every country for which benchmark measures are available
>
> * Majorities in five of seven NATO countries surveyed support a more
> independent relationship with the U.S. on diplomatic and security
> affairs. The percentage of Americans favoring continued close ties

- > with Western Europe also has fallen.
- >
- > * Since last summer, favorable opinions of the U.S. have slipped in
- > nearly every country for which trend measures are available. Negative
- > views of the U.S. among Muslims, which had been largely limited to
- > countries in the Middle East, have spread to Muslim populations in
- > Indonesia and Nigeria.
- >
- > * A growing percentage of Muslims around the world see serious threats
- >
- > to Islam.
- >
- > * Majorities in seven of eight Muslim populations surveyed express
- > worries that the U.S. might become a military threat to their
- > countries.
- >
- > * Large majorities in the Palestinian Authority, Indonesia and Jordan
- > - and nearly half of those in Morocco and Pakistan - say they have
- > some confidence in Osama bin Laden to "do the right thing regarding
- > world affairs."
- >
- > * There is considerable appetite in the Muslim world for democratic
- > freedoms. Most Muslim populations believe that Western-style democracy
- >
- > can work in their countries. Many of the Muslim publics polled
- > expressed a stronger desire for democratic freedoms than the publics
- > in some nations of Eastern Europe, notably Russia and Bulgaria.
- >
- > Looking Forward
- >
- > * Most non-Muslim publics believe that Iraqis will be better off now
- > that Saddam Hussein has been removed from power. Even in countries
- > that opposed the war, such as France and Germany, most people believe
- > Iraqis' lives will improve.
- >
- > * There is limited optimism for a surge of democratic reform in the
- > Middle East. Substantial minorities of Muslims in many countries say
- > the region will become somewhat more democratic, but only in Kuwait do
- >
- > as many as half say the region will become much more democratic.
- >
- > * In 20 of 21 populations surveyed, majorities believe the United
- > States favors Israel over the Palestinians too much. Americans
- > disagree, but the Israelis themselves do not. Nearly half of Israelis
- > think the U.S. favors Israel too much, while 38% say the policy is
- > fair.
- >
- > * Most Muslim populations doubt that a way can be found for the state
- > of Israel to exist so that the needs of the Palestinian people are
- > met. Eight-in-ten Palestinians are pessimistic about co-existence with
- >
- > Israel.
- >
- >

- > World Embraces Democratic Values and Free Markets
- >
- > * Democratic principles and the free market model have been accepted
- > by people all around the world. People embrace the increased
- > interconnectedness that defines globalization. There is broad
- > agreement that children need to learn English to succeed.
- >
- > * Americans stand out for their strong endorsement of personal freedom
- >
- > and their more measured support the social safety net. People in the
- > U.S. are more likely than most others to say that most people who fail
- >
- > in life have themselves to blame, rather than society.
- >
- > * Globalization is credited for the increasing the availability of
- > food and modern medicines. But globalization not is blamed for
- > increased growing problems such as a scarcity of good jobs and the
- > widening gap between rich and poor.
- >
- > * Large corporations from other countries are viewed favorably in most
- >
- > places. So too are international financial organizations like the
- > World Bank, IMF, and WTO. By contrast, anti-globalization protestors
- > are viewed unfavorably in most countries.
- >
- > Global Gaps On Social Issues
- >
- > * Majorities in most countries say it is necessary to believe in God
- > to be moral. This is the prevailing view in most developing countries
- > - and the U.S. But Canadians and Europeans take the secular view that
- > it is possible to be moral without believing in God.
- >
- > * Acceptance of homosexuality divides the publics of the world in a
- > similar way. People in Africa and the Middle East strongly object to
- > society accepting homosexuality, while there is broad tolerance in
- > Western Europe.
- >
- >

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, 9 Jun 2003 09:30:12 -0600
Reply-To: Steve Wygant <saw36@EMAIL.BYU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Steve Wygant <saw36@EMAIL.BYU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Pew Research Center Global Attitudes Project
Comments: To: "Saad, Lydia" <Lydia_Saad@GALLUP.COM>
In-Reply-To: <16D7ABF1B1E58D4CB432013854C338F9655367@exchng11.gallup.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Lydia

For the frequency list, researchers first asked participants to assign a numerical equivalent to "sometimes", then presented them with a list of 38 other descriptors to which they were asked to assigned numerical equivalents relative to the numerical equivalent they gave "sometimes". The researcher then followed the same procedure for amount descriptors, first establishing the numerical equivalent of "some" as the standard, then rating 43 other descriptors in relation to that standard. So participants did have make their ratings in the context of other descriptors, but -- as you suggest -- that context was different than the typical four or five point survey scale. Determining exactly what the numerical equivalents might be in the more restricted survey scale is clearly an empirical question, and I don't know if that kind of follow-up has ever been done.

Steve

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Saad, Lydia
Sent: Friday, June 06, 2003 8:13 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Pew Research Center Global Attitudes Project

Steve,

Do you know if the research you describe positioned "somewhat" in a scale relative to the other adjectival descriptors(e.g. rating an issue as either "very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not important at all"), or were perceptions about the value of each descriptor measured in isolation? Obviously, in the example I gave, the placement in the scale gives the respondent a strong clue about the value we intend it to have. Thus, I would imagine the perceived numeric equivalent would be very different depending on which approach was used. (I'd be very surprised if the mean rating for "somewhat important" was 11.75 in my example, but...)

Lydia

Lydia Saad
Senior Editor, The Gallup Poll
502 Carnegie Center, Suite 300
Princeton, NJ 08540

(609) 924-9600
lydia_saad@gallup.com

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

From: Steve Wygant [mailto:saw36@EMAIL.BYU.EDU]
Sent: Friday, June 06, 2003 5:02 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Pew Research Center Global Attitudes Project

Selzer raised a good question about the relative semantic values of scale points. This issue is addressed rather directly in psychometric research. One older study in particular looked at correlates between adjectival descriptors of frequency and amount (e.g. "sometimes" and "some") and corresponding numerical values.

The researchers had participants choose a number to represent what they perceived "sometimes" to mean in reference to the frequency of a particular event. Using that as a standard, they asked the participant to make comparative numerical assignments of frequency to other adjectival descriptors (e.g. "usually", "frequently", "rarely"). They followed the same procedure for assigning numerical equivalents to descriptors of amount -- including "somewhat".

Their findings suggested that "somewhat" fell towards the lower end of the middle range of descriptors. With "none" anchoring the bottom (mean = .15) of the range and "all" at the top (mean = 66.12), "somewhat" was assigned values averaging 11.75. This would suggest that there is far more semantic space between "somewhat" and the first position in a four point scale than between "somewhat" and the third point of such a scale, and that it might be a better choice as a label for the third point than the second. However, even if that is case, adding percentages of "somewhat" and "very" to claim that a proportion of respondents are "more concerned than not" might not be problematic. Doing the converse -- adding the percent of respondents in the lowest two spots of this scale and concluding that this total represented those who were "less concerned than concerned" would be more problematic.

This research was published in 1974, and may be outdated in terms of contemporary usage of language. However, it does suggest terms which can be selected based on empirically derived adjectival/numerical correspondence. There may also be more recent research which replicates or modifies these findings, but I am not aware of anything. The article reference follows:

Bass, B., Cascio, W., and O'Connor, E., (1974). "Magnitude Estimates of Expressions of Frequency and Amount". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 59, no. 3, 313-320.

Steven A. Wygant, Ph.D.
Institutional Assessment and Analysis
121D FOB

Brigham Young University
(801) 422-2258
Steve_wygant@byu.edu <mailto:Steve_wygant@byu.edu>

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of J. Ann Selzer
Sent: Thursday, June 05, 2003 12:49 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Pew Research Center Global Attitudes Project

This may be as good a time as any to raise a question about the use of "somewhat" in the second position on a four-point scale, with the first position representing the most of the attitude under scrutiny and the fourth position representing the least.

The idea of a four-point scale is for the first two positions to mean "more toward this end than not" so that the top two boxes can be added together. My semantic understanding of "somewhat," and I'd welcome those who think otherwise" is that it is unclear whether this means more of something than not.

With somewhat in the second position, the scale seems lopsided. The top box (often using the adjective "very") is far from "somewhat," which is close to the third box "only a little," which is close to the fourth box "not at all."

So, in the Pew study, they've added the top two boxes and say

"Majorities in seven of eight Muslim populations surveyed express worries that the U.S. might become a military threat to their countries.

" Large majorities in the Palestinian Authority, Indonesia and Jordan - and nearly half of those in Morocco and Pakistan - say they have some confidence in Osama bin Laden to "do the right thing regarding world affairs."

With "somewhat" as the second box, I just can't conclude what they conclude--that majorities are more worried than not, or that majorities are more confident than not.

That said, there are good reasons to use this scale when there is tracking data. But, can someone set me straight on the semantic advantage of this scale?

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines, Iowa 50312
515.271.5700

visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

E-mail address for purposes of this list: JAnnSelzer@aol.com;
otherwise, contact JASelzer@SelzerCo.com.

In a message dated 6/4/2003 9:27:45 AM Central Daylight Time,
dimockm@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG writes:

>
> For those interested, the Pew Research Center has just released the
> second of two major studies of global attitudes.
>
> The study focuses on data from two major multinational surveys:
>
> * A post-war survey conducted in 20 countries plus the Palestinian
> Authority--16,000 interviews focusing on the war in Iraq, situation in

> the Middle East, the United States, President Bush and other world
> leaders, the United Nations and the transatlantic alliance
>
> * A 44-nation survey of 38,000 people exploring attitudes toward
> Islam and public policy, democracy, globalization, nationalism,
> international institutions, and more
>
>
> A more detailed description follows.
> The report and full toplines are available at our website:
> <http://people-press.org>
>
> Michael Dimock
> Research Director
> The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press
>
>
> WAR WITH IRAQ FURTHER DIVIDES GLOBAL PUBLICS
>
> * Public confidence in the United Nations is a major victim of the
> conflict in Iraq. Positive ratings for the world body have tumbled in
> nearly every country for which benchmark measures are available
>
> * Majorities in five of seven NATO countries surveyed support a more
> independent relationship with the U.S. on diplomatic and security
> affairs. The percentage of Americans favoring continued close ties
> with Western Europe also has fallen.
>
> * Since last summer, favorable opinions of the U.S. have slipped in
> nearly every country for which trend measures are available. Negative
> views of the U.S. among Muslims, which had been largely limited to
> countries in the Middle East, have spread to Muslim populations in
> Indonesia and Nigeria.
>
> * A growing percentage of Muslims around the world see serious threats

> to Islam.
>

- > * Majorities in seven of eight Muslim populations surveyed express
- > worries that the U.S. might become a military threat to their
- > countries.
- >
- > * Large majorities in the Palestinian Authority, Indonesia and Jordan
- > - and nearly half of those in Morocco and Pakistan - say they have
- > some confidence in Osama bin Laden to "do the right thing regarding
- > world affairs."
- >
- > * There is considerable appetite in the Muslim world for democratic
- > freedoms. Most Muslim populations believe that Western-style democracy
- >
- > can work in their countries. Many of the Muslim publics polled
- > expressed a stronger desire for democratic freedoms than the publics
- > in some nations of Eastern Europe, notably Russia and Bulgaria.
- >
- > Looking Forward
- >
- > * Most non-Muslim publics believe that Iraqis will be better off now
- > that Saddam Hussein has been removed from power. Even in countries
- > that opposed the war, such as France and Germany, most people believe
- > Iraqis' lives will improve.
- >
- > * There is limited optimism for a surge of democratic reform in the
- > Middle East. Substantial minorities of Muslims in many countries say
- > the region will become somewhat more democratic, but only in Kuwait do
- >
- > as many as half say the region will become much more democratic.
- >
- > * In 20 of 21 populations surveyed, majorities believe the United
- > States favors Israel over the Palestinians too much. Americans
- > disagree, but the Israelis themselves do not. Nearly half of Israelis
- > think the U.S. favors Israel too much, while 38% say the policy is
- > fair.
- >
- > * Most Muslim populations doubt that a way can be found for the state
- > of Israel to exist so that the needs of the Palestinian people are
- > met. Eight-in-ten Palestinians are pessimistic about co-existence with
- >
- > Israel.
- >
- >
- > World Embraces Democratic Values and Free Markets
- >
- > * Democratic principles and the free market model have been accepted
- > by people all around the world. People embrace the increased
- > interconnectedness that defines globalization. There is broad
- > agreement that children need to learn English to succeed.
- >
- > * Americans stand out for their strong endorsement of personal freedom
- >
- > and their more measured support the social safety net. People in the
- > U.S. are more likely than most others to say that most people who fail

- > in life have themselves to blame, rather than society.
- >
- > * Globalization is credited for the increasing the availability of
- > food and modern medicines. But globalization not is blamed for
- > increased growing problems such as a scarcity of good jobs and the
- > widening gap between rich and poor.
- >
- > * Large corporations from other countries are viewed favorably in most
- >
- > places. So too are international financial organizations like the
- > World Bank, IMF, and WTO. By contrast, anti-globalization protestors
- > are viewed unfavorably in most countries.
- >
- > Global Gaps On Social Issues
- >
- > * Majorities in most countries say it is necessary to believe in God
- > to be moral. This is the prevailing view in most developing countries
- > - and the U.S. But Canadians and Europeans take the secular view that
- > it is possible to be moral without believing in God.
- >
- > * Acceptance of homosexuality divides the publics of the world in a
- > similar way. People in Africa and the Middle East strongly object to
- > society accepting homosexuality, while there is broad tolerance in
- > Western Europe.
- >
- >

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: Mon, 9 Jun 2003 15:50:56 +0000
Reply-To: alisu1@ATTBI.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Alis U <alisu1@ATTBI.COM>
Subject: Re: Pew Research Center Global Attitudes Project
Comments: To: Steve Wygant <saw36@EMAIL.BYU.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

To complicate matters, the scale discussed for the Pew project must have been

administered in several languages. Translating scales always poses the issue of the distance between scale points in different languages. For those interested in this aspect of the topic, Janet Harkness at ZUMA has written quite a bit on scale translation issues.

Alisú

Alisú Schoua-Glusberg, Ph.D.
General Partner
Research Support Services
847.864.5677 - fax: 847.869.5565
Alisu@email.com

> Lydia

>

> For the frequency list, researchers first asked participants to assign
> a numerical equivalent to "sometimes", then presented them with a list
> of 38 other descriptors to which they were asked to assigned numerical
> equivalents relative to the numerical equivalent they gave "sometimes".
> The researcher then followed the same procedure for amount
> descriptors, first establishing the numerical equivalent of "some" as
> the standard, then rating 43 other descriptors in relation to that
> standard. So participants did have make their ratings in the context of
> other descriptors, but -- as you suggest -- that context was different
> than the typical four or five point survey scale. Determining exactly
> what the numerical equivalents might be in the more restricted survey
> scale is clearly an empirical question, and I don't know if that kind of
> follow-up has ever been done.

>

> Steve

>

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Saad, Lydia

> Sent: Friday, June 06, 2003 8:13 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Pew Research Center Global Attitudes Project

>

>

> Steve,

>

> Do you know if the research you describe positioned "somewhat" in a
> scale relative to the other adjectival descriptors(e.g. rating an issue
> as either "very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not
> important at all"), or were perceptions about the value of each
> descriptor measured in isolation? Obviously, in the example I gave, the
> placement in the scale gives the respondent a strong clue about the
> value we intend it to have. Thus, I would imagine the perceived numeric
> equivalent would be very different depending on which approach was used.
> (I'd be very surprised if the mean rating for "somewhat important" was
> 11.75 in my example, but...)

>

> Lydia

>

>

>
> Lydia Saad
> Senior Editor, The Gallup Poll
> 502 Carnegie Center, Suite 300
> Princeton, NJ 08540
> (609) 924-9600
> lydia_saad@gallup.com

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

> From: Steve Wygant [mailto:saw36@EMAIL.BYU.EDU]
> Sent: Friday, June 06, 2003 5:02 PM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Re: Pew Research Center Global Attitudes Project

>
>
> Selzer raised a good question about the relative semantic values of
> scale points. This issue is addressed rather directly in psychometric
> research. One older study in particular looked at correlates between
> adjectival descriptors of frequency and amount (e.g. "sometimes" and
> "some") and corresponding numerical values.

>
> The researchers had participants choose a number to represent what they
> perceived "sometimes" to mean in reference to the frequency of a
> particular event. Using that as a standard, they asked the participant
> to make comparative numerical assignments of frequency to other
> adjectival descriptors (e.g. "usually", "frequently", "rarely"). They
> followed the same procedure for assigning numerical equivalents to
> descriptors of amount -- including "somewhat".

>
> Their findings suggested that "somewhat" fell towards the lower end of
> the middle range of descriptors. With "none" anchoring the bottom (mean
> = .15) of the range and "all" at the top (mean = 66.12), "somewhat" was
> assigned values averaging 11.75. This would suggest that there is far
> more semantic space between "somewhat" and the first position in a four
> point scale than between "somewhat" and the third point of such a scale,
> and that it might be a better choice as a label for the third point than
> the second. However, even if that is case, adding percentages of
> "somewhat" and "very" to claim that a proportion of respondents are
> "more concerned than not" might not be problematic. Doing the converse
> -- adding the percent of respondents in the lowest two spots of this
> scale and concluding that this total represented those who were "less
> concerned than concerned" would be more problematic.

>
> This research was published in 1974, and may be outdated in terms of
> contemporary usage of language. However, it does suggest terms which
> can be selected based on empirically derived adjectival/numerical
> correspondence. There may also be more recent research which replicates
> or modifies these findings, but I am not aware of anything. The article
> reference follows:

>
> Bass, B., Cascio, W., and O'Connor, E., (1974). "Magnitude Estimates of
> Expressions of Frequency and Amount". Journal of Applied Psychology,
> vol. 59, no. 3, 313-320.

>
>
> Steven A. Wygant, Ph.D.
> Institutional Assessment and Analysis
> 121D FOB
> Brigham Young University
> (801) 422-2258
> Steve_wygant@byu.edu <mailto:Steve_wygant@byu.edu>

>
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of J. Ann Selzer
> Sent: Thursday, June 05, 2003 12:49 PM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Re: Pew Research Center Global Attitudes Project

>
>
> This may be as good a time as any to raise a question about the use of
> "somewhat" in the second position on a four-point scale, with the first
> position representing the most of the attitude under scrutiny and the
> fourth position representing the least.
>
> The idea of a four-point scale is for the first two positions to mean
> "more toward this end than not" so that the top two boxes can be added
> together. My semantic understanding of "somewhat," and I'd welcome
> those who think otherwise" is that it is unclear whether this means more
> of something than not.
>
> With somewhat in the second position, the scale seems lopsided. The top
> box (often using the adjective "very") is far from "somewhat," which is
> close to the third box "only a little," which is close to the fourth box
> "not at all."
>
> So, in the Pew study, they've added the top two boxes and say
>
> "Majorities in seven of eight Muslim populations surveyed express
> worries that the U.S. might become a military threat to their countries.
>
> " Large majorities in the Palestinian Authority, Indonesia and Jordan -
> and nearly half of those in Morocco and Pakistan - say they have some
> confidence in Osama bin Laden to "do the right thing regarding world
> affairs."
>
> With "somewhat" as the second box, I just can't conclude what they
> conclude--that majorities are more worried than not, or that majorities
> are more confident than not.
>
> That said, there are good reasons to use this scale when there is
> tracking data. But, can someone set me straight on the semantic
> advantage of this scale?
>
> J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
> Selzer & Company, Inc.

> Des Moines, Iowa 50312

> 515.271.5700

>

> visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

>

> E-mail address for purposes of this list: JAnnSelzer@aol.com;

> otherwise, contact JASelzer@SelzerCo.com.

>

>

> In a message dated 6/4/2003 9:27:45 AM Central Daylight Time,

> dimockm@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG writes:

>

>>

>> For those interested, the Pew Research Center has just released the
>> second of two major studies of global attitudes.

>>

>> The study focuses on data from two major multinational surveys:

>>

>> * A post-war survey conducted in 20 countries plus the Palestinian
>> Authority--16,000 interviews focusing on the war in Iraq, situation in

>

>> the Middle East, the United States, President Bush and other world
>> leaders, the United Nations and the transatlantic alliance

>>

>> * A 44-nation survey of 38,000 people exploring attitudes toward
>> Islam and public policy, democracy, globalization, nationalism,
>> international institutions, and more

>>

>>

>> A more detailed description follows.

>> The report and full topline are available at our website:

>> <http://people-press.org>

>>

>> Michael Dimock

>> Research Director

>> The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press

>>

>>

>> WAR WITH IRAQ FURTHER DIVIDES GLOBAL PUBLICS

>>

>> * Public confidence in the United Nations is a major victim of the
>> conflict in Iraq. Positive ratings for the world body have tumbled in
>> nearly every country for which benchmark measures are available

>>

>> * Majorities in five of seven NATO countries surveyed support a more
>> independent relationship with the U.S. on diplomatic and security
>> affairs. The percentage of Americans favoring continued close ties
>> with Western Europe also has fallen.

>>

>> * Since last summer, favorable opinions of the U.S. have slipped in
>> nearly every country for which trend measures are available. Negative
>> views of the U.S. among Muslims, which had been largely limited to
>> countries in the Middle East, have spread to Muslim populations in
>> Indonesia and Nigeria.

>>
>> * A growing percentage of Muslims around the world see serious threats
>
>> to Islam.
>>
>> * Majorities in seven of eight Muslim populations surveyed express
>> worries that the U.S. might become a military threat to their
>> countries.
>>
>> * Large majorities in the Palestinian Authority, Indonesia and Jordan
>> - and nearly half of those in Morocco and Pakistan - say they have
>> some confidence in Osama bin Laden to "do the right thing regarding
>> world affairs."
>>
>> * There is considerable appetite in the Muslim world for democratic
>> freedoms. Most Muslim populations believe that Western-style democracy
>
>> can work in their countries. Many of the Muslim publics polled
>> expressed a stronger desire for democratic freedoms than the publics
>> in some nations of Eastern Europe, notably Russia and Bulgaria.
>>
>> Looking Forward
>>
>> * Most non-Muslim publics believe that Iraqis will be better off now
>> that Saddam Hussein has been removed from power. Even in countries
>> that opposed the war, such as France and Germany, most people believe
>> Iraqis' lives will improve.
>>
>> * There is limited optimism for a surge of democratic reform in the
>> Middle East. Substantial minorities of Muslims in many countries say
>> the region will become somewhat more democratic, but only in Kuwait do
>
>> as many as half say the region will become much more democratic.
>>
>> * In 20 of 21 populations surveyed, majorities believe the United
>> States favors Israel over the Palestinians too much. Americans
>> disagree, but the Israelis themselves do not. Nearly half of Israelis
>> think the U.S. favors Israel too much, while 38% say the policy is
>> fair.
>>
>> * Most Muslim populations doubt that a way can be found for the state
>> of Israel to exist so that the needs of the Palestinian people are
>> met. Eight-in-ten Palestinians are pessimistic about co-existence with
>
>> Israel.
>>
>>
>> World Embraces Democratic Values and Free Markets
>>
>> * Democratic principles and the free market model have been accepted
>> by people all around the world. People embrace the increased
>> interconnectedness that defines globalization. There is broad
>> agreement that children need to learn English to succeed.

>>
>> * Americans stand out for their strong endorsement of personal freedom
>
>> and their more measured support the social safety net. People in the

>> U.S. are more likely than most others to say that most people who fail
>
>> in life have themselves to blame, rather than society.
>>
>> * Globalization is credited for the increasing the availability of
>> food and modern medicines. But globalization not is blamed for
>> increased growing problems such as a scarcity of good jobs and the
>> widening gap between rich and poor.
>>
>> * Large corporations from other countries are viewed favorably in most
>
>> places. So too are international financial organizations like the
>> World Bank, IMF, and WTO. By contrast, anti-globalization protestors
>> are viewed unfavorably in most countries.

>> Global Gaps On Social Issues

>> * Majorities in most countries say it is necessary to believe in God
>> to be moral. This is the prevailing view in most developing countries
>> - and the U.S. But Canadians and Europeans take the secular view that
>> it is possible to be moral without believing in God.

>> * Acceptance of homosexuality divides the publics of the world in a
>> similar way. People in Africa and the Middle East strongly object to
>> society accepting homosexuality, while there is broad tolerance in
>> Western Europe.

> -----
> 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: Tue, 10 Jun 2003 09:12:17 -0500
Reply-To: Jing Zhou <jzhou@SYMMETRICSMARKETING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jing Zhou <jzhou@SYMMETRICSMARKETING.COM>
Subject: email lists of IT professionals
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Does anyone know of good resources for purchasing email lists of IT professionals? We're working on finding respondents in qualitative, it's a blind study with IT professionals as our target.

=20

Thanks.

=20

Jing Zhou
Research Manager
Symmetrics Marketing Corporation
Phone: 317.915.3036
Fax: 317.577.5851
jzhou@symmetrics.com

=20

=20

=20

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Tue, 10 Jun 2003 17:02:58 -0500
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: FW: Articles for MRA Newsletter
Comments: cc: LAsadour@aol.com
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Please respond to the following e-mail address directly if interested: =
LAsadour@aol.com

=20

Hi...

I am writing to you on behalf of the Marketing Research Association (MRA =
- www.mra-net.org). MRA's editorial board is seeking articles about =
Ethics in Marketing Research for an upcoming issue of the MRA Alert! =
Newsletter. I am contacting you because I am hoping you will be willing =
to contribute an article. Unfortunately, since we are non-profit, we do =
not have money in our budget to pay writers. I will however, include a =
biography and company information at the end of your article. Articles =
are usually 1500-2000 words, but I like to leave length up to the =

author. If you have an article that you have already written, and would like to submit that, I would welcome that as well. Any help you could provide is appreciated. =20

As stated above, This month's issue is about Ethics. Or rather: Best Practices/Ethics/Standards and Guidelines. We want to discuss why ethical practices exist, and why we need these standards and why researchers should use them. Topics include: Privacy, Validation, Business Practices, Incentives, etc. We also want to try and include ethical horror stories researchers have experienced. Of recent interest is the issue of ethics in polling.

Unfortunately we have a short deadline, so any help you could provide would be very greatly appreciated.

Please let me know if you are interested in writing on this subject, and the viewpoint you would present. Or if you know someone who might be interested in writing on this subject, feel free to or pass this e-mail on or give me the person's name.=20

Thank you so much for your time. It is greatly appreciated. You can reach me at Lasadour@aol.com or lisa.asadourian@mra-net.org. If you would like to talk to me in person, please contact me at 860-257-4008.

Thank you again.

Sincerely,

Lisa Asadourian
Alert! Editor
860-257-4008

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Wed, 11 Jun 2003 06:14:54 -0700
Reply-To: Scott Beach <scottb@PITT.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Scott Beach <scottb@PITT.EDU>
Subject: web survey software

AAPOR colleagues:

Our organization is currently in the process of evaluating various web survey software packages. One that has caught our attention is Sensus Web, which was developed by Sawtooth Technologies (developers of Ci3 CATI software). Does anyone out there have any experience with Sensus Web? I would be interested in any feedback anyone could provide.

You can respond directly to me at the address below.

Thanks a lot.

Scott R. Beach, Ph.D.
Director, Survey Research Program
University Center for Social and Urban Research
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

PH: 412-624-7785
FAX: 412-624-4810
e-mail: scottb@pitt.edu

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

Date: Wed, 11 Jun 2003 17:05:07 -0500
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Job Posting
Comments: cc: zagatsky-maria@norc.net
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Please respond directly to: zagatsky-maria@norc.net =20
=20

Director, Telephone Center Operations (03-032)
Location: Chicago, IL

NORC, a national organization for research associated with the =
University of Chicago, is seeking a highly motivated and effective =
individual to fill the critical role of Director of Telephone Center =
Operations. We are currently upgrading and expanding our telephone =
interviewing capabilities, and we have a unique opportunity for =
professional growth in the field of telephone survey methodology. =20

At NORC our mission is to conduct high quality social science research =
in the public interest. The Director of the Telephone Center will be =
expected to make significant contributions to our continuing development =
of high quality telephone methodology. The successful candidate will =
therefore have both advanced survey methodology knowledge and telephone =
operations management experience. Responsibilities will also include =
all aspects of managing our telephone center and directing a staff of 10 =
direct, and up to 300 (currently) indirect reports. =20

A degree in Social Sciences, Survey Methodology or Business Management =
or its equivalent in experience is required with a minimum of six (6) =
years of significant experience in survey operations. The successful =
candidate will also have demonstrated skills in leadership, staff =
development and client relations. =20

NORC offers a comprehensive compensation and benefits package including = paid time off, holiday pay, medical and dental coverage, life insurance, = short and long-term disability insurance, a 403(b) retirement plan, and = tuition assistance.

NORC is an affirmative action, equal opportunity employer that values = and actively seeks diversity in the workforce.

For immediate consideration, send a brief letter of interest and = electronic r=E9sum=E9 to:
norc-recruiter@norcmail.uchicago.edu or mail to:

NORC Human Resources
1155 E. 60th Street
Chicago, IL 60637
www.norc.org <<http://www.norc.org>>

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

Date: Thu, 12 Jun 2003 16:13:10 -0400
Reply-To: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>
Subject: synthesis- leaving messages
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/html; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

<html>

<body>

HI,

Here is a little synthesis on my question to the list about leaving messages. References on the question follow for those interested. Thanks to all who answered my request...

1) messages left are similar to introductory messages normally used when the telephone is answered i.e. My name is,,, from... purpose, type of study...

2) Some leave a call-back phone number but most don't. They just say that they will most probably call back.

3) when to leave the message is an issue : On the first call, on all the calls, on some calls and not others? It seems clear that you should not leave a message on all the calls to a household because it may sound like harrassment.

4) The information on the firm's identity should appear for people who have caller i.d. on their phone.

According to CMOR 1999 respondent cooperation survey, 74% of households have an answering machine and 25% of those use it for screening. 17% of the companies (25% of the non for profit ones) leave a message. There is variation in when the message is left (1 st call, subsequent calls, etc.) : 75% (of the 17%) left a 800 number to call back, 71% left a message on the first call, 62% on subsequent calls.

Impact : "It legitimates the study"; It is equivalent to an

advance letter; Interviewers say that respondents react positively :
"Oh yeah, I remember you said you would call back..." (but then we suppose pollsters have to call back most of the time, if not the impact may be negative on the long term); modestbut positive impact on response rates (paper presented at midwest AApur conference by Rob Daves).

Articles : I search bibliographic data bases and found 6 articles, all in POQ (1 in 1991, 2 in 1993, 2 in 1994, 1 in 1999). Here are the abstracts:

Notice 1 de 6 dans Sociological Abstracts 1986-2002/12

TI: Call Screening: Is It Really a Problem for Survey Research?

AU: Link,-Michael-W.; Oldendick,-Robert-W.

IN: Research Triangle Instit, Research Triangle Park, NC

SO: Public-Opinion-Quarterly; 1999, 63, 4, winter, 577-589.

DT: aja Abstract-of-Journal-Article

AB: Explores the relationship between call screening & nonresponse in public opinion research, drawing on 1998 telephone interview data from 2,458 adults in SC, of whom 26.7% had Caller-ID & 64.9% had a telephone answering machine. Respondents (Rs) who were younger, higher educated, & had one or more children in the household were more likely to screen calls. The sociodemographic characteristics of Caller-ID vs answering machines are compared, arguing that the use of the former has expanded the threat of nonresponse across demographic groups; ie, sample representativeness might be compromised. Call-screening behavior is examined in terms of what Rs respond to when receiving an incoming call, drawing on an investigation of how survey calls were listed on their Caller-ID services. Findings suggest Rs are more wary of calls listed as "unknown" or "out of area." The impact of call screening on efforts to complete an interview is addressed, focusing on potential nonresponse indicators as gleaned from call histories: number of attempts made, number of days on which calls were made, & likelihood of refusal. Results are mixed, indicating an increase in self-reported call screening, but also a larger role of social factors vs call screening behavior in the growing nonresponse problem. 4 Tables, 7 References. J. Lindroth

AN: 200008291

Notice 2 de 6 dans Sociological Abstracts 1986-2002/12

TI: The Answering Machine Generation: Who Are They and What Problem Do They Pose for Survey Research?

AU: Oldendick,-Robert-W.; Link,-Michael-W.

IN: Instit Public Affairs U South Carolina, Columbia 29208

SO: Public-Opinion-Quarterly; 1994, 58, 2, summer, 264-273.

DT: aja Abstract-of-Journal-Article

AB: Increased incidence of telephone answering machines & the use of such devices to screen calls pose a potential threat to the representativeness of samples in telephone surveys. Using data from 9 statewide surveys conducted in SC 1989-1992, examined here are the extent to which answering machines are used to screen calls & the demographic characteristics associated with answering machine use call screening. Results show that 2%-3% of households appear to use answering machines consistently to screen calls, & that such screening is more likely to take place in households with higher family incomes, outside

rural areas, & which include individuals who are younger & have higher levels of education. While call screening does not presently seem to be a grave threat to the representativeness of samples in telephone surveys, the increased incidence of answering machines together with the increased % of households indicating that these devices are sometimes used to screen calls demonstrate that the potential bias from this source is growing. 4 Tables, 9 References. Modified AA

AN: 9503011

Notice 3 de 6 dans Sociological Abstracts 1986-2002/12

TI: The Rise of the New Media

AU: Mayer,-William-G.

IN: Northeastern U, Boston MA 02115

SO: Public-Opinion-Quarterly; 1994, 58, 1, spring, 124-146.

DT: aja Abstract-of-Journal-Article

AB: Survey results from numerous US polls conducted by Gallup, Barna Research, USA Today, CBS News, & Roper display trends in the use of new media forms & technologies, including video cassette recorders (VCRs), cable TV, phone answering & fax machines, & computers. As of the early 1990s, 70+% of US households owned a VCR & remote control, 60% received cable, & 45% had an answering machine; 20%-30% owned personal computers & compact disc players. Only 2%-3% owned satellite dishes, car phones, modems, or laptops. Only about 1% had fax machines at home, but 27% had access to them at work. Although the new media are spreading, they are not likely to entirely replace older media, eg, network TV. Also, many households who own new technologies use them infrequently or for limited purposes. 10 References. E. Blackwell

AN: 9409801

Notice 4 de 6 dans Sociological Abstracts 1986-2002/12

TI: Meeting the Challenge of Answering Machines

AU: Piazza,-Thomas

IN: Survey Research Center U California, Berkeley 94720

SO: Public-Opinion-Quarterly; 1993, 57, 2, summer, 219-231.

DT: aja Abstract-of-Journal-Article

AB: Analyzes data from the calling records of the 1990 California Disability Survey that could help researchers develop a strategy for increasing the efficiency of calls to households using answering machines. A random-digit dialing sample of 33,000 CA households yielded completed interviews with 24,000. The results of making multiple callbacks at different times are examined, & the best & worst times for reaching those who use an answering machine are delineated. 5 Tables, 5 References. Modified AA

AN: 9400848

Notice 5 de 6 dans Sociological Abstracts 1986-2002/12

TI: The Impact of Messages on Survey Participation in Answering Machine Households

AU: Xu,-Minghua; Bates,-Benjamin-J.; Schweitzer,-John-C.

IN: c/o Schweitzer-Dept Communication Studies Texas Tech U, Lubbock 79409

SO: Public-Opinion-Quarterly; 1993, 57, 2, summer, 232-237.

DT: aja Abstract-of-Journal-Article

AB: Examines the impact of telephone answering machines on telephone survey participation. Of 2,394 successful first call attempts, 51% completed interviews, 40% refused, & 10% requested call-backs. Of

the 1,802 unsuccessful first call attempts, 7% were busy, 71% unanswered, & 22% answered by a machine. Statistical analyses indicate that households with answering machines are more likely to be contacted later & to complete the interview, & less likely to refuse to participate in the study, than households where there was no answer on the initial call attempt. Three different kinds of messages were left on answering machines, but little difference was found in their effectiveness in soliciting survey participation. 2 Tables, 8 References.

Adapted from the source document

AN: 9400053

Notice 6 de 6 dans Sociological Abstracts 1986-2002/12

TI: The Answering Machine Poses Many Questions for Telephone Survey Researchers

AU: Tuckel,-Peter-S.; Feinberg,-Barry-M.

IN: Dept Sociology Hunter Coll, New York NY 10021

SO: Public-Opinion-Quarterly; 1991, 55, 2, summer, 200-217.

DT: aja Abstract-of-Journal-Article

AB: The increasing use of the answering machine raises a number of critical issues for telephone survey researchers. Among them are accessibility to households that use answering machines to screen their calls, & variability in such use by time of calling (weekday evening vs weekend) & by size of community (along an urban-rural continuum). These issues are addressed by examining data from a nationwide telephone survey (N =3D 1,061 respondents) analyzing the prevalence of the answering machine as a response disposition to all telephone numbers dialed. In addition, individuals who completed the interview were asked whether their telephone was equipped with an answering machine. Results indicate that a sizable % of people with answering machines are able to be contacted, & many assent to be interviewed. Answering machines are used more on weekends than on weekday evenings & are more prevalent in urbanized than in less populated areas. 8 Tables, 8 References.

Modified AA

AN: 91Y0286

<x-sigsep><p></x-sigsep>
Claire Durand

Claire.Durand@umontreal.ca

<a href=3D"http://www.fas.umontreal.ca/socio/durandc"=
eudora=3D"autourl">http://www.fas.umontreal.ca/socio/durandc

Professeur,

Responsable des cycles sup=E9rieurs,

d=E9partement de sociologie,

Universit=E9 de Montr=E9al

C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,

Montr=E9al, Qu=E9bec, H3C 3J7

</body>

</html>

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

Date: Thu, 12 Jun 2003 17:02:05 -0500

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

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Job Posting
Comments: cc: ahajat@health.nyc.gov
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

If interested in responding to the job posting next below, please =
respond directly to: ahajat@health.nyc.gov =20

City of New York
Department of Health
125 Worth Street, Room 315
New York, NY 10013

Civil Service Title: City Research Scientist Level: III
Salary: \$67,321 - \$81,368
Office Title: Division of Epidemiology =20
Work Location: 125 Worth Street
Division/Work Unit: No. of Positions: 1
Hours/Shift: Duration: 35 hours/week - Full Time

JOB DESCRIPTION:

The newly created Bureau of Epidemiology Services within the New York =
City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene is a multidisciplinary unit =
with the goal of combining cutting-edge epidemiologic research and data =
analyses with policy development and recommendations. The unit will =
undertake analyses that have broad Departmental applications and will =
also be available to provide epidemiologic consultation services with =
all categorical Departmental programs (including those responsible for =
infectious diseases, chronic diseases, community health, =
environmental/occupational health, and access to health care).=20

The City Research Scientist III, with very wide latitude for the =
exercise of independent judgment and initiative, will work under the =
direction of the Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Epidemiology =
Services. The City Research Scientist III will be responsible for but =
not limited to the following: developing, designing and pre-testing =
survey methodologies; supervising and quality control of data =
collection; data management and data cleaning; generation of =
post-stratification weights; and analysis of surveys with complex design

PREFERRED SKILLS:

Extensive experience with all aspects of survey design, implementation, =
and management, including survey instrument design and pre-testing. =
Applied statistical and survey experience in public health and/or social =
science programs. Knowledge of different national, (e.g. BRFSS, NHIS, =
NHANES) state and local surveys and accompanying methodologies for =
administering these surveys. Computer skills including presentation =
software such as Microsoft Excel, Access and Powerpoint, geographical =
information systems, and statistical packages such as SPSS and SAS. =

Prior experience with CATI programming, and analysis using SUDAAN a = plus.

QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS:

1. A doctorate degree from an accredited college or university with = specialization in epidemiology or an appropriate field of physical, = biological, environmental or social science and one year of full-time = experience in a responsible supervisory, administrative or research = capacity in the appropriate field of specialization; or
2. A master's degree from an accredited college or university with = specialization in an appropriate field of physical, biological, = environmental or social science and three years of responsible full-time = experience in the appropriate field of specialization, including one = year of full-time experience in a responsible supervisory, = administrative or research capacity in the appropriate field of = specialization; or
3. Education and/or experience which is equivalent to "1" or "2" above. = However, all candidates must have a master's degree in an appropriate = field of specialization and one year of full-time experience in a = responsible supervisory, administrative, or research capacity as = described in "2" above.

NOTE: IF YOU WERE EDUCATED IN A FOREIGN SCHOOL, YOU MUST SUBMIT A = FOREIGN DEGREE EVALUATION WITH YOUR RESUME.

NOTE: NEW YORK CITY RESIDENCY IS REQUIRED

Please submit resume and cover letter via e-mail, fax, or mail to:

Ms. Anjum Hajat
Division of Epidemiology
Bureau of Epidemiology Services
125 Worth Street
Room 315, CN6
New York, NY 10013
ahajat@health.nyc.gov <mailto:ahajat@health.nyc.gov>
fax: 212-788-4473

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

Date: Thu, 12 Jun 2003 18:14:16 -0400
Reply-To: Anne Ciemnecki <ACiemnecki@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Anne Ciemnecki <ACiemnecki@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM>
Subject: Job Opportunities at Mathematica Policy Research

Mathematica Policy Research, a national leader in social policy research, survey design, and data collection, seeks Survey Specialists for our Princeton, NJ and Washington, DC offices. Successful candidates will work with senior survey researchers on the development and management of national projects on significant policy issues, such as health care and education and will have:

* A Masters Degree in the social sciences or a related field, or

equivalent experience

- * Minimum of one year survey research work experience, preferably in social policy
- * Excellent oral and written communication skills
- * Familiarity with CATI and experience with spreadsheets or other PC programs preferred

MPR is an employee owned company and offers competitive salaries, a comprehensive benefits package, and convenient office locations. Visit our web site at www.mathematica-mpr.com to learn more. Submit your resume, professional references, and transcripts to: Sherry Metzger, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., P.O. Box 2393, Princeton, NJ 08543-2393 or email to HRNJ@mathematica-mpr.com or fax to (609) 799-0005.

Mathematica is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer

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

Date: Fri, 13 Jun 2003 10:48:47 -0400
Reply-To: Ward Kay <wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ward Kay <wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM>
Organization: Adirondack Communications
Subject: Public Opinion in Crisis
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

"Public Opinion in Crisis" is the theme for this year's Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research (MAPOR) conference. Depending upon your research interest, the theme can represent the methodological challenges facing the public opinion research industry, the ebb and flow of public opinion during international conflicts, the implications of the crisis orientation of mass media news coverage. MAPOR invites proposals addressing any interpretation of the conference theme, as well as any area related to public opinion methodology, theory, and analysis of data. MAPOR is a chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research. Conference is November 21-22 in Chicago.

Abstract deadline is June 30.

Paper call at:
<http://www.mapor.org/2003papercall.pdf>

Student paper competition:
<http://www.mapor.org/studentpapers.pdf>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Fri, 13 Jun 2003 17:00:44 -0400
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: New spamr "survey"
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Here is a new scam from a notorious spammer, presumably designed to harvest live email addresses.

I love the following line: "This offer may contain typographical errors or inaccuracies and therefore we reserve all rights."

Is whoever wrote that a great parodist or what?

Jan Werner

Dear Friend,

Today, we're gathering opinions and preferences about popular soft drinks. Your feedback will help us determine the people's choice.

SURVEY QUESTION

DOES PEPSI® TASTE BETTER THAN COKE®?

1. Yes
2. No

Sincerely,
Cathy Ann McNeil

*This is an independent offer from ConsumerValueDirect. Pepsi and Coke are not sponsors or co-sponsors of this promotion. Pepsi is a registered trademark of Pepsi Corporation. Coke is a registered trademark of Coca Cola Corporation. This offer may contain typographical errors or inaccuracies and therefore we reserve all rights.

You received this email because you signed up at one of Virtumundo's websites (see the "Properties" listed at <http://privacy.virtumundo.com/properties.html>) or you signed up with a party that has contracted with Virtumundo. To unsubscribe from the Virtumundo Rewards List, go to <http://www.virtumundo.com/unsubscribe> or go here . To read Virtumundo's privacy policy, go to [Privacy Policy](#) . The products and/or services advertised in this email are the sole responsibility of the advertiser, and questions about this offer should be directed to the advertiser.

(c) 1998-2003 Virtumundo, Inc. All rights reserved.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Mon, 16 Jun 2003 13:26:17 -0400
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Baby Boomers Transform an Old Bloc
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

June 15, 2003
Baby Boomers Transform an Old Bloc
By SHERYL GAY STOLBERG
<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/06/15/weekinreview/15STOL.html>

WASHINGTON - Few people paid attention to the minutiae of how older Americans voted in Florida's 1998 election for governor. Susan A. MacManus was one of them, and in her analysis of Jeb Bush's victory, there is an important lesson about Democrats, Republicans and the legendary elderly voter bloc.

Professor MacManus, an expert at the University of South Florida in voting trends among the elderly, said she was hardly surprised to learn that voters 65 and older cast their ballots for Mr. Bush's Democratic opponent. After all, it is an axiom of politics that the elderly tend to vote Democratic.

But when the professor changed her definition of elderly to include people 60 and older, a funny thing happened to her statistics: the vote tilted Republican. By last year, when Governor Bush won re-election, a majority of the elderly - by any definition - voted for him.

The governor's brother, President Bush, may have been mindful of those numbers last week when he prodded Congress toward adopting a Medicare prescription drug benefits package that included a provision he had previously opposed. Older Americans have long been a powerful force in national politics. But as he heads into the 2004 election, Mr. Bush has more reasons than ever to court them.

First, Mr. Bush's approval ratings among elderly voters are not as high as among the general electorate. According to a poll conducted last week by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, voters 65 and older gave a modest 53 percent approval rating, compared with 64 percent for people 18 to 64.

Second, the ranks of older Americans will only grow as the baby boom generation ages. There were 35 million people 65 and older in the United States in 2000, but the number is expected to increase to 39.7 million by 2010.

Finally, the elderly vote is increasingly up for grabs. As the F.D.R.

generation dies out, the demographics of the elderly are changing. Today's older voters are typically more educated and affluent than their parents, and they are increasingly willing to align themselves with Republicans.

Over the next 10 years, then, this is the group that is going to dominate American politics. "Seniors are one of three crucial groups for Republican candidates, along with independents and women," said Glen Bolger, a Republican pollster. "When you look at the last couple of elections, Republicans have done extremely well with senior citizens. Part of that is because we spend a lot more time in our campaigns talking about their issues and targeting them, as opposed to just cowering in fear when the Democrats play the 'scare seniors' card."

That card worked well with the elderly of yesteryear, for whom voting Republican may have felt unnatural. But a growing number of retirees spent their formative years with a Republican in the White House, said John C. Rother, a lobbyist for AARP, which represents the nation's retirees.

"People turning 65 today were born in 1938," Mr. Rother said. "If you were born in '38, you barely remember the Second World War. You are basically an Eisenhower kid. You are more likely to have grown up in the suburbs. You are less likely to have been a union member. You are much more likely than your parents to have been white collar. Your attachment to F.D.R. is much less than your parents' generation. So it's all trending in a Republican direction."

Exit polls from the 2000 presidential race conducted by the Voter News Service showed that 47 percent of people 60 and older voted Republican, compared with 44 percent in 1996. And after years of voting Democratic in Congressional races, the 60-and-older group voted Republican from 1994 to 1998, but swung back to Democrats in 2000. There is no poll data available for 2002.

At the same time, the elderly are important simply because they go to the polls - at a time when the nation is evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats. "Because their turnout rates are so much higher than other age groups, in a way, their vote is magnified," said Professor MacManus of the University of South Florida.

In the big swing states - like Florida, West Virginia and Pennsylvania - older voters "represent the difference between winning and losing," said Geoffrey Garin, a Democratic pollster advising Senator Bob Graham of Florida in his bid to become the Democratic presidential nominee.

That electoral power was on full display last week in the Senate, where Republicans went head to head with Democrats to position themselves as the party with the interests of older Americans at heart. In an important turnabout, President Bush acceded to the demands of senators from both parties when he said the White House would now accept equal drug benefits for people in the traditional Medicare program and for those who join private health plans.

Senator Bill Frist of Tennessee, the Republican leader, acknowledged in an interview that Americans "are generally more comfortable with Democrats in dealing with Medicare." But if a Republican Congress passes a Medicare prescription drug benefit, and a Republican president signs it, "it will neutralize the issue," he said. "No longer will the Democrats have an inherent advantage as we look at health care issues."

Democrats counter that the prescription drug benefit is only getting traction because they forced the issue.

"Seniors know who's on their side," said Tom Daschle of South Dakota, the Democratic leader in the Senate. "They know that Democrats created Medicare and have always defended it for one simple reason: the health of America's seniors."

Senator John B. Breaux, a Louisiana Democrat, regards the prescription drug issue as critical to the president's re-election. "I think the White House realizes that this is an area that they've been particularly vulnerable in," he said, "and I think they are moving in the direction of being more involved in programs that can help the elderly."

But, he said, retirees are hardly leaving his party in droves: "I think they'll continue to be reliable Democratic constituents because we've been traditionally aligned on their interests."

Those interests, however, are changing. Today's retirees, for instance, rely on the stock market and their 401(k) plans alongside Social Security, so corporate scandals and tax cuts are also issues that resonate. "Because seniors' interests are changing, they are looking at politics and politicians differently," said Senator Larry E. Craig, the Idaho Republican and chairman of the Senate's Special Committee on Aging.

All of which means candidates and their strategists in both parties will be especially busy in the coming months and years, devising ways to attract the votes of those 65 and older.

"It's a group that you have to pay special attention to as a Republican candidate because you know Democrats are going to go after them and go after them hard," said Mr. Bolger, the Republican pollster. He said he advises his clients to have a "SUTS page in their campaign plan." That's S-U-T-S, Mr. Bolger said, as in "suck up to seniors."

Copyright 2003 The New York Times 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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Tue, 17 Jun 2003 09:27:29 -0400
Reply-To: "Featherston, Fran A." <ffeather@NSF.GOV>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Featherston, Fran A." <ffeather@NSF.GOV>
Subject: Poll finds 22% of Americans believe Iraqis used biological
weapon

s
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

A colleague sent this link to me regarding a University of Maryland survey:
<http://www.philly.com/mld/inquirer/news/front/6085261.htm>

Does anyone have the actual items used?
(fran)

Fran Featherston
ffeather@nsf.gov
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22230
Phone: 703-292-4221

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

Date: Tue, 17 Jun 2003 09:47:21 -0400
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Re: Poll finds 22% of Americans believe Iraqis used biological
weapon s
In-Reply-To: <F6017D7863389E42BD52A45B164E37B1AEA82C@nsfmail01.nsf.gov>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I already sent this to Fran but I meant to send it to AAPOR as well:

Here it is

http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Iraq/Iraqqaire_5_03.pdf

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101

Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Featherston,
Fran A.

> Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2003 9:27 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Poll finds 22% of Americans believe Iraqis used biological
weapon

> s

>

> A colleague sent this link to me regarding a University of Maryland

> survey:

> <http://www.philly.com/mld/inquirer/news/front/6085261.htm>

>

> Does anyone have the actual items used?

> (fran)

> Fran Featherston

> ffeather@nsf.gov

> National Science Foundation

> 4201 Wilson Boulevard

> Arlington, Virginia 22230

> Phone: 703-292-4221

>

> -----

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

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

Date: Tue, 17 Jun 2003 11:48:33 -0700

Reply-To: Joel Bloom <jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Joel Bloom <jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU>

Subject: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability

In-Reply-To: <[003701c3342c\\$64e6f990\\$130a010a@LEO](mailto:003701c3342c$64e6f990$130a010a@LEO)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Proof that people lie to pollsters, from a newly-released Gallup poll
(courtesy of National Journal's Poll Track):

Which new book would you, personally, be more interested in reading:
"Living History" by Hillary Clinton or "Harry Potter and the Order of the
Phoenix" by J.K. Rowling?

Living History	37%
Harry Potter	48
Both (vol.)	*
Neither (vol.)	14
No opinion	1

37%? That seems a bit high, with no disrespect intended toward the Junior Senator from my former home state.

-- 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

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

Date: Tue, 17 Jun 2003 15:30:05 -0400
Reply-To: Steven Kull <skull@PIPA.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Steven Kull <skull@PIPA.ORG>
Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability
Comments: To: Joel Bloom <jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The question was not whether they would want to read Hilary's book but whether they would be more interested in reading it than Harry Potter. The fact that more say they would prefer to read a children's book than to poke around in the sordid details of the Clinton's sex life is what I find curious and more plausibly evidence of a social desirability effect.

Joel Bloom wrote:

- > Proof that people lie to pollsters, from a newly-released Gallup poll
- > (courtesy of National Journal's Poll Track):
- >
- > Which new book would you, personally, be more interested in reading:
- > "Living History" by Hillary Clinton or "Harry Potter and the Order of the
- > Phoenix" by J.K. Rowling?
- >
- > Living History 37%
- > Harry Potter 48
- > Both (vol.) *
- > Neither (vol.) 14
- > No opinion 1
- >
- > 37%? That seems a bit high, with no disrespect intended toward the Junior
- > Senator from my former home state.
- >
- > -- Joel
- >
- > *****

> Joel David Bloom Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
> Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate 5245 University of Oregon
> Telephone: 541-346-0891 Eugene, OR 97403-5245
> j bloom@uoregon.edu Facsimile: 541-346-0388
> http://www.uoregon.edu/~jbloom http://osrl.uoregon.edu
> *****
>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

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

Date: Tue, 17 Jun 2003 15:39:06 -0400
Reply-To: "Donelan, Karen" <KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Donelan, Karen" <KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG>
Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

I believe this is a survey of adults 18+
about personal preferences.
No surprise to me.

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

From: Steven Kull [mailto:skull@PIPA.ORG]
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2003 3:30 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability

The question was not whether they would want to read Hilary's book but
whether
they would be more interested in reading it than Harry Potter. The fact
that
more say they would prefer to read a children's book than to poke around in
the sordid details of the Clinton's sex life is what I find curious and more
plausibly evidence of a social desirability effect.

Joel Bloom wrote:

> Proof that people lie to pollsters, from a newly-released Gallup poll
> (courtesy of National Journal's Poll Track):
>
> Which new book would you, personally, be more interested in reading:
> "Living History" by Hillary Clinton or "Harry Potter and the Order of the
> Phoenix" by J.K. Rowling?
>
> Living History 37%
> Harry Potter 48
> Both (vol.) *
> Neither (vol.) 14

> No opinion 1

>

> 37%? That seems a bit high, with no disrespect intended toward the Junior

> Senator from my former home state.

>

> -- Joel

>

> *****

> Joel David Bloom Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
> Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate 5245 University of Oregon
> Telephone: 541-346-0891 Eugene, OR 97403-5245
> j bloom@uoregon.edu Facsimile: 541-346-0388
> http://www.uoregon.edu/~j bloom http://osrl.uoregon.edu

> *****

>

> -----

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

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

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

=====
Date: Tue, 17 Jun 2003 15:45:38 -0400
Reply-To: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>
Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

I find it interesting that 85% of the people say they would be interested in reading any book.

Ed Ratledge
University of Delaware

-----Original Message-----
From: Donelan, Karen [mailto:KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG]
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2003 3:39 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability

I believe this is a survey of adults 18+ about personal preferences. No surprise to me.

-----Original Message-----
From: Steven Kull [mailto:skull@PIPA.ORG]
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2003 3:30 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability

The question was not whether they would want to read Hilary's book but whether they would be more interested in reading it than Harry Potter. The fact that more say they would prefer to read a children's book than to poke around in the sordid details of the Clinton's sex life is what I find curious and more plausibly evidence of a social desirability effect.

Joel Bloom wrote:

> Proof that people lie to pollsters, from a newly-released Gallup poll
> (courtesy of National Journal's Poll Track):
>
> Which new book would you, personally, be more interested in reading:
> "Living History" by Hillary Clinton or "Harry Potter and the Order of the
> Phoenix" by J.K. Rowling?
>
> Living History 37%
> Harry Potter 48
> Both (vol.) *
> Neither (vol.) 14
> No opinion 1
>
> 37%? That seems a bit high, with no disrespect intended toward the Junior
> Senator from my former home state.

> -- Joel

> *****
> Joel David Bloom Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
> Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate 5245 University of Oregon
> Telephone: 541-346-0891 Eugene, OR 97403-5245
> j bloom@uoregon.edu Facsimile: 541-346-0388
> http://www.uoregon.edu/~j bloom http://osrl.uoregon.edu
> *****

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

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

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

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

=====
Date: Tue, 17 Jun 2003 15:46:12 -0400
Reply-To: Melissa Marcello <mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Melissa Marcello <mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability--and Harry Potter
In-Reply-To: <3EEF6C3D.743605B7@pipa.org>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

While this is only tangentially related to the topic, I do have to share =
it.

Seems there is a website that sells all sorts of Harry Potter books and
merchandise.

A former sociology professor of mine whose name is Harry Potter has an
academic book he co-authored for sale on that site (totally unbeknownst =
to
him). Well, lo and behold, someone bought this book on social networks =
and
community thinking it was going to be about Rowling's characters. The
person who bought the book admitted to their surprise upon receiving =
this
academic book, read it anyway, and actually gave it a good review rating =
it
5 stars on the website. =20

Perhaps there is a lesson for us all in this Harry Potter tale

Melissa Marcello
Pursuant, Inc.
p 202.887.0070=20
f 800.567.1723
c 202.352.7462

Visit our website at www.pursuantresearch.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Steven Kull
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2003 3:30 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability

The question was not whether they would want to read Hilary's book but
whether
they would be more interested in reading it than Harry Potter. The =
fact
that
more say they would prefer to read a children's book than to poke around =
in
the sordid details of the Clinton's sex life is what I find curious and =
more
plausibly evidence of a social desirability effect.

Joel Bloom wrote:

> Proof that people lie to pollsters, from a newly-released Gallup poll
> (courtesy of National Journal's Poll Track):
>
> Which new book would you, personally, be more interested in reading:
> "Living History" by Hillary Clinton or "Harry Potter and the Order of =
the
> Phoenix" by J.K. Rowling?

>
> Living History 37%
> Harry Potter 48
> Both (vol.) *
> Neither (vol.) 14
> No opinion 1

>
> 37%? That seems a bit high, with no disrespect intended toward the =
Junior
> Senator from my former home state.

>
> -- Joel

>
> =
*****=

*
> Joel David Bloom Oregon Survey Research =
Laboratory
> Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate 5245 University of =
Oregon
> Telephone: 541-346-0891 Eugene, OR =
97403-5245
> j bloom@uoregon.edu Facsimile: =
541-346-0388
> http://www.uoregon.edu/~j bloom =
http://osrl.uoregon.edu

> =
*****=

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

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

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

=====
Date: Tue, 17 Jun 2003 15:37:26 -0400
Reply-To: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability
Comments: To: Steven Kull <skull@PIPA.ORG>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Have you read any of the Harry Potter books? They're great! (and quite honestly, I think we all may know more about the Clinton sex life than any of us were slotted for at birth).

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

From: Steven Kull [mailto:skull@PIPA.ORG]=20
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2003 3:30 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability

The question was not whether they would want to read Hilary's book but whether they would be more interested in reading it than Harry Potter. The fact that more say they would prefer to read a children's book than to poke around in the sordid details of the Clinton's sex life is what I find curious and more plausibly evidence of a social desirability effect.

Joel Bloom wrote:

> Proof that people lie to pollsters, from a newly-released Gallup poll=20
> (courtesy of National Journal's Poll Track):
>
> Which new book would you, personally, be more interested in reading:=20
> "Living History" by Hillary Clinton or "Harry Potter and the Order of=20
> the Phoenix" by J.K. Rowling?
>
> Living History 37%
> Harry Potter 48
> Both (vol.) *
> Neither (vol.) 14
> No opinion 1
>
> 37%? That seems a bit high, with no disrespect intended toward the=20
> Junior Senator from my former home state.

> -- Joel

> *****

> **

> Joel David Bloom Oregon Survey Research
> Laboratory
> Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate 5245 University of
> Oregon
> Telephone: 541-346-0891 Eugene, OR
> 97403-5245
> j bloom@uoregon.edu Facsimile:
> 541-346-0388
> http://www.uoregon.edu/~jbloom
> http://osrl.uoregon.edu

> *****

> ****

>

> -----

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

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

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

Date: Tue, 17 Jun 2003 15:48:39 -0400

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

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Lance Hoffman <lhoffman@OPINIONACCESS.COM>

Organization: Opinion Access Corp.

Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability

Comments: To: "Donelan, Karen" <KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG>

In-Reply-To:

<57531340B9FDD611A8580008026158F1010986B9@phsexch26.mgh.harvard.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I must agree with Karen. Besides, have you ever read any of the other Harry Potter books? They are excellent.

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 Donelan, Karen

Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2003 3:39 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability

I believe this is a survey of adults 18+ about personal preferences.

No surprise to me.

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

From: Steven Kull [mailto:skull@PIPA.ORG]
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2003 3:30 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability

The question was not whether they would want to read Hilary's book but whether they would be more interested in reading it than Harry Potter. The fact that more say they would prefer to read a children's book than to poke around in the sordid details of the Clinton's sex life is what I find curious and more plausibly evidence of a social desirability effect.

Joel Bloom wrote:

> Proof that people lie to pollsters, from a newly-released Gallup poll
> (courtesy of National Journal's Poll Track):
>
> Which new book would you, personally, be more interested in reading:
> "Living History" by Hillary Clinton or "Harry Potter and the Order of
the
> Phoenix" by J.K. Rowling?
>
> Living History 37%
> Harry Potter 48
> Both (vol.) *
> Neither (vol.) 14
> No opinion 1
>
> 37%? That seems a bit high, with no disrespect intended toward the
Junior
> Senator from my former home state.

> -- Joel

**
> Joel David Bloom Oregon Survey Research
Laboratory
> Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate 5245 University of
Oregon
> Telephone: 541-346-0891 Eugene, OR
97403-5245
> j bloom@uoregon.edu Facsimile:
541-346-0388

> <http://www.uoregon.edu/~jbloom>

<http://osrl.uoregon.edu>

>

**

>

> -----

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

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

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

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

Date: Tue, 17 Jun 2003 15:57:08 -0400

Reply-To: "Richard M. Perloff" <r.perloff@CSUOHIO.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Richard M. Perloff" <r.perloff@CSUOHIO.EDU>

Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability

Comments: To: "Donelan, Karen" <KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG>

In-Reply-To: <57531340B9FDD611A8580008026158F1010986B9@phsexch26.mgh.harvard.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Or it may mean that the public places more credulity in Harry's accounts of a fictional Voldemort than it does in Hillary's accounts of real-life people -- not entirely unreasonable given the believability of some of the New York senator's previous explanations (such as during Travelgate, Whitewater, and the health care fiasco).

-- Richard Perloff
Cleveland State

At 03:39 PM 6/17/2003 -0400, Donelan, Karen wrote:

>I believe this is a survey of adults 18+

>about personal preferences.

>No surprise to me.

>

>

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

>From: Steven Kull [<mailto:skull@PIPA.ORG>]

>Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2003 3:30 PM

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability

>

>

>The question was not whether they would want to read Hilary's book but

>whether
>they would be more interested in reading it than Harry Potter. The fact
>that
>more say they would prefer to read a children's book than to poke around in
>the sordid details of the Clinton's sex life is what I find curious and more
>plausibly evidence of a social desirability effect.

>Joel Bloom wrote:

>> Proof that people lie to pollsters, from a newly-released Gallup poll
>> (courtesy of National Journal's Poll Track):
>>
>> Which new book would you, personally, be more interested in reading:
>> "Living History" by Hillary Clinton or "Harry Potter and the Order of the
>> Phoenix" by J.K. Rowling?

>> Living History 37%
>> Harry Potter 48
>> Both (vol.) *
>> Neither (vol.) 14
>> No opinion 1

>> 37%? That seems a bit high, with no disrespect intended toward the Junior
>> Senator from my former home state.

>> -- Joel

>> *****

>> Joel David Bloom Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
>> Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate 5245 University of Oregon
>> Telephone: 541-346-0891 Eugene, OR 97403-5245
>> j bloom@uoregon.edu Facsimile: 541-346-0388
>> http://www.uoregon.edu/~jbloom http://osrl.uoregon.edu

>> *****

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

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

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

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

Date: Tue, 17 Jun 2003 16:33:18 -0400
Reply-To: pkmurray@rci.rutgers.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Patrick Murray <pkmurray@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU>
Organization: Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling
Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability
In-Reply-To: <FCDC58EC0F22D4119F0800A0C9E58995D249BD@exchange.chep.udel.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The response old option quandary...
If "neither" had been included in the actual question text, I'm sure the
marginals for both response options would have been lower (despite the
obvious merits of one of the books).

Patrick Murray
Eagleton Institute of Politics

|-----Original Message-----

|From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Ratledge, Edward
|Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2003 2:46 PM
|To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
|Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability

|I find it interesting that 85% of the people say they would be =
|interested
|in
|reading any book.

|Ed Ratledge
|University of Delaware

|-----Original Message-----

|From: Donelan, Karen [mailto:KDONELAN@PARTNERS.ORG]
|Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2003 3:39 PM
|To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
|Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability

|I believe this is a survey of adults 18+
|about personal preferences.
|No surprise to me.

|-----Original Message-----

|From: Steven Kull [mailto:skull@PIPA.ORG]
|Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2003 3:30 PM
|To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
|Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability

|The question was not whether they would want to read Hilary's book but
|whether
|they would be more interested in reading it than Harry Potter. The =
|fact
|that
|more say they would prefer to read a children's book than to poke =
|around in
|the sordid details of the Clinton's sex life is what I find curious and

more
plausibly evidence of a social desirability effect.

Joel Bloom wrote:

> Proof that people lie to pollsters, from a newly-released Gallup poll
> (courtesy of National Journal's Poll Track):
>
> Which new book would you, personally, be more interested in reading:
> "Living History" by Hillary Clinton or "Harry Potter and the Order of =

the
> Phoenix" by J.K. Rowling?

>
> Living History 37%
> Harry Potter 48
> Both (vol.) *
> Neither (vol.) 14
> No opinion 1

>
> 37%? That seems a bit high, with no disrespect intended toward the =
Junior
> Senator from my former home state.

> -- Joel

*****=
**

> Joel David Bloom Oregon Survey Research
Laboratory
> Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate 5245 University of
Oregon
> Telephone: 541-346-0891 Eugene, OR =
97403-
5245
> j bloom@uoregon.edu Facsimile: =
541-346-
0388
> <http://www.uoregon.edu/~jbloom>
<http://osrl.uoregon.edu>

*****=
**

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

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

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

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

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

Date: Tue, 17 Jun 2003 17:03:31 -0400
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability
In-Reply-To: <5.1.0.14.0.20030617155058.01ad3e90@popmail.csuohio.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

CBS News Poll on Hillary Rodham Clinton
See Results: <http://www.cbsnews.com/htdocs/hillary.pdf>

See story:
<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2003/06/15/opinion/polls/main558757.shtml>
"(CBS) Yes, Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton is a polarizing figure - but even her opponents admit she has some good qualities, according to a CBS News poll."

...

Mark David Richards

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Richard M. Perloff
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2003 3:57 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability

Or it may mean that the public places more credulity in Harry's accounts of a fictional Voldemort than it does in Hillary's accounts of real-life people -- not entirely unreasonable given the believability of some of the New York senator's previous explanations (such as during Travelgate, Whitewater, and the health care fiasco).

-- Richard Perloff
Cleveland State

At 03:39 PM 6/17/2003 -0400, Donelan, Karen wrote:

>I believe this is a survey of adults 18+
>about personal preferences.
>No surprise to me.

>

>

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

>From: Steven Kull [<mailto:skull@PIPA.ORG>]
>Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2003 3:30 PM

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability

>
>
>The question was not whether they would want to read Hilary's book but
>whether
>they would be more interested in reading it than Harry Potter. The
fact
>that
>more say they would prefer to read a children's book than to poke
around in
>the sordid details of the Clinton's sex life is what I find curious and
more
>plausibly evidence of a social desirability effect.

>Joel Bloom wrote:

>
>> Proof that people lie to pollsters, from a newly-released Gallup
poll
>> (courtesy of National Journal's Poll Track):

>>
>> Which new book would you, personally, be more interested in reading:
>> "Living History" by Hillary Clinton or "Harry Potter and the Order
of the
>> Phoenix" by J.K. Rowling?

>>
>> Living History 37%
>> Harry Potter 48
>> Both (vol.) *
>> Neither (vol.) 14
>> No opinion 1

>>
>> 37%? That seems a bit high, with no disrespect intended toward the
Junior
>> Senator from my former home state.

>>
>> -- Joel

>>
>>

**

>> Joel David Bloom Oregon Survey Research
Laboratory
>> Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate 5245 University of
Oregon
>> Telephone: 541-346-0891 Eugene, OR
97403-5245
>> j bloom@uoregon.edu Facsimile:
541-346-0388
>> http://www.uoregon.edu/~jbloom
http://osrl.uoregon.edu

>>

**

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability

The question was not whether they would want to read Hilary's book but whether they would be more interested in reading it than Harry Potter. The fact that more say they would prefer to read a children's book than to poke around the sordid details of the Clinton's sex life is what I find curious and plausibly evidence of a social desirability effect.

Joel Bloom wrote:
> Proof that people lie to pollsters, from a newly-released Gallup poll
> (courtesy of National Journal's Poll Track):

> Which new book would you, personally, be more interested in reading:
> "Living History" by Hillary Clinton or "Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix" by J.K. Rowling?

> Living History
History
37%

> Harry Potter
48%

> Both
(vol.)
*

> Neither
(vol.)
14%

> No opinion
1
> 37%? That seems a bit high, with no disrespect intended toward the Junior Senator from my former home state.

> -- Joel
>

Professeur,

Responsable des cycles sup=E9rieurs,

d=E9partement de sociologie,

Universit=E9 de Montr=E9al

C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,

Montr=E9al, Qu=E9bec, H3C 3J7

</body>
</html>

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

Date: Wed, 18 Jun 2003 00:03:02 -0700
Reply-To: Richard Perloff <r.perloff@CSUOHIO.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Richard Perloff <r.perloff@CSUOHIO.EDU>
Subject: Re: Lies, damn lies, and social desirability
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

It seems plausible that respondents were not lying to pollsters at all, but telling the truth. To many respondents, Harry Potter's accounts of battles with his fictitious foe -- Voldemort -- have more credulity than Hillary Clinton's battles with her real-life foes, as evidenced from collective memory of Travelgate hocus pocus and magical appearance of Whitewater documents in the Clinton White House. To the extent that book buying intent reflects perceived credibility of the book protagonist, the public looks very rational indeed.

Richard Perloff
Cleveland State

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

Date: Wed, 18 Jun 2003 00:19:09 -0400
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: Lies, damn lies, and social desirability
Comments: To: Richard Perloff <r.perloff@CSUOHIO.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <5.1.0.14.0.20030617235437.00a33d40@popmail.csuohio.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

More credulity maybe. More credibility, probably not.

With the apparent exception of some AAPOR members, most people pick their Summer reading for entertainment, not because they confuse the

contents with reality.

Jan Werner

Richard Perloff wrote:

> It seems plausible that respondents were not lying to
> pollsters at all, but telling the truth. To many respondents,
> Harry Potter's accounts of battles with his fictitious
> foe -- Voldemort -- have more credulity than Hillary
> Clinton's battles with her real-life foes, as evidenced
> from collective memory of Travelgate hocus pocus and
> magical appearance of Whitewater documents in the
> Clinton White House. To the extent that book buying intent
> reflects perceived credibility of the book protagonist, the
> public looks very rational indeed.

>
> Richard Perloff
> Cleveland State

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

>
>

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

Date: Wed, 18 Jun 2003 09:40:23 -0400
Reply-To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: Lies, Damn Lies and Social Desirability
Comments: To: jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

In a message dated 6/17/2003 3:31:07 PM Central Daylight Time,
jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM writes:

>
> Have you read any of the Harry Potter books? They're great! (and quite
> honestly, I think we all may know more about the Clinton sex life than
> any of us were slotted for at birth).
>

Interesting how even pollsters can't resist generalizing from our own
experience. I, on the other hand, read the first Harry Potter book and found
it
dreadful. But I've purchased the Clinton book, not for the sex part but for
how
she made the decision to run for Senator during a particularly nasty public
relations nightmare. JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Des Moines, Iowa 50312
515.271.5700

visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

E-mail address for purposes of this list: JAnnSelzer@aol.com; otherwise,
contact JASelzer@SelzerCo.com.

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

Date: Wed, 18 Jun 2003 08:45:37 -0500
Reply-To: Barry Feinberg <bfeinberg@CUSTOMRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Barry Feinberg <bfeinberg@CUSTOMRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Re: Lies, damn lies, and social desirability
Comments: To: jwerner@JWDP.COM
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

My own reading of the Gallup question leads me to conclude that it should not be taken seriously. I think it is basically a "joke question" - yes, that's a new question genre. If it were a serious question, the Clinton book would have been listed along with other memoirs of presidential wives and not along with a Harry Potter book. It reminds me of another joke question from elementary school days.... "Would you rather walk to school or take your lunch?"

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

>>> Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM> 06/17/03 11:19PM >>>
More credulity maybe. More credibility, probably not.

With the apparent exception of some AAPOR members, most people pick their Summer reading for entertainment, not because they confuse the contents with reality.

Jan Werner

Richard Perloff wrote:

> It seems plausible that respondents were not lying to
> pollsters at all, but telling the truth. To many respondents,

> Harry Potter's accounts of battles with his fictitious
> foe -- Voldemort -- have more credulity than Hillary
> Clinton's battles with her real-life foes, as evidenced
> from collective memory of Travelgate hocus pocus and
> magical appearance of Whitewater documents in the
> Clinton White House. To the extent that book buying intent
> reflects perceived credibility of the book protagonist, the
> public looks very rational indeed.

>
> Richard Perloff
> Cleveland State

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

>
>
> -----
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.

=====

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

=====

Date: Wed, 18 Jun 2003 10:06:55 -0400
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Like I said - everyone is frugging
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

By the way does AAPOR have an official statement on Fund raising in the guise of surveying? I have been referring reporters to the 2003 push poll statement and I'd wonder if I have that option on this topic.

Byron York
No worries about terror? Donate to Hillary
<http://www.thehill.com/york/061803.aspx>

Forget about her book. If you're looking for truly revealing words from Sen. Hillary Rodham Clinton (D-N.Y.), check out her latest fundraising

appeal.

"Please join HILLPAC," Clinton writes in a mass mailing for her political action committee.

SNIP

In the mailing, Clinton includes a "2003 Critical National Issues Survey," which, among other things, asks contributors to rate Republicans and Democrats on the issues of Social Security, the environment, the economy, reproductive rights and education.

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

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

Date: Wed, 18 Jun 2003 10:13:54 -0400
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Re: Lies, damn lies, and social desirability
In-Reply-To: <03Jun18.083942cdt.119181@gateway.cresearch.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

It appears that Gallup also asked this about her book:

"The Gallup poll asked where Hillary's book should go in the bookstore - the history section "because it is as accurate as most history books," the political section "because it is so political in nature," or the fiction section "because it is so inaccurate?" Half said the political section, but 22 percent said the fiction section - beating out the history section's 16 percent."

From:
<http://www.msnbc.com/news/927935.asp?0cv=OB10>

--

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 Barry Feinberg

> Sent: Wednesday, June 18, 2003 9:46 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Lies, damn lies, and social desirability

>

> My own reading of the Gallup question leads me to conclude that it

> should not be taken seriously. I think it is basically a "joke

> question" - yes, that's a new question genre. If it were a serious

> question, the Clinton book would have been listed along with other

> memoirs of presidential wives and not along with a Harry Potter book.

> It reminds me of another joke question from elementary school

> days...."Would you rather walk to school or take your lunch?"

>

> 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

>

> >>> Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM> 06/17/03 11:19PM >>>

> More credulity maybe. More credibility, probably not.

>

> With the apparent exception of some AAPOR members, most people pick

> their Summer reading for entertainment, not because they confuse the

> contents with reality.

>

> Jan Werner

>

>

> Richard Perloff wrote:

>> It seems plausible that respondents were not lying to

>> pollsters at all, but telling the truth. To many respondents,

>> Harry Potter's accounts of battles with his fictitious

>> foe -- Voldemort -- have more credulity than Hillary

>> Clinton's battles with her real-life foes, as evidenced

>> from collective memory of Travelgate hocus pocus and

>> magical appearance of Whitewater documents in the

>> Clinton White House. To the extent that book buying intent

>> reflects perceived credibility of the book protagonist, the

>> public looks very rational indeed.

>>

>> Richard Perloff

>> Cleveland State

>>

>>

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

>>

>>

>>

>
> -----
> 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.
> =====

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

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

Date: Wed, 18 Jun 2003 10:29:19 -0400
Reply-To: Stephanie Berg <stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Stephanie Berg <stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET>
Subject: Re: Lies, damn lies, and social desirability
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Having made a jump from public opinion research to pure marketing research, I'd like to point out this question does not reflect purchase intent (a more realistic version of intent to read the book, though possibly running more conservative due to lending/borrowing practices). I wouldn't read too seriously into "interest in reading" without knowing their purchase intent because you cannot equate "interest in reading" to "intend to read". I strongly suspect that purchase intent would have been significantly lower for both.

=====
Stephanie Berg
stephanie.berg@verizon.net
----- Original Message -----
From: Leo G. Simonetta
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Sent: Wednesday, June 18, 2003 10:13 AM
Subject: Re: Lies, damn lies, and social desirability

It appears that Gallup also asked this about her book:

"The Gallup poll asked where Hillary's book should go in the bookstore - the history section "because it is as accurate as most history books," the political section "because it is so political in nature," or the fiction section "because it is so inaccurate?" Half said the political section, but 22 percent said the fiction section - beating out the

history section's 16 percent."

From:

<http://www.msnbc.com/news/927935.asp?0cv=OB10>

--

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 Barry Feinberg

> Sent: Wednesday, June 18, 2003 9:46 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Lies, damn lies, and social desirability

>

> My own reading of the Gallup question leads me to conclude that it
> should not be taken seriously. I think it is basically a "joke
> question" - yes, that's a new question genre. If it were a serious
> question, the Clinton book would have been listed along with other
> memoirs of presidential wives and not along with a Harry Potter book.
> It reminds me of another joke question from elementary school
> days...."Would you rather walk to school or take your lunch?"

>

> 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

>

> >>> Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM> 06/17/03 11:19PM >>>

> More credulity maybe. More credibility, probably not.

>

> With the apparent exception of some AAPOR members, most people pick
> their Summer reading for entertainment, not because they confuse the
> contents with reality.

>

> Jan Werner

>

>

> Richard Perloff wrote:

>> It seems plausible that respondents were not lying to
>> pollsters at all, but telling the truth. To many respondents,
>> Harry Potter's accounts of battles with his fictitious
>> foe -- Voldemort -- have more credulity than Hillary
>> Clinton's battles with her real-life foes, as evidenced

>> from collective memory of Travelgate hocus pocus and
>> magical appearance of Whitewater documents in the
>> Clinton White House. To the extent that book buying intent
>> reflects perceived credibility of the book protagonist, the
>> public looks very rational indeed.

>>
>> Richard Perloff
>> Cleveland State

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

>>
>>
>>
>> -----
> 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.
> =====

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

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

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

Date: Wed, 18 Jun 2003 10:39:57 -0400
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Subject: Re: Lies, damn lies, and social desirability
In-Reply-To: <002601c335a6\$022d43b0\$08a2ad0a@sbergltt30>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

washingtonpost.com

That Won't be Crow on Carlson's Plate
By Lloyd Grove
Wednesday, June 18, 2003; Page C03

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A6689-2003Jun17.html>

It's hard to see how Tucker Carlson can get out of it.

On repeated occasions in the past six weeks, the CNN "Crossfire" host has vowed on the air to eat his shoes if Hillary Rodham Clinton's book sells a million copies. He has also pledged to eat his shoes if Simon & Schuster recoups its \$8 million advance. Sometimes he has promised to eat his tie, too, and to buy co-host Paul Begala dinners for a month.

"If they make \$8 million on that book, I will eat my shoes," Carlson declared on April 28 about "Living History," the New York junior senator's memoirs. "I promise that right here." The next night, Carlson vowed: "If this woman sells a million copies, I'll eat my shoes and my tie."

On May 16, Carlson reaffirmed that pledge to Begala, and added: "Literally, I will pay for your dinner for a month if she makes \$8 million." On June 5, Carlson insisted that if Clinton's book "does sell more than a million copies, I'll eat my shoes here on 'Crossfire.' "

On June 11, Carlson declared: "If she sells a million copies of this book, I'll eat my shoes and my tie. I will." On June 12, Carlson repeated: "If she sells a million copies, I will eat them."

But last Friday, the day Simon & Schuster announced that Clinton had already sold 600,000 copies, Carlson didn't sound quite so confident. "There are not 400,000 more gullible people in this nation," he said.

Yesterday he told us: "I feel a little sick to my stomach just thinking about it." In a self-pitying tone, Carlson added: "I am probably going to end up being punished for attempting to be honorable. I'm still betting on America, but I'm probably going to end up like Al Gore. I'm going to contest the results and demand recounts, but ultimately I'm going to give in and do the right thing."

Carlson predicted that he'll soon be consulting fetishistic Web sites for edible footwear. But he won't eat his tie. "There's only so much humiliation one man can take." As for Begala's month of dinners, Carlson said: "They'll be Mrs. Lee's tuna sandwiches."

Simon & Schuster spokeswoman Victoria Meyer told us: "When the time comes, we'll be only too happy to send Tucker a bottle of steak sauce."

Mark David Richards

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Stephanie Berg
Sent: Wednesday, June 18, 2003 10:29 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Lies, damn lies, and social desirability

Having made a jump from public opinion research to pure marketing research,
I'd like to point out this question does not reflect purchase intent (a
more

realistic version of intent to read the book, though possibly running more conservative due to lending/borrowing practices). I wouldn't read too seriously into "interest in reading" without knowing their purchase intent because you cannot equate "interest in reading" to "intend to read". I strongly suspect that purchase intent would have been significantly lower for both.

=====
Stephanie Berg
stephanie.berg@verizon.net

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

From: Leo G. Simonetta

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Sent: Wednesday, June 18, 2003 10:13 AM

Subject: Re: Lies, damn lies, and social desirability

It appears that Gallup also asked this about her book:

"The Gallup poll asked where Hillary's book should go in the bookstore

-
the history section "because it is as accurate as most history books,"
the political section "because it is so political in nature," or the
fiction section "because it is so inaccurate?" Half said the political
section, but 22 percent said the fiction section - beating out the
history section's 16 percent."

From:

<http://www.msnbc.com/news/927935.asp?0cv=OB10>

--

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 Barry Feinberg

> Sent: Wednesday, June 18, 2003 9:46 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Lies, damn lies, and social desirability

>
> My own reading of the Gallup question leads me to conclude that it
> should not be taken seriously. I think it is basically a "joke
> question" - yes, that's a new question genre. If it were a serious
> question, the Clinton book would have been listed along with other
> memoirs of presidential wives and not along with a Harry Potter

book.

> It reminds me of another joke question from elementary school

> days...."Would you rather walk to school or take your lunch?"

>

> 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

>

> >>> Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM> 06/17/03 11:19PM >>>

> More credulity maybe. More credibility, probably not.

>

> With the apparent exception of some AAPOR members, most people pick

> their Summer reading for entertainment, not because they confuse the

> contents with reality.

>

> Jan Werner

>

>

> Richard Perloff wrote:

>> It seems plausible that respondents were not lying to

>> pollsters at all, but telling the truth. To many respondents,

>> Harry Potter's accounts of battles with his fictitious

>> foe -- Voldemort -- have more credulity than Hillary

>> Clinton's battles with her real-life foes, as evidenced

>> from collective memory of Travelgate hocus pocus and

>> magical appearance of Whitewater documents in the

>> Clinton White House. To the extent that book buying intent

>> reflects perceived credibility of the book protagonist, the

>> public looks very rational indeed.

>>

>> Richard Perloff

>> Cleveland State

>>

>> -----

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

>>

>>

>

> -----

> 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.

> =====

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

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

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

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

Date: Wed, 18 Jun 2003 10:51:45 -0400
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Organization: Rider University
Subject: Re: Lies, damn lies, and social desirability
Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The interesting issue here is how many people could have read the book at this point to answer "the fiction section?" The question ranks up there with one that Michael Moore once commissioned that found that a majority of Perot voters in 1992 thought that "If dolphins were so smart, they'd be able to get out of those nets."

"Leo G. Simonetta" wrote:

> It appears that Gallup also asked this about her book:
>
> "The Gallup poll asked where Hillary's book should go in the bookstore -
> the history section "because it is as accurate as most history books,"
> the political section "because it is so political in nature," or the
> fiction section "because it is so inaccurate?" Half said the political
> section, but 22 percent said the fiction section - beating out the
> history section's 16 percent."

>
> From:
> <http://www.msnbc.com/news/927935.asp?0cv=OB10>

> --
> 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 Barry Feinberg

>> Sent: Wednesday, June 18, 2003 9:46 AM
>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>> Subject: Re: Lies, damn lies, and social desirability

>>
>> My own reading of the Gallup question leads me to conclude that it
>> should not be taken seriously. I think it is basically a "joke
>> question" - yes, that's a new question genre. If it were a serious
>> question, the Clinton book would have been listed along with other
>> memoirs of presidential wives and not along with a Harry Potter book.
>> It reminds me of another joke question from elementary school
>> days...."Would you rather walk to school or take your lunch?"

>>
>> 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

>>
>> >>> Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM> 06/17/03 11:19PM >>>
>> More credulity maybe. More credibility, probably not.

>>
>> With the apparent exception of some AAPOR members, most people pick
>> their Summer reading for entertainment, not because they confuse the
>> contents with reality.

>>
>> Jan Werner

>> _____
>>

>> Richard Perloff wrote:
>>> It seems plausible that respondents were not lying to
>>> pollsters at all, but telling the truth. To many respondents,
>>> Harry Potter's accounts of battles with his fictitious
>>> foe -- Voldemort -- have more credulity than Hillary
>>> Clinton's battles with her real-life foes, as evidenced
>>> from collective memory of Travelgate hocus pocus and
>>> magical appearance of Whitewater documents in the
>>> Clinton White House. To the extent that book buying intent
>>> reflects perceived credibility of the book protagonist, the
>>> public looks very rational indeed.

>>>
>>> Richard Perloff
>>> Cleveland State

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

>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> _____
>>> 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.

>> =====
>>

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

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

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

Date: Wed, 18 Jun 2003 17:55:15 +0300
Reply-To: "Vladimir I. Paniotto" <paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Vladimir I. Paniotto" <paniotto@KMIS.KIEV.UA>
Organization: KIIS
Subject: Rules and restrictions in the surveys of children
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I am looking for any reference about the methodological peculiarities and special restrictions in sociological and marketing surveys of children and young people. Any help is deeply appreciated. Especially if it's possible to find something on line (to find your books in Kiev is not easier than my books in Ukrainian in USA).

Volodimir Paniotto, Director of KIIS
(Kiev International Institute of Sociology)
Milchakova 1/18, kv.11, Kiev-02002, UKRAINE
Phone (380-44)-463-5868,238-2567,238-2568 (office)
Phone-fax (380-44)-238-2567, 238-2568
Phone (380-44)-517-3949 (home)
E-mail: paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua
<http://www.kiis.com.ua>

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

Date: Wed, 18 Jun 2003 13:47:40 -0400
Reply-To: Erik Nisbet <ecn1@CORNELL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Erik Nisbet <ecn1@CORNELL.EDU>

Subject: Previous Research on Sample Types and Weight
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

I was wondering if anyone could direct me to ANY previously published or unpublished research or information that compared the use of the following types of samples in telephone survey research - and issues regarding comparative weighting as well?

A. Listed Household B. Listed-Assisted RDD C. RDD

I was at the AAPOR conference session that compared RDD and Listed - but I wanted to know if there was more out there on the subject. Any help or assistance would be appreciated.

Thanks

Erik

Erik C. Nisbet

Manager - Field Operations & Empire State Poll
Survey Research Institute (formerly CAST)
B12 Ives Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853
ph: 607-255-0375
email: ecn1@cornell.edu

M.S. Candidate
Political Communication & Public Opinion
Department of Communication
Cornell University
338 Kennedy Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853-4203

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

Date: Wed, 18 Jun 2003 15:09:46 -0400
Reply-To: HOneill536@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Harry O'Neill <HOneill536@AOL.COM>
Subject: Hillary's book
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I'm sure glad that Hillary wrote her book. Otherwise I would not get so much stimulating e-mail from AAPOR.

Harry O'Neill

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

Date: Wed, 18 Jun 2003 15:41:09 -0400
Reply-To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>
Subject: Re: Previous Research on Sample Types and Weight
Comments: To: Erik Nisbet <ecn1@CORNELL.EDU>
Comments: cc: "hubbard, ryan" <rh9k@virginia.edu>,
"Hartman, David" <deh9q@virginia.edu>
In-Reply-To:
<5.1.0.14.2.20030618133404.01990688@postoffice2.mail.cornell.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Erik:
In researching the "RDD v. Listed" paper we gave at AAPOR in Nashville (which you kindly mention in your message), Dave Hartman, Ryan Hubbard and I did find a few relevant articles.

I'm copying this to the whole list because if anybody out there knows of other articles or papers making these comparisons, we sure would like to know about them. Thanks!

References

- Blankenship, AB. 1977. "Listed versus Unlisted Numbers in Telephone-Survey Samples." *Journal of Advertising Research* 17: 39-42.
- Gilbert, Gregg H. DDS, R. Paul Duncan, PhD, Andrew M. Kulley, PhD, Raymond T. Coward, PHD, and Marc W. Heft, DMD, PhD. 1997. "Evaluation of bias and logistics in a survey of adults at increased risk for oral health decrements." *Journal of Public Health Dentistry*, Winter: 48-58.
- Landenberger, Bryce D., Robert M. Groves, and James M. Lepkowski. 1984. "A Comparison of Listed and Randomly Dialed Telephone Numbers." *ASA Proceedings of the Section on Survey Methods*, pp. 280-284.
- Psaty, Bruce M., Allen Cheadle, Susan Curry, Thomas McKenna, Thomas D. Koepsell, Thomas Wickizer, Michael VonKorff, Paula Diehr, Edward B. Perrin, and Edward H. Wagner. 1991. "Sampling elderly in the community: A comparison of

commercial telemarketing lists and random digit dialing techniques for assessing health behaviors and health status." American Journal of Epidemiology, 134: 96-106.

Schejbal, Judith A. and Paul J. Lavrakas. 1994. "Coverage error and cost issues in small area telephone surveys." American Statistical Association: 1994 Proceedings of the Section on Survey Methods, 1287-1292.

Traugott, Michael W, Robert M. Groves, and James M. Lepkowski. 1987). "Using dual frame designs to reduce nonresponse in telephone surveys." Public Opinion Quarterly 51:522-39.

Wilson, David H., Gary J. Starr, Anne W. Taylor, and Eleonara Dal Grande (1999) "Random digit dialing and electronic white pages samples compared: demographic profiles and health estimates." Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, 23: 627-633.

--On Wednesday, June 18, 2003 1:47 PM -0400 Erik Nisbet <ecn1@CORNELL.EDU> wrote:

> I was wondering if anyone could direct me to ANY previously published or
> unpublished research or information that compared the use of the following
> types of samples in telephone survey research - and issues regarding
> comparative weighting as well?
>
> A. Listed Household B. Listed-Assisted RDD C. RDD
>
> I was at the AAPOR conference session that compared RDD and Listed - but I
> wanted to know if there was more out there on the subject. Any help or
> assistance would be appreciated.
>
> Thanks
>
> Erik
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Erik C. Nisbet
>
> Manager - Field Operations & Empire State Poll

cmllyckgeW91IHdvdWxkIGxpa2UgdG8gc2hhcmUsIHRoYXQgd291bGQgYmUgZ3JIYXQuICANCg0K
IA0KDQpBbHNvLCBpZiB5b3Ugd291bGQgYmUgYXZhaWxhYmxiIHRvIGJvdW5jZSBzb21lIGlkZWZz
IG9mZiBvZiwgeW91IGNhbiBILW1haWwgbWUgYXQgV2Fuc2lua0B1aXVjLmVkdS4NCg0KIA0KDQog
ICAg
ICAg
ICAg
c2lua0KDQpQcm9mZXXNzb3Igb2YgQnVzaW5lc3MgQWRtaW5pc3RyYXRpb24sb2YgQWR2ZXJ0aXNp
bmcsIA0KDQpvZiBOdXRyaXRpb25hbCBTY2llbmNlCBhbmQgb2YgQWdyaWN1bHRlcmFsIGFuZCBD
b25zdW11ciBTY2llbmNlQoNCjM1MCBxb2hsZXJzIEhhbGwNCg0KVVW5pdmVyc2l0eSBvZiBjbGxp
bm9pcw0KDQpDaGFtcGFpZ24sIEIMICA2MTgyMA0KDQoyMTctMjQ0LTAyMDgNCg0KRmF4IDlxNy0y
NDQtNzk2OQ0KDQpXYW5zaW5rQHVPdWMuZWR1IDxtYWlsdG86V2Fuc2lua0B1aXVjLmVkdT4gDQoN
Cnd3dy5Gb29kUHN5Y2hvbG9neS5jb20NCg0KIA0KDQogDQoNCg==

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Thu, 19 Jun 2003 08:35:33 -0400
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <cporter@HP.UFL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Colleen Porter <cporter@HP.UFL.EDU>
Subject: Re: Previous Research on Sample Types and Weight
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

As a note, my partner in crime--um, research--is Paul Duncan, whose paper appears second on Tom's list. He was very gratified to see that it is of interest to others, because he had to fight very hard to get it published at all. Editors kept saying, "But it is just about your methodology."

The wonderful thing about AAPOR is that we understand it isn't, "just methodology." We all appreciate how methodology impacts results.

This is in contrast to some of my other colleagues, who believe that "data comes on disks," without any regard for how it was collected.

Colleen
(who has a copy of Harry Potter 5 pre-ordered)

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/273-6068, fax: 273-6075
University of Florida
Department of Health Services Administration
Location: 101 Newell Drive, Rm. 4136
US Mail: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

>>> "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU> 6/18/2003
3:41:09 PM >>>
Erik:

In researching the "RDD v. Listed" paper we gave at AAPOR in Nashville (which you kindly mention in your message), Dave Hartman, Ryan Hubbard and I did find a few relevant articles.

I'm copying this to the whole list because if anybody out there knows of other articles or papers making these comparisons, we sure would like to know about them. Thanks!

References

Blankenship, AB. 1977. "Listed versus Unlisted Numbers in Telephone-Survey Samples." *Journal of Advertising Research* 17: 39-42.

Gilbert, Gregg H. DDS, R. Paul Duncan, PhD, Andrew M. Kulley, PhD, Raymond T.

Coward, PHD, and Marc W. Heft, DMD, PhD. 1997. "Evaluation of bias and logistics in a survey of adults at increased risk for oral health decrements." *Journal of Public Health Dentistry*, Winter: 48-58.

Landenberger, Bryce D., Robert M. Groves, and James M. Lepkowski. 1984.

"A Comparison of Listed and Randomly Dialed Telephone Numbers." *ASA Proceedings of the Section on Survey Methods*, pp. 280-284.

Psaty, Bruce M., Allen Cheadle, Susan Curry, Thomas McKenna, Thomas D. Koepsell, Thomas Wickizer, Michael VonKorff, Paula Diehr, Edward B. Perrin, and Edward H.

Wagner. 1991. "Sampling elderly in the community: A comparison of commercial telemarketing lists and random digit dialing techniques for assessing health behaviors and health status." *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 134: 96-106.

Schejbal, Judith A. and Paul J. Lavrakas. 1994. "Coverage error and cost issues in small area telephone surveys." *American Statistical Association: 1994 Proceedings of the Section on Survey Methods*, 1287-1292.

Traugott, Michael W, Robert M. Groves, and James M. Lepkowski. 1987). "Using dual frame designs to reduce nonresponse in telephone surveys." *Public Opinion*

Quarterly 51:522-39.

Wilson, David H., Gary J. Starr, Anne W. Taylor, and Eleonara Dal Grande
(1999)
"Random digit dialing and electronic white pages samples compared: demographic profiles and health estimates." Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, 23: 627-633.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Thu, 19 Jun 2003 09:21:19 -0400
Reply-To: "Lanham, Carla" <lanham@RTI.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Lanham, Carla" <lanham@RTI.ORG>
Subject: Unsubscribe to AAPORNET
MIME-version: 1.0

To Whom It May Concern:

Thank you for enrolling me in AAPORNET however I am not interested in being a part of this email list at this time. I will be listed under Carla Bann, email: lanham@rti.org. I'd appreciate it very much if you would take my name off this distribution list. I will be happy to enroll again as time allows.

Thanks again for your understanding.

Carla L. Lanham

RTI- Statistics Research

3040 Cornwallis Rd

RTP, NC 27709

Phone (919)316-3888

Fax (919) 541-6722

email: <<mailto:lanham@rti.org>> lanham@rti.org

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Thu, 19 Jun 2003 09:32:26 -0400
Reply-To: "Lanham, Carla" <lanham@RTI.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Lanham, Carla" <lanham@RTI.ORG>
Subject: Recall: Unsubscribe to AAPORNET
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

Lanham, Carla would like to recall the message, "Unsubscribe to AAPORNET".

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Thu, 19 Jun 2003 20:29:54 -0700
Reply-To: "Don A. Dillman" <dillman@WSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Don A. Dillman" <dillman@WSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Hillary's book
Comments: To: HOneill536@AOL.COM
In-Reply-To: <129.2c8875b9.2c2212fa@aol.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I'm coming into this a little late, and may have missed it, but don't recall anything about the content of the book. I've been reading it on airplanes this week and am struck by two things. It's a fascinating read, that tells a lot about the influences on Hillary Rodham Clinton's life. I am also struck with how much further along I might be had I not been interrupted so many times by people wanting to know what I thought about it. I don't think I have ever been asked so many questions about anything I have been reading on airplanes (which may say more about my usual choice of books than anything else, I suppose). Anyway, in a book shop in Tampa this morning I saw a huge stack of old Harry Potter books, and also noticed that "Living History" wasn't on the table with other recently released books. Wondering why, I asked a clerk if they had copies. "Are you kidding," she replied. "They sold out immediately and it's back ordered, sir. We hope we'll get more soon." Short of some wizardly action I don't think Harry Potter or the editorial comments I've seen are going to keep this book from selling a lot. Don

Don A. Dillman
Professor, Departments of Sociology, Rural Sociology
and Social Economic Sciences Research Center
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington 99164-4014
<http://survey.sesrc.wsu.edu/dillman/>
509-335-1511, fax 509-35-0116
dillman@wsu.edu

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Harry O'Neill

Sent: Wednesday, June 18, 2003 12:10 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Hillary's book

I'm sure glad that Hillary wrote her book. Otherwise I would not get so much stimulating e-mail from AAPOR.

Harry O'Neill

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

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

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

=====
Date: Fri, 20 Jun 2003 08:52:57 -0400

Reply-To: Ed Freeland <efreelan@PRINCETON.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Ed Freeland <efreelan@PRINCETON.EDU>

Subject: Job Posting - Princeton University

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Job Opportunity at Princeton University

The Survey Research Center (SRC) at Princeton University is seeking applications for the position of Assistant Director. The Assistant Director is responsible for managing survey research projects conducted by the SRC, supervision of the SRC biweekly, casual hourly, and student employee staff, and management of the SRC's finances and facilities. The Assistant Director works collaboratively with the SRC's Director and Associate Director and with faculty, students and administrators who want to design and implement research projects based on interviews conducted by telephone, mail or over the Internet. The Assistant Director will also assist in planning lectures or symposia to be sponsored by the SRC. The SRC has a 12-station telephone interviewing facility and a staff of 50 students who are employed as part-time interviewers.

This position requires a bachelor's or higher level degree in a social science field, at least three years' experience in survey research or equivalent project management; at least three years' experience at supervising telephone interviewers; excellent interpersonal and communication skills; experience using all four major MS Office applications (i.e., Word, Excel, Access, and PowerPoint); experience using WinCATI and Sensus software (or equivalent survey center software); and, experience with statistical analysis software such as STATA, SAS or SPSS.

Please send your cover letter and resume to jobs@princeton.edu. Please include the job title (Assistant Director of the SRC) and requisition number (03-0003001) in the subject line. For more information, please go to http://jobs.princeton.edu/openjobs/pu_jobdesc.asp?ReqNo=03-0003001.

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

Date: Fri, 20 Jun 2003 10:14:59 -0400
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Arianna cites a poll without slamming it!
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

HUFFINGTON: WMDs and the Psychology of Fanaticism

<http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=16204>

Excerpt

"Gustav le Bon, a social scientist known for his crowd psychology theories, has stressed the importance of repetition as a weapon in the fanatic's arsenal. Repetition breeds blind acceptance and contagion.

'Ideas, sentiments, emotions and beliefs,' writes le Bon, 'possess in crowds a contagious power as intense as that of microbes.' As James Moore, co-author of 'Bush's Brain,' says, 'If the president says it over and over enough, people will believe it, just as Karl Rove got him to say over and over that Saddam Hussein was involved in 9/11.'

The technique was so successful that a poll taken by the Pew Center in 2002 showed that 66 percent of Americans believed that Hussein and bin Laden were both behind the attacks. In the words of that giant banner that Rove had placed behind the president following his Top Gun landing on the USS Abraham Lincoln: 'Mission Accomplished.' "

Social psychology in op-ed pieces, what is the world coming to?

--

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

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

Date: Fri, 20 Jun 2003 11:08:53 -0400
Reply-To: Richard Clark <clark@CVIOG.UGA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Richard Clark <clark@CVIOG.UGA.EDU>
Subject: Job Opportunity
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8BIT

Research Coordinator II
Survey Research and Data Services Unit
Carl Vinson Institute of Government
University of Georgia

The Carl Vinson Institute of Government invites applications for a Research Coordinator in the Survey Research and Data Services Unit of the Policy Research and Analysis Division. Review of applications will begin immediately and continue until a qualified applicant is hired. This position seeks applicants with a Masters degree, survey research experience and academic training in the Social Sciences.

The successful candidate will be familiar with questionnaire design, basic sampling methods, and data analysis. Familiarity with SPSS is essential. The selected candidate will work in the Survey Research and Data Services Unit, assisting faculty and working with external clients on survey research projects.

To apply, go to the University of Georgia Human Resources web site (http://www.busfin.uga.edu/employment/joblist_research.html#lab) – see job #06-073. For more information about the Carl Vinson Institute of Government, visit our website (<http://www.cviog.uga.edu>).

The University of Georgia is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution.

--

Richard L. Clark, Ph.D.
Manager of Survey Research & Data Services Unit
Director of Peach State Poll
Carl Vinson Institute of Government
University of Georgia
201 N. Milledge Avenue
Athens, GA 30602
(706) 542-2736

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

Date: Fri, 20 Jun 2003 14:56:40 -0400
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>

Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Kinsley column on polls & WMD
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

This appears in today's Washington Post and in yesterday's Slate.

I don't necessarily agree with Mr. Kinsley, and he takes a while to get to the point, but since he raises issues that have been debated at some length among AAPOR members, it is worth reading the column through.

Jan Werner

washingtonpost.com

Untethered to Reality

By Michael Kinsley

Friday, June 20, 2003; Page A25

Why are we even bothering to keep looking for those weapons of mass destruction in Iraq? At this point, what difference does it make whether we find them? Trying to find them serves two ostensible purposes: One is to prevent them from being used, and the other is to settle the argument about whether they exist. But neither purpose really applies any longer.

As we are belatedly noticing, other nations are closer to having usable nuclear weapons than Iraq. The claim was that nuclear and other weapons were especially dangerous in the hands of a malevolent madman like Saddam Hussein. Now Hussein is gone. Iraq is not quite yet the gentle, loving democracy promised by Bush administration propaganda. But its government, or lack of one, is hardly the rogue nuclear power we must fear the most.

As for settling the argument about WMD as a justification for the war, that argument is already settled. It's obvious that the Bush administration had no good evidence to back up its dire warnings. And even if months of desperate searching ultimately turns up a thing or two, this will hardly vindicate the administration's claim to have known it all along. The administration itself in effect now agrees that actually finding the weapons doesn't matter. It asserts that the war can be justified on humanitarian grounds alone and that Hussein may have destroyed those weapons on his way out the door. (Exactly what we wanted him to do, by the way, now repositioned as a dirty trick.) These are not the sorts of things you say if you know those weapons exist. And if it doesn't matter that they don't seem to exist, it cannot logically matter if they do.

The general citizenry doesn't seem to care whether those weapons are discovered. Americans tell pollsters they do not mind that WMD

haven't materialized and are not even withholding judgment while the search goes on. Some now believe the war was justified on other grounds. Some believe the weapons exist despite the lack of evidence. Some actually believe that WMD have been discovered. And some even believe that the Bush administration outright lied about WMD, but they don't care.

According to a Harris poll out Wednesday, a majority of Americans still think the Bush administration was telling the truth before the war when it said it had hard evidence of WMD. A Knight Ridder poll released last weekend reports that a third of the populace believes the weapons have been discovered. A Fox News poll last week found that almost half of Americans believe that the administration was "intentionally misleading" about Iraq's weapons, but more than two-thirds think the war was justified anyway. A Gallup poll released Wednesday concludes that almost 9 out of 10 Americans still think Hussein had or was close to having WMD.

By now, WMD have taken on a mythic role in which fact doesn't play much of a part. The phrase itself -- "weapons of mass destruction" -- is more like an incantation than a description of anything. The term is a new one to almost everybody, and the concern it officially embodies was on almost no one's radar screen until recently. Unofficially, "weapons of mass destruction" are to George W. Bush what fairies were to Peter Pan. He wants us to say, "We DO believe in weapons of mass destruction. We DO believe. We DO." If we all believe hard enough, they will be there. And it's working.

The most striking thing about polls such as these isn't how many people believe or disbelieve some unproven factual assertion or prediction but how few give the only correct answer, which is "Don't know." In the Fox News poll, vast majorities expressed certitude one way or the other about the existence of WMD in Iraq, the likelihood of peace in the Middle East and so on. Those who voted "not sure" (an even more tempting cop-out than the pollsters' usual "don't know") rarely broke 20 percent and usually hovered around 10. Four-fifths or more were sure about everything.

As someone who manufactures opinions for a living, it is my job to be sure. And my standards for the ingredients of an opinion are necessarily low. There may be a few ancient pundits such as George Will who still follow the traditional guild practices: days in the library making notes on index cards, a half-dozen lunches at the club with key sources, an hour spent alone in silence with a martini and one's thoughts -- and only then does a perfectly modulated opinion take its lovely shape. Most of us have no time for that anymore. It's a quick surf around the 'Net, a flip of the coin and out pops an opinion, ready to go except perhaps for a bit of extra last-minute coarsening.

Still, even the most modern major generalist among the professional commentariat likes to have a little something in the way of knowledge as he or she scatters opinions like bird seed. The general public, or at least the part of it that deals with

pollsters, is not so cowardly. Most people, it seems, will happily state a belief on a question of fact that nobody knows the answer to, then just as happily do a double back flip from that shaky platform into a pool of opinions about which they are "sure."

Pollsters themselves, and the media that report their findings deadpan, are partly responsible for this. Every news report about a poll result reinforces the impression that opinion untethered to reality is valid or even patriotic (and to be "not sure" is shameful). The modern pundit culture is also partly to blame, I suppose, with its emphasis on televised argumentation. Viewers do not always grasp the difference between low standards and no standards.

Are there weapons of mass destruction in Iraq? Sure there are -- in every sense that matters, reality not being one of them.

© 2003 The Washington Post Company

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

Date: Fri, 20 Jun 2003 17:57:55 -0400
Reply-To: jtanur@NOTES.CC.SUNYSB.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Judith Tanur <jtanur@NOTES.CC.SUNYSB.EDU>
Subject: meeting survey
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

The following is something I've tried to send back to knowledge networks and to aapor directly after getting a reminder that I was being a nonrespondent to the meeting survey. I don't know how to do any better....

I've written twice to say that I can't get past the first matrix question. There is no scroll bar, and the advice I was given, to hit the page-down key, didn't work. I wrote to say that it did not, and have received no response. The response rate will stay low if people have this kind of trouble with the survey and the folks mounting it are not more helpful.
Judith Tanur

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

Date: Fri, 20 Jun 2003 17:35:50 -0500
Reply-To: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Susan Carol Losh <slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU>
Subject: On knowledge and opinions
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain
Content-transfer-encoding: binary

A few years back, approximately 70 percent of Americans knew whether space aliens looked "like us" or not.

About the same percentage knew whether space aliens were friendly or not.

Next to these figures, the Washington Post story seems right down to earth.

Susan

On Fri, 20 Jun 2003 14:56:40 -0400 Jan Werner wrote:

> This appears in today's Washington Post and in yesterday's Slate.

>

> I don't necessarily agree with Mr. Kinsley, and he takes a while to get
> to the point, but since he raises issues that have been debated at some
> length among AAPOR members, it is worth reading the column through.

>

> Jan Werner

> -----

>

> washingtonpost.com

>

> Untethered to Reality

>

> By Michael Kinsley

>

> Friday, June 20, 2003; Page A25

>

> Why are we even bothering to keep looking for those weapons of mass
> destruction in Iraq? At this point, what difference does it make
> whether we find them? Trying to find them serves two ostensible
> purposes: One is to prevent them from being used, and the other is
> to settle the argument about whether they exist. But neither
> purpose really applies any longer.

>

> As we are belatedly noticing, other nations are closer to having
> usable nuclear weapons than Iraq. The claim was that nuclear and
> other weapons were especially dangerous in the hands of a malevolent
> madman like Saddam Hussein. Now Hussein is gone. Iraq is not quite
> yet the gentle, loving democracy promised by Bush administration
> propaganda. But its government, or lack of one, is hardly the rogue
> nuclear power we must fear the most.

>

> As for settling the argument about WMD as a justification for the
> war, that argument is already settled. It's obvious that the Bush
> administration had no good evidence to back up its dire warnings.
> And even if months of desperate searching ultimately turns up a
> thing or two, this will hardly vindicate the administration's claim
> to have known it all along. The administration itself in effect now
> agrees that actually finding the weapons doesn't matter. It asserts
> that the war can be justified on humanitarian grounds alone and that
> Hussein may have destroyed those weapons on his way out the door.
> (Exactly what we wanted him to do, by the way, now repositioned as a

> dirty trick.) These are not the sorts of things you say if you know
> those weapons exist. And if it doesn't matter that they don't seem
> to exist, it cannot logically matter if they do.

>
> The general citizenry doesn't seem to care whether those weapons are
> discovered. Americans tell pollsters they do not mind that WMD
> haven't materialized and are not even withholding judgment while the
> search goes on. Some now believe the war was justified on other
> grounds. Some believe the weapons exist despite the lack of
> evidence. Some actually believe that WMD have been discovered. And
> some even believe that the Bush administration outright lied about
> WMD, but they don't care.

>
> According to a Harris poll out Wednesday, a majority of Americans
> still think the Bush administration was telling the truth before the
> war when it said it had hard evidence of WMD. A Knight Ridder poll
> released last weekend reports that a third of the populace believes
> the weapons have been discovered. A Fox News poll last week found
> that almost half of Americans believe that the administration was
> "intentionally misleading" about Iraq's weapons, but more than
> two-thirds think the war was justified anyway. A Gallup poll
> released Wednesday concludes that almost 9 out of 10 Americans still
> think Hussein had or was close to having WMD.

>
> By now, WMD have taken on a mythic role in which fact doesn't play
> much of a part. The phrase itself -- "weapons of mass destruction"
> -- is more like an incantation than a description of anything. The
> term is a new one to almost everybody, and the concern it officially
> embodies was on almost no one's radar screen until recently.
> Unofficially, "weapons of mass destruction" are to George W. Bush
> what fairies were to Peter Pan. He wants us to say, "We DO believe
> in weapons of mass destruction. We DO believe. We DO." If we all
> believe hard enough, they will be there. And it's working.

>
> The most striking thing about polls such as these isn't how many
> people believe or disbelieve some unproven factual assertion or
> prediction but how few give the only correct answer, which is "Don't
> know." In the Fox News poll, vast majorities expressed certitude
> one way or the other about the existence of WMD in Iraq, the
> likelihood of peace in the Middle East and so on. Those who voted
> "not sure" (an even more tempting cop-out than the pollsters' usual
> "don't know") rarely broke 20 percent and usually hovered around 10.
> Four-fifths or more were sure about everything.

>
> As someone who manufactures opinions for a living, it is my job to
> be sure. And my standards for the ingredients of an opinion are
> necessarily low. There may be a few ancient pundits such as George
> Will who still follow the traditional guild practices: days in the
> library making notes on index cards, a half-dozen lunches at the
> club with key sources, an hour spent alone in silence with a martini
> and one's thoughts -- and only then does a perfectly modulated
> opinion take its lovely shape. Most of us have no time for that
> anymore. It's a quick surf around the 'Net, a flip of the coin and
> out pops an opinion, ready to go except perhaps for a bit of extra

> last-minute coarsening.
>
> Still, even the most modern major generalist among the professional
> commentariat likes to have a little something in the way of
> knowledge as he or she scatters opinions like bird seed. The
> general public, or at least the part of it that deals with
> pollsters, is not so cowardly. Most people, it seems, will happily
> state a belief on a question of fact that nobody knows the answer
> to, then just as happily do a double back flip from that shaky
> platform into a pool of opinions about which they are "sure."
>
> Pollsters themselves, and the media that report their findings
> deadpan, are partly responsible for this. Every news report about a
> poll result reinforces the impression that opinion untethered to
> reality is valid or even patriotic (and to be "not sure" is
> shameful). The modern pundit culture is also partly to blame, I
> suppose, with its emphasis on televised argumentation. Viewers do
> not always grasp the difference between low standards and no
> standards.
>
> Are there weapons of mass destruction in Iraq? Sure there are -- in
> every sense that matters, reality not being one of them.
>
> © 2003 The Washington Post Company
>
> -----
> 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>

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

Date: Fri, 20 Jun 2003 20:09:58 -0400
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Organization: Rider University
Subject: Re: On knowledge and opinions
Comments: To: slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

> One issue that no one seems to have raised in the United States concerns the
> deliberations in the UN Security Council prior to the war with Iraq.
> Basically, those nations that dissented from the war, notably France,
Russia,
> Germany, and others argued that the inspections needed more time to
determine
> whether Iraq was indeed harboring weapons of mass destruction. If these
> weapons do not ultimately turn up, or if the threat has been intentionally
> over estimated, it proves that the UN Security Council's dissenters were
> correct, and that there was no justification under the UN resolutions for
> war. This line of discussion would perhaps focus attention on why the image
> of the United States has declined in world opinion over the past two years
or
> so. It would also provide an interesting coda to those who faulted the
> French for not going along with the United States (although few seemed to
> fault Germany, where Schroeder was the first to declare that his nation
would
> not participate in a war, and won re-election on that issue). What does it
> say to all those in the US who are blaming the French and boycotting French
> products if their reservations about war under the UN auspices turn out to
be
> correct? It may not matter in domestic opinion, but it may portend some
real
> problems for the US in world opinion.

>
> On Fri, 20 Jun 2003 14:56:40 -0400 Jan Werner wrote:

>>
>> This appears in today's Washington Post and in yesterday's Slate.
>>
>> I don't necessarily agree with Mr. Kinsley, and he takes a while to get
>> to the point, but since he raises issues that have been debated at some
>> length among AAPOR members, it is worth reading the column through.

>> Jan Werner

>> -----

>> washingtonpost.com

>> Untethered to Reality

>> By Michael Kinsley

>> Friday, June 20, 2003; Page A25

>> Why are we even bothering to keep looking for those weapons of mass
>> destruction in Iraq? At this point, what difference does it make
>> whether we find them? Trying to find them serves two ostensible
>> purposes: One is to prevent them from being used, and the other is
>> to settle the argument about whether they exist. But neither
>> purpose really applies any longer.

>> As we are belatedly noticing, other nations are closer to having

>> usable nuclear weapons than Iraq. The claim was that nuclear and
>> other weapons were especially dangerous in the hands of a malevolent
>> madman like Saddam Hussein. Now Hussein is gone. Iraq is not quite
>> yet the gentle, loving democracy promised by Bush administration
>> propaganda. But its government, or lack of one, is hardly the rogue
>> nuclear power we must fear the most.

>> As for settling the argument about WMD as a justification for the
>> war, that argument is already settled. It's obvious that the Bush
>> administration had no good evidence to back up its dire warnings.
>> And even if months of desperate searching ultimately turns up a
>> thing or two, this will hardly vindicate the administration's claim
>> to have known it all along. The administration itself in effect now
>> agrees that actually finding the weapons doesn't matter. It asserts
>> that the war can be justified on humanitarian grounds alone and that
>> Hussein may have destroyed those weapons on his way out the door.
>> (Exactly what we wanted him to do, by the way, now repositioned as a
>> dirty trick.) These are not the sorts of things you say if you know
>> those weapons exist. And if it doesn't matter that they don't seem
>> to exist, it cannot logically matter if they do.

>> The general citizenry doesn't seem to care whether those weapons are
>> discovered. Americans tell pollsters they do not mind that WMD
>> haven't materialized and are not even withholding judgment while the
>> search goes on. Some now believe the war was justified on other
>> grounds. Some believe the weapons exist despite the lack of
>> evidence. Some actually believe that WMD have been discovered. And
>> some even believe that the Bush administration outright lied about
>> WMD, but they don't care.

>> According to a Harris poll out Wednesday, a majority of Americans
>> still think the Bush administration was telling the truth before the
>> war when it said it had hard evidence of WMD. A Knight Ridder poll
>> released last weekend reports that a third of the populace believes
>> the weapons have been discovered. A Fox News poll last week found
>> that almost half of Americans believe that the administration was
>> "intentionally misleading" about Iraq's weapons, but more than
>> two-thirds think the war was justified anyway. A Gallup poll
>> released Wednesday concludes that almost 9 out of 10 Americans still
>> think Hussein had or was close to having WMD.

>> By now, WMD have taken on a mythic role in which fact doesn't play
>> much of a part. The phrase itself -- "weapons of mass destruction"
>> -- is more like an incantation than a description of anything. The
>> term is a new one to almost everybody, and the concern it officially
>> embodies was on almost no one's radar screen until recently.
>> Unofficially, "weapons of mass destruction" are to George W. Bush
>> what fairies were to Peter Pan. He wants us to say, "We DO believe
>> in weapons of mass destruction. We DO believe. We DO." If we all
>> believe hard enough, they will be there. And it's working.

>> The most striking thing about polls such as these isn't how many
>> people believe or disbelieve some unproven factual assertion or
>> prediction but how few give the only correct answer, which is "Don't

>> know." In the Fox News poll, vast majorities expressed certitude
>> one way or the other about the existence of WMD in Iraq, the
>> likelihood of peace in the Middle East and so on. Those who voted
>> "not sure" (an even more tempting cop-out than the pollsters' usual
>> "don't know") rarely broke 20 percent and usually hovered around 10.
>> Four-fifths or more were sure about everything.

>> As someone who manufactures opinions for a living, it is my job to
>> be sure. And my standards for the ingredients of an opinion are
>> necessarily low. There may be a few ancient pundits such as George
>> Will who still follow the traditional guild practices: days in the
>> library making notes on index cards, a half-dozen lunches at the
>> club with key sources, an hour spent alone in silence with a martini
>> and one's thoughts -- and only then does a perfectly modulated
>> opinion take its lovely shape. Most of us have no time for that
>> anymore. It's a quick surf around the 'Net, a flip of the coin and
>> out pops an opinion, ready to go except perhaps for a bit of extra
>> last-minute coarsening.

>> Still, even the most modern major generalist among the professional
>> commentariat likes to have a little something in the way of
>> knowledge as he or she scatters opinions like bird seed. The
>> general public, or at least the part of it that deals with
>> pollsters, is not so cowardly. Most people, it seems, will happily
>> state a belief on a question of fact that nobody knows the answer
>> to, then just as happily do a double back flip from that shaky
>> platform into a pool of opinions about which they are "sure."

>> Pollsters themselves, and the media that report their findings
>> deadpan, are partly responsible for this. Every news report about a
>> poll result reinforces the impression that opinion untethered to
>> reality is valid or even patriotic (and to be "not sure" is
>> shameful). The modern pundit culture is also partly to blame, I
>> suppose, with its emphasis on televised argumentation. Viewers do
>> not always grasp the difference between low standards and no
>> standards.

>> Are there weapons of mass destruction in Iraq? Sure there are -- in
>> every sense that matters, reality not being one of them.

>> © 2003 The Washington Post Company

>> -----
>> 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>

>

> -----

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

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

=====

Date: Sat, 21 Jun 2003 08:28:18 -0400
Reply-To: Reg_Baker@MARKETSTRATEGIES.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Reginald Baker <Reg_Baker@MARKETSTRATEGIES.COM>
Subject: Re: meeting survey
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

And to Judy's comment I would add that it's an ugly little beast with all that depressing black background. Plus I noted that you can click "Other" and it doesn't remind you that you didn't supply the other specify open end. And the scales are displayed low to high when presented vertically but high to low when presented horizontally. Very confusing.

AAPOR, of all people, ought to set a better example.

With apologies,

Reg Baker
MSInteractive/Market Strategies

Judith Tanur
<jtanur@NOTES.CC.SUNY.SB.EDU> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
cc:
Sent by: AAPORNET Subject: meeting survey
<AAPORNET@asu.edu>

06/20/2003 05:57
PM
Please respond to
jtanur

The following is something I've tried to send back to knowledge networks and to aapor directly after getting a reminder that I was being a nonrespondent to the meeting survey. I don't know how to do any better....

I've written twice to say that I can't get past the first matrix question.

There is no scroll bar, and the advice I was given, to hit the page-down key, didn't work. I wrote to say that it did not, and have received no response. The response rate will stay low if people have this kind of trouble with the survey and the folks mounting it are not more helpful.
Judith Tanur

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

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

Date: Sun, 22 Jun 2003 13:16:09 -0400
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: RIP: Albert D. Biderman, 79; Social Science Researcher (WashPost)
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

-----=20

=A9 2003 The Washington Post Company
-----=20

www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A17817-2003Jun20

Saturday, June 21, 2003; Page B06

Albert D. Biderman, 79; Social Science Researcher

Albert D. Biderman, 79, a social scientist whose research into a wide range of social indicators included the National Crime Victimization Survey, a major study of violent crime trends used by the Justice Department, died June 16 at his home in McLean.

He died as a result of injuries he received about a month ago in a fall in his home.

Colleagues said Dr. Biderman helped found the study of contemporary social indicators, while pointing out the limitations of economic indicators to monitor the well-being of Americans. They said this was a reaction to the social upheavals of the 1960s, when questions were raised about statistical information, including crime rates, that the government used to formulate policy.

Dr. Biderman was among the first to turn to an alternative way of determining crime statistics: victim self-reporting. He did this work from 1958 to 1985 with the Bureau of Social Science Research, an independent survey research organization that was begun in Washington

at American University. At the bureau, he directed a research consortium that made the national survey a model for sociologists in other countries.

In all, he produced more than 100 publications in criminology, psychology, sociology, political science, statistics and graphical representation of social data. After he retired from the bureau, he was a research professor at American University's School of Public Affairs.

Dr. Biderman was a corporate, institutional and government consultant in this country and abroad. He was an adviser to Congress and federal agencies on issues including military personnel policy, criminal justice and communist indoctrination and interrogation.

His books included "March to Calumny: The Story of American POWs in the Korean War," which rebutted the misconception that U.S. prisoners collaborated with their communist captors. His work on forceful interrogation led to changes in U.S. military policy and training.

Dr. Biderman was born in Paterson, N.J. He served in the Army in Europe during World War II and in the military government in Germany after the war.

He received an economics degree from New York University and a master's degree and a doctorate, both in sociology, from the University of Chicago.

He sat on several editorial boards and committees, including that of the Social Indicator Network News and Information Design News.

His honors included a Distinguished Career Achievement Award from the American Sociological Association and the Stuart A. Rice Award of the D.C. Sociological Society. He was a fellow of the American Statistical Association and the American Association for the Advancement of Science and a member of a number of professional organizations, including the American Political Science Association. He was chairman of the executive council of the American Association for Public Opinion Research.

Survivors include his wife of 51 years, Sumiko Fujii Biderman of McLean; three children, David Biderman and Joseph Biderman, both of Los Angeles, and Paula Biderman of Purcellville; and a granddaughter.

www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A17817-2003Jun20

-----=20

=A9 2003 The Washington Post Company

-----=20

Mitofsky International
1776 Broadway - Suite 1708
New York, NY 10019

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Sun, 22 Jun 2003 13:03:30 -0500
Reply-To: Alice Robbin <arobbin@indiana.edu>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Alice Robbin <arobbin@INDIANA.EDU>
Subject: Re: RIP: Albert D. Biderman,
79; Social Science Researcher (WashPost)
Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
In-Reply-To: <5.2.0.9.2.20030622131439.030a5810@pop.mindspring.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: QUOTED-PRINTABLE

Albert Biderman was a great influence on me and others. I hope that AAPOR will add him to our esteemed pantheon of contributors to public opinion and public policy research. My heart goes out to his family and loved ones.

Alice Robbin/IU

On Sun, 22 Jun 2003, Warren Mitofsky wrote:

> -----=
> =20
> -----
> =A9 2003 The Washington Post Company
> -----=
> =20
> -----
> www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A17817-2003Jun20
> =20
> Saturday, June 21, 2003; Page B06
> =20
> =20

> Albert D. Biderman, 79; Social Science Researcher

>=20

>=20

> Albert D. Biderman, 79, a social scientist whose research into a wide

> range of social indicators included the National Crime Victimization

> Survey, a major study of violent crime trends used by the Justice

> Department, died June 16 at his home in McLean.

>=20

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

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

Date: Mon, 23 Jun 2003 11:49:01 -0400

Reply-To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

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

Subject: Invitation to subscribe to ASRO listserv

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

To: Academic survey directors and other managers of academic survey
research organizations

Each year at AAPOR, under the leadership of John Kennedy at Indiana University, the ASRO (Academic Survey Research Organization) group meets for discussions of current issues. We usually meet concurrently with NNSP (the National Network of State Polls). To provide a forum for continued discussion, the ASRO listserv was created several years ago. Tom Guterbock at UVa administers the list. This is a low-traffic list that is not meant to compete with AAPOR. Its purpose is to provide a forum for the occasional question or discussion that is of interest primarily to those who manage university-based survey centers. (Examples: issues concerning indirect cost rates, university IRB procedures, hiring students vs. non-students.) The list is open to anyone who wishes to subscribe. Most subscribers are directors, assistant directors, field or project managers in university shops, and it seems that nearly all are AAPOR members.

To subscribe to ASRO, just visit the following website:

<https://list.mail.Virginia.EDU/mailman/listinfo/asro>

Tom

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

 CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222

Center for Survey Research FAX: (434)243-5233

University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2205 Fontaine Ave

P. O. Box 400767 Suite 303

Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 Charlottesville, VA 22903

 e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

Date: Mon, 23 Jun 2003 12:41:47 -0400
Reply-To: "Ronald E. Langley" <langley@UKY.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Ronald E. Langley" <langley@UKY.EDU>
Subject: Code of Ethics
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Greetings! We have a particularly nasty political fight going over ownership of a local utility. In the midst of this is a series of public opinion surveys sponsored by the utility which have taken some heat due to arguably 'leading' questions. Without going into more detail, a local citizen on one side of the issue has approached me for an interpretation of AAPOR's Code of Professional Ethics and Practices regarding a paid advertisement in the local newspaper which cited results to selected questions from one of these surveys. At the bottom of the full page ad was the following statement from one of the partners in the firm hired to conduct the survey:

"This survey of public opinion was completed in full accordance with the official code of professional ethics and practices of the American Association of Public Opinion Researchers (AAPOR)."

The citizen got on AAPOR's web site to examine the code and feels that the "Standards for Minimal Disclosure" section has been violated several times with this ad (because several of the items listed are not disclosed in the ad). He also feels that the very existence of this statement in the ad violates section C.2. (We shall not cite our membership in the Association as evidence of professional competence, since the association does not so certify any persons or organizations).

I told him I wasn't sure if an advertisement constituted a "report of research results" but that if the utility released the items covered in the minimal disclosure section when asked, then they are not violating the code. I wasn't sure how to respond to his second charge.

Aside from the fact that the partner in the firm hired to conduct the survey is a little confused about what the name AAPOR stands for, are there any thoughts you have about whether this constitutes a violation of our ethical standards?

Thanks for you guidance.

Ron Langley

Ronald E. Langley, Ph.D. Phone: (859) 257-4684
Director, Survey Research Center FAX: (859) 323-1972
University of Kentucky langley@uky.edu
Chairman, National Network of State Polls
302 Breckinridge Hall

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

Date: Mon, 23 Jun 2003 10:13:52 -0700
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Code of Ethics
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Does AAPOR have a Committee on Professional Ethics which could review =
the situation and make an official ruling? I know the Amer. Sociological =
Assoc. does. Perhaps the exec council could take that role?
leora

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

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

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

> From: Ronald E. Langley [<mailto:langley@UKY.EDU>]

> Sent: Monday, June 23, 2003 9:42 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Code of Ethics

>=20

>=20

> Greetings! We have a particularly nasty political fight going over

> ownership of a local utility. In the midst of this is a=20

> series of public

> opinion surveys sponsored by the utility which have taken=20

> some heat due to
> arguably 'leading' questions. Without going into more=20
> detail, a local
> citizen on one side of the issue has approached me for an=20
> interpretation of
> AAPOR's Code of Professional Ethics and Practices regarding a paid
> advertisement in the local newspaper which cited results to selected
> questions from one of these surveys. At the bottom of the=20
> full page ad was
> the following statement from one of the partners in the firm hired to
> conduct the survey:
>=20
> "This survey of public opinion was completed in full=20
> accordance with the
> official code of professional ethics and practices of the American
> Association of Public Opinion Researchers (AAPOR)."
>=20
> The citizen got on AAPOR's web site to examine the code and=20
> feels that the
> "Standards for Minimal Disclosure" section has been violated=20
> several times
> with this ad (because several of the items listed are not=20
> disclosed in the
> ad). He also feels that the very existence of this statement in the ad
> violates section C.2. (We shall not cite our membership in=20
> the Association
> as evidence of professional competence, since the association=20
> does not so
> certify any persons or organizations).
>=20
> I told him I wasn't sure if an advertisement constituted a "report of
> research results" but that if the utility released the items=20
> covered in the
> minimal disclosure section when asked, then they are not violating the
> code. I wasn't sure how to respond to his second charge.
>=20
> Aside from the fact that the partner in the firm hired to conduct the
> survey is a little confused about what the name AAPOR stands for, are
> there any thoughts you have about whether this constitutes a=20
> violation of
> our ethical standards?
>=20
> Thanks for you guidance.
>=20
> Ron Langley
>=20
>=20
>=20
> Ronald E. Langley, Ph.D. Phone: (859) 257-4684
> Director, Survey Research Center FAX: (859) 323-1972
> University of Kentucky langley@uky.edu
> Chairman, National Network of State Polls
> 302 Breckinridge Hall
> Lexington, KY 40506-0056 http://survey.rgs.uky.edu

>=20

> -----

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

>=20

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

Date: Mon, 23 Jun 2003 14:00:57 -0400
Reply-To: "Caplan, James R „DMDCEAST" <Caplanjr@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Caplan, James R „DMDCEAST" <Caplanjr@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL>
Subject: Re: Code of Ethics
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

Just my personal opinion but I think we should consult counsel over the possible loss of our rights to AAPOR as our trade name if we don't intervene. Not to mention the false and deceptive advertising complaint.

Jim Caplan
Arlington

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

From: Ronald E. Langley [mailto:langley@UKY.EDU]
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2003 12:42 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Code of Ethics

Greetings! We have a particularly nasty political fight going over ownership of a local utility. In the midst of this is a series of public opinion surveys sponsored by the utility which have taken some heat due to arguably 'leading' questions. Without going into more detail, a local citizen on one side of the issue has approached me for an interpretation of AAPOR's Code of Professional Ethics and Practices regarding a paid advertisement in the local newspaper which cited results to selected questions from one of these surveys. At the bottom of the full page ad was the following statement from one of the partners in the firm hired to conduct the survey:

"This survey of public opinion was completed in full accordance with the official code of professional ethics and practices of the American Association of Public Opinion Researchers (AAPOR)."

The citizen got on AAPOR's web site to examine the code and feels that the "Standards for Minimal Disclosure" section has been violated several times with this ad (because several of the items listed are not disclosed in the ad). He also feels that the very existence of this statement in the ad violates section C.2. (We shall not cite our membership in the Association as evidence of professional competence, since the association does not so certify any persons or organizations).

I told him I wasn't sure if an advertisement constituted a "report of

research results" but that if the utility released the items covered in the minimal disclosure section when asked, then they are not violating the code. I wasn't sure how to respond to his second charge.

Aside from the fact that the partner in the firm hired to conduct the survey is a little confused about what the name AAPOR stands for, are there any thoughts you have about whether this constitutes a violation of our ethical standards?

Thanks for you guidance.

Ron Langley

Ronald E. Langley, Ph.D. Phone: (859) 257-4684
Director, Survey Research Center FAX: (859) 323-1972
University of Kentucky langley@uky.edu
Chairman, National Network of State Polls
302 Breckinridge Hall
Lexington, KY 40506-0056 http://survey.rgs.uky.edu

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

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

Date: Mon, 23 Jun 2003 14:06:21 -0400
Reply-To: Scott Keeter <skeeter@GMU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Scott Keeter <skeeter@GMU.EDU>
Organization: George Mason University
Subject: Re: Code of Ethics
Comments: To: "Ronald E. Langley" <langley@UKY.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

In my view, citing conformity to the AAPOR code is acceptable IF the researchers have actually conformed to it... e.g., disclosed everything that should be disclosed. That may not be feasible in a newspaper ad, but there should be a clear and easy route for the reader to get the full report with all of the methodological details.

The selective citation of results is unacceptable unless those results are representative of the overall findings.

"Ronald E. Langley" wrote:

>
> Greetings! We have a particularly nasty political fight going over
> ownership of a local utility. In the midst of this is a series of public
> opinion surveys sponsored by the utility which have taken some heat due to
> arguably 'leading' questions. Without going into more detail, a local

> citizen on one side of the issue has approached me for an interpretation of
> AAPOR's Code of Professional Ethics and Practices regarding a paid
> advertisement in the local newspaper which cited results to selected
> questions from one of these surveys. At the bottom of the full page ad was
> the following statement from one of the partners in the firm hired to
> conduct the survey:

>
> "This survey of public opinion was completed in full accordance with the
> official code of professional ethics and practices of the American
> Association of Public Opinion Researchers (AAPOR)."

>
> The citizen got on AAPOR's web site to examine the code and feels that the
> "Standards for Minimal Disclosure" section has been violated several times
> with this ad (because several of the items listed are not disclosed in the
> ad). He also feels that the very existence of this statement in the ad
> violates section C.2. (We shall not cite our membership in the Association
> as evidence of professional competence, since the association does not so
> certify any persons or organizations).

>
> I told him I wasn't sure if an advertisement constituted a "report of
> research results" but that if the utility released the items covered in the
> minimal disclosure section when asked, then they are not violating the
> code. I wasn't sure how to respond to his second charge.

>
> Aside from the fact that the partner in the firm hired to conduct the
> survey is a little confused about what the name AAPOR stands for, are
> there any thoughts you have about whether this constitutes a violation of
> our ethical standards?

>
> Thanks for you guidance.

>
> Ron Langley

>
> Ronald E. Langley, Ph.D. Phone: (859) 257-4684
> Director, Survey Research Center FAX: (859) 323-1972
> University of Kentucky langley@uky.edu
> Chairman, National Network of State Polls
> 302 Breckinridge Hall
> Lexington, KY 40506-0056 http://survey.rgs.uky.edu

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

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

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

Date: Mon, 23 Jun 2003 14:07:51 -0400
Reply-To: Roger Tourangeau <rtourangeau@SURVEY.UMD.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Roger Tourangeau <rtourangeau@SURVEY.UMD.EDU>
Subject: Re: Code of Ethics
Comments: To: leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

AAPOR does have a procedure for reviewing complaints about violations of AAPOR's Code. The process is launched when AAPOR's Standards Chair (right now, that's me) receives a formal complaint alleging a violation; then AAPOR's Council decides whether to launch a formal investigation. By themselves, the issues mentioned in the description below don't, in my opinion, constitute a violation of the AAPOR Code. However, if the citizen contacted the survey organization or the paper that sponsored the survey, and they refused to disclose methodological details (including the item wording) that could constitute a violation. I don't think saying the survey was done "in full accordance with the official code of professional ethics and practices of the American Association of Public Opinion Researchers (AAPOR)" itself violates the code.

>>> Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM> 06/23/03 01:13PM >>>
Does AAPOR have a Committee on Professional Ethics which could review the situation and make an official ruling? I know the Amer. Sociological Assoc. does. Perhaps the exec council could take that role?
leora

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

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

destroy
this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

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

> From: Ronald E. Langley [mailto:langley@UKY.EDU]

> Sent: Monday, June 23, 2003 9:42 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Code of Ethics

>

>

> Greetings! We have a particularly nasty political fight going over

> ownership of a local utility. In the midst of this is a

> series of public

> opinion surveys sponsored by the utility which have taken

> some heat due to

> arguably 'leading' questions. Without going into more

> detail, a local

> citizen on one side of the issue has approached me for an

> interpretation of

> AAPOR's Code of Professional Ethics and Practices regarding a paid

> advertisement in the local newspaper which cited results to selected

> questions from one of these surveys. At the bottom of the

> full page ad was

> the following statement from one of the partners in the firm hired

to

> conduct the survey:

>

> "This survey of public opinion was completed in full

> accordance with the

> official code of professional ethics and practices of the American

> Association of Public Opinion Researchers (AAPOR)."

>

> The citizen got on AAPOR's web site to examine the code and

> feels that the

> "Standards for Minimal Disclosure" section has been violated

> several times

> with this ad (because several of the items listed are not

> disclosed in the

> ad). He also feels that the very existence of this statement in the

ad

> violates section C.2. (We shall not cite our membership in

> the Association

> as evidence of professional competence, since the association

> does not so

> certify any persons or organizations).

>

> I told him I wasn't sure if an advertisement constituted a "report

of

> research results" but that if the utility released the items

> covered in the

> minimal disclosure section when asked, then they are not violating

the

> code. I wasn't sure how to respond to his second charge.

>

> Aside from the fact that the partner in the firm hired to conduct
the
> survey is a little confused about what the name AAPOR stands for,
are
> there any thoughts you have about whether this constitutes a
> violation of
> our ethical standards?

>
> Thanks for you guidance.

> Ron Langley

>
>
> Ronald E. Langley, Ph.D. Phone: (859) 257-4684
> Director, Survey Research Center FAX: (859) 323-1972
> University of Kentucky langley@uky.edu
> Chairman, National Network of State Polls
> 302 Breckinridge Hall
> Lexington, KY 40506-0056 http://survey.rgs.uky.edu

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

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

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

Date: Mon, 23 Jun 2003 22:08:14 +0000
Reply-To: wendy.landiers@TALK21.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: wendy.landiers@TALK21.COM
Subject: college alumni surveys

Hello,

I was told that college alumni surveys often get in the neighborhood of a 20% response rate. Does anyone normally get a higher response rate? Does anyone know what works best with this population?

Thanks!

Wendy Landiers

talk21 your FREE portable and private address on the net at
<http://www.talk21.com>

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

Date: Mon, 23 Jun 2003 22:11:00 +0000
Reply-To: wendy.landiers@TALK21.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: wendy.landiers@TALK21.COM
Subject: college alumni response rates

Hi,

I was told that college alumni surveys usually get around a 20% response rate.
Does any college normally get a higher response rate?

Thanks,

Wendy Landiers

talk21 your FREE portable and private address on the net at
<http://www.talk21.com>

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

Date: Mon, 23 Jun 2003 17:33:01 -0400
Reply-To: mmichaels@michaelsresearch.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Maureen Michaels <mmichaels@MICHAELSRESEARCH.COM>
Organization: Michaels Opinion Reserach, Inc.
Subject: Re: Code of Ethics
Comments: To: Roger Tourangeau <rtourangeau@SURVEY.UMD.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <sef70983.086@survey.umd.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Doesn't use of the AAPOR name, in a paid advertisement, to support or imply the legitimacy of survey findings in a "nasty political fight" warrant some level of review by the Association? Why would we wait for some citizen to investigate and report a violation when it has already been called to our attention? Am I interpreting Roger's response correctly?

--Maureen Michaels
Michaels Opinion Research, Inc.
73 Spring St., Suite 203
New York, NY 10012

T: 212-226-6251
F: 212-226-3758
E: mmichaels@michaelsresearch.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Roger Tourangeau
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2003 2:08 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Code of Ethics

AAPOR does have a procedure for reviewing complaints about violations of AAPOR's Code. The process is launched when AAPOR's Standards Chair (right now, that's me) receives a formal complaint alleging a violation; then AAPOR's Council decides whether to launch a formal investigation. By themselves, the issues mentioned in the description below don't, in my opinion, constitute a violation of the AAPOR Code. However, if the citizen contacted the survey organization or the paper that sponsored the survey, and they refused to disclose methodological details (including the item wording) that could constitute a violation. I don't think saying the survey was done "in full accordance with the official code of professional ethics and practices of the American Association of Public Opinion Researchers (AAPOR)" itself violates the code.

>>> Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM> 06/23/03 01:13PM >>>
Does AAPOR have a Committee on Professional Ethics which could review the situation and make an official ruling? I know the Amer. Sociological Assoc. does. Perhaps the exec council could take that role? leora

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

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

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

> From: Ronald E. Langley [mailto:langley@UKY.EDU]
> Sent: Monday, June 23, 2003 9:42 AM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Code of Ethics
>

>
> Greetings! We have a particularly nasty political fight going over
> ownership of a local utility. In the midst of this is a series of
> public opinion surveys sponsored by the utility which have taken
> some heat due to
> arguably 'leading' questions. Without going into more
> detail, a local
> citizen on one side of the issue has approached me for an
> interpretation of
> AAPOR's Code of Professional Ethics and Practices regarding a paid
> advertisement in the local newspaper which cited results to selected
> questions from one of these surveys. At the bottom of the
> full page ad was
> the following statement from one of the partners in the firm hired
to
> conduct the survey:
>
> "This survey of public opinion was completed in full accordance with
> the official code of professional ethics and practices of the American
> Association of Public Opinion Researchers (AAPOR)."
>
> The citizen got on AAPOR's web site to examine the code and feels that

> the "Standards for Minimal Disclosure" section has been violated
> several times
> with this ad (because several of the items listed are not
> disclosed in the
> ad). He also feels that the very existence of this statement in the
ad
> violates section C.2. (We shall not cite our membership in the
> Association as evidence of professional competence, since the
> association does not so
> certify any persons or organizations).
>
> I told him I wasn't sure if an advertisement constituted a "report
of
> research results" but that if the utility released the items covered
> in the minimal disclosure section when asked, then they are not
> violating
the
> code. I wasn't sure how to respond to his second charge.
>
> Aside from the fact that the partner in the firm hired to conduct
the
> survey is a little confused about what the name AAPOR stands for,
are
> there any thoughts you have about whether this constitutes a violation

> of our ethical standards?
>
> Thanks for you guidance.
>
> Ron Langley
>

>
>
> Ronald E. Langley, Ph.D. Phone: (859) 257-4684
> Director, Survey Research Center FAX: (859) 323-1972
> University of Kentucky langley@uky.edu
> Chairman, National Network of State Polls
> 302 Breckinridge Hall
> Lexington, KY 40506-0056 http://survey.rgs.uky.edu

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

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

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

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

=====
Date: Mon, 23 Jun 2003 15:06:43 -0700
Reply-To: Joel Bloom <jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joel Bloom <jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU>
Subject: Re: college alumni surveys
Comments: To: wendy.landiers@TALK21.COM
In-Reply-To: <20030623210934.TODC15580.wmpmta02-app.mail-store.com@wmpmtavirtual>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Wendy,

Our last alumni survey for the University of Oregon (around a year ago) had an 81% response rate. This was a CASRO-type response rate -- we are in the process of converting to AAPOR guidelines -- but that would not drop it more than a couple points I think. Most alumni are very happy to do a survey for their alma mater and are especially thrilled that no one is asking them for money! There is no reason why an alumni survey would automatically have such a low response rate, other than a budget that doesn't allow for call-backs.

-- 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 Mon, 23 Jun 2003 wendy.landlers@TALK21.COM wrote:

> Hello,
>
> I was told that college alumni surveys often get in the neighborhood of a
> 20% response rate. Does anyone normally get a higher response rate? Does
> anyone know what works best with this population?
>
> Thanks!
>
> Wendy Landers
>
>
>
> -----
> talk21 your FREE portable and private address on the net at
> <http://www.talk21.com>
>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>

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

Date: Mon, 23 Jun 2003 18:11:36 -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: Code of Ethics
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

To carry this thread a little further, does anyone have the right to claim
or to imply approval because something is done "in accordance with" the
Code? Seems to me that's as inappropriate as citing membership in the
Association as evidence of professional competence. The Association does
not certify individual surveys any more than it does individual members or
organizations.

The cynical observer might wonder if the misstatement of AAPOR's name, which
in the ad is cited as ending with the word "Researchers" rather than
Research, is a deliberate attempt to mislead the public. That would be a
violation of the AAPOR Code and probably a few laws as well.

Karen Goldenberg

Karen L. Goldenberg

-- Personal opinion only--

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: Maureen Michaels [mailto:mmichaels@MICHAELSRESEARCH.COM]
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2003 5:33 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Code of Ethics

Doesn't use of the AAPOR name, in a paid advertisement, to support or imply the legitimacy of survey findings in a "nasty political fight" warrant some level of review by the Association? Why would we wait for some citizen to investigate and report a violation when it has already been called to our attention? Am I interpreting Roger's response correctly?

--Maureen Michaels
Michaels Opinion Research, Inc.
73 Spring St., Suite 203
New York, NY 10012

T: 212-226-6251
F: 212-226-3758
E: mmichaels@michaelsresearch.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Roger Tourangeau
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2003 2:08 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Code of Ethics

AAPOR does have a procedure for reviewing complaints about violations of AAPOR's Code. The process is launched when AAPOR's Standards Chair (right now, that's me) receives a formal complaint alleging a violation; then AAPOR's Council decides whether to launch a formal investigation. By themselves, the issues mentioned in the description below don't, in my opinion, constitute a violation of the AAPOR Code. However, if the citizen contacted the survey organization or the paper that sponsored the survey, and they refused to disclose methodological details (including the item wording) that could constitute a violation. I don't think saying the survey was done "in full accordance with the official code of professional ethics and practices of the American Association of Public Opinion Researchers (AAPOR)" itself violates the code.

>>> Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM> 06/23/03 01:13PM >>>
Does AAPOR have a Committee on Professional Ethics which could review the situation and make an official ruling? I know the Amer. Sociological Assoc. does. Perhaps the exec council could take that role? leora

Leora Lawton, Ph.D.

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

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

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

> From: Ronald E. Langley [mailto:langley@UKY.EDU]

> Sent: Monday, June 23, 2003 9:42 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Code of Ethics

>

>

> Greetings! We have a particularly nasty political fight going over ownership of a local utility. In the midst of this is a series of public opinion surveys sponsored by the utility which have taken some heat due to arguably 'leading' questions. Without going into more detail, a local citizen on one side of the issue has approached me for an interpretation of AAPOR's Code of Professional Ethics and Practices regarding a paid advertisement in the local newspaper which cited results to selected questions from one of these surveys. At the bottom of the full page ad was the following statement from one of the partners in the firm hired to conduct the survey:

>

> "This survey of public opinion was completed in full accordance with the official code of professional ethics and practices of the American Association of Public Opinion Researchers (AAPOR)."

>

> The citizen got on AAPOR's web site to examine the code and feels that

> the "Standards for Minimal Disclosure" section has been violated several times with this ad (because several of the items listed are not disclosed in the

> ad). He also feels that the very existence of this statement in the ad

> violates section C.2. (We shall not cite our membership in the Association as evidence of professional competence, since the association does not so certify any persons or organizations).

>
> I told him I wasn't sure if an advertisement constituted a "report
of
> research results" but that if the utility released the items covered
> in the minimal disclosure section when asked, then they are not
> violating
the
> code. I wasn't sure how to respond to his second charge.
>
> Aside from the fact that the partner in the firm hired to conduct
the
> survey is a little confused about what the name AAPOR stands for,
are
> there any thoughts you have about whether this constitutes a violation

> of our ethical standards?

>

> Thanks for you guidance.

>

> Ron Langley

>

>

>

> Ronald E. Langley, Ph.D. Phone: (859) 257-4684
> Director, Survey Research Center FAX: (859) 323-1972
> University of Kentucky langley@uky.edu
> Chairman, National Network of State Polls
> 302 Breckinridge Hall
> Lexington, KY 40506-0056 http://survey.rgs.uky.edu

>

> -----

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

>

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

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

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

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

=====
Date: Tue, 24 Jun 2003 01:01:08 -0400
Reply-To: Barbara Carvalho <Barbara.Carvalho@MARIST.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Barbara Carvalho <Barbara.Carvalho@MARIST.EDU>
Subject: Barbara Carvalho/ADM/Marist is out of the office.
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

I will be out of the office starting 06/23/2003 and will not return until 07/07/2003.

If you need to reach me, call my office at 845.575.5050.
Otherwise, I will get back to you when I return.

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

Date: Tue, 24 Jun 2003 11:43:39 -0400
Reply-To: Megan Thee <thee@NYTIMES.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Megan Thee <thee@NYTIMES.COM>
Subject: Job Posting
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

The New York Times/CBS News Poll is currently hiring individuals to serve as part-time, bilingual (Spanish) telephone interviewers. The job entails conducting public opinion surveys over the telephone in English and Spanish. The openings are for primarily weekday evening and weekend hours. Computer skills are a plus. Fluency in English and Spanish is a must for all applicants. Applicants must be able to read and converse in both English and Spanish in order to apply. We are going to be conducting a training session on Monday, July 7th from 6 to 10PM. Applicants must be available on that evening in order to apply.

If you know someone who meets the eligibility as stated above and is interested in applying for the position, he/she should call 212-556-4185 for more information and to apply. Thank you!

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

Date: Tue, 24 Jun 2003 10:53:01 -0500
Reply-To: "Sosin, Jennifer" <jsosin@WEBERSHANDWICK.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Sosin, Jennifer" <jsosin@WEBERSHANDWICK.COM>
Subject: Job opportunities: KRC Research / Weber Shandwick
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

KRC Research, the research division of Weber Shandwick Worldwide, is seeking candidates for positions in its Washington, D.C., Boston or New York offices.

KRC Research is a full-service opinion and marketing research firm, conducting both quantitative and qualitative research for corporations, non-profits, and governments. Its clients include corporations in changing markets, institutions and industries working to redefine their image or the image of their products, organizations running public affairs and public education campaigns, and advocates campaigning for legislative reform. Offering global market research capabilities, KRC has offices in the U.S. and Europe.

KRC Research currently seeks a senior manager for its Washington, Boston or New York office, as well as an analyst for its Washington office.

For the senior position, we seek a distinguished leader with a minimum of 8-10 years experience conducting qualitative and quantitative research, including experience managing large clients, projects, and staff. Qualified candidates will have very strong presentation and writing skills; a demonstrated ability to develop and manage research projects for a wide range of industries and purposes using a variety of methodologies; proven success in developing new business, including effective development of research proposals; flexibility and creativity; and the ability to work collaboratively.

For the analyst position, qualified candidates will have at least 1-2 years experience in market research and strong writing skills. A degree or substantial coursework in quantitative survey research methods is preferred.

Interested candidates should please send resume and cover letter to:

Kirsten Howard
Human Resources Manager
KRC Research / Weber Shandwick
700 13th Street NW
Washington, DC 20005
khoward@webershandwick.com <mailto:khoward@webershandwick.com>

Weber Shandwick is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

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

Date: Tue, 24 Jun 2003 09:24:47 -0700
Reply-To: kjuffer@wested.org
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Kristin Juffer <kjuffer@WESTED.ORG>
Subject: Re: On knowledge and opinions
Comments: To: rusciano@RIDER.EDU
In-Reply-To: <3EF3A256.D0A9015D@rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

And it may provide a partial explanation for why direct foreign investment in this country has recently dropped a whopping 90% -- Source:=
=20

Wall Street Journal, Friday, June 19, 2003). America's unilateralist approach to foreign policy appears to be contributing to significant harm the American economy.

>> One issue that no one seems to have raised in the United States
>> concerns the deliberations in the UN Security Council prior to the war

>> with Iraq. Basically, those nations that dissented from the war,
>> notably France, Russia, Germany, and others argued that the
>> inspections needed more time to determine whether Iraq was indeed
>> harboring weapons of mass destruction. If these weapons do not
>> ultimately turn up, or if the threat has been intentionally over
>> estimated, it proves that the UN Security Council's dissenters were
>> correct, and that there was no justification under the UN resolutions
>> for war. This line of discussion would perhaps focus attention on why
>> the image of the United States has declined in world opinion over the
>> past two years or so. It would also provide an interesting coda to
>> those who faulted the French for not going along with the United
>> States (although few seemed to fault Germany, where Schroeder was the
>> first to declare that his nation would not participate in a war, and
>> won re-election on that issue). What does it say to all those in the
>> US who are blaming the French and boycotting French products if their
>> reservations about war under the UN auspices turn out to be correct?
>> It may not matter in domestic opinion, but it may portend some real
>> problems for the US in world opinion.

>>
>>
>> On Fri, 20 Jun 2003 14:56:40 -0400 Jan Werner wrote:

>>> This appears in today's Washington Post and in yesterday's Slate.
>>>
>>> I don't necessarily agree with Mr. Kinsley, and he takes a while to
>> get to the point, but since he raises issues that have been debated
>> at some length among AAPOR members, it is worth reading the column
>> through.

>>> Jan Werner

>>> -----

>>> washingtonpost.com

>>> Untethered to Reality

>>> By Michael Kinsley

>>> Friday, June 20, 2003; Page A25

>>> Why are we even bothering to keep looking for those weapons of
>> mass destruction in Iraq? At this point, what difference does
>> it make whether we find them? Trying to find them serves two
>> ostensible purposes: One is to prevent them from being used,
>> and the other is to settle the argument about whether they
>> exist. But neither purpose really applies any longer.

>>> As we are belatedly noticing, other nations are closer to
>> having usable nuclear weapons than Iraq. The claim was that
>> nuclear and other weapons were especially dangerous in the
>> hands of a malevolent madman like Saddam Hussein. Now Hussein
>> is gone. Iraq is not quite yet the gentle, loving democracy
>> promised by Bush administration propaganda. But its

>> government, or lack of one, is hardly the rogue nuclear power
>> we must fear the most.

>>>

>>> As for settling the argument about WMD as a justification for
>> the war, that argument is already settled. It's obvious that
>> the Bush administration had no good evidence to back up its
>> dire warnings. And even if months of desperate searching
>> ultimately turns up a thing or two, this will hardly vindicate
>> the administration's claim to have known it all along. The
>> administration itself in effect now agrees that actually
>> finding the weapons doesn't matter. It asserts that the war
>> can be justified on humanitarian grounds alone and that Hussein
>> may have destroyed those weapons on his way out the door.
>> (Exactly what we wanted him to do, by the way, now repositioned
>> as a dirty trick.) These are not the sorts of things you say
>> if you know those weapons exist. And if it doesn't matter that
>> they don't seem to exist, it cannot logically matter if they
>> do.

>>>

>>> The general citizenry doesn't seem to care whether those
>> weapons are discovered. Americans tell pollsters they do not
>> mind that WMD haven't materialized and are not even withholding
>> judgment while the search goes on. Some now believe the war
>> was justified on other grounds. Some believe the weapons exist
>> despite the lack of evidence. Some actually believe that WMD
>> have been discovered. And some even believe that the Bush
>> administration outright lied about WMD, but they don't care.

>>>

>>> According to a Harris poll out Wednesday, a majority of
>> Americans still think the Bush administration was telling the
>> truth before the war when it said it had hard evidence of WMD.
>> A Knight Ridder poll released last weekend reports that a third
>> of the populace believes the weapons have been discovered. A
>> Fox News poll last week found that almost half of Americans
>> believe that the administration was "intentionally misleading"
>> about Iraq's weapons, but more than two-thirds think the war
>> was justified anyway. A Gallup poll released Wednesday
>> concludes that almost 9 out of 10 Americans still think Hussein
>> had or was close to having WMD.

>>>

>>> By now, WMD have taken on a mythic role in which fact doesn't
>> play much of a part. The phrase itself -- "weapons of mass
>> destruction" -- is more like an incantation than a description
>> of anything. The term is a new one to almost everybody, and
>> the concern it officially embodies was on almost no one's radar
>> screen until recently. Unofficially, "weapons of mass
>> destruction" are to George W. Bush what fairies were to Peter
>> Pan. He wants us to say, "We DO believe in weapons of mass
>> destruction. We DO believe. We DO." If we all believe hard
>> enough, they will be there. And it's working.

>>>

>>> The most striking thing about polls such as these isn't how
>> many people believe or disbelieve some unproven factual
>> assertion or prediction but how few give the only correct

>> answer, which is "Don't know." In the Fox News poll, vast
>> majorities expressed certitude one way or the other about the
>> existence of WMD in Iraq, the likelihood of peace in the Middle
>> East and so on. Those who voted "not sure" (an even more
>> tempting cop-out than the pollsters' usual "don't know") rarely
>> broke 20 percent and usually hovered around 10. Four-fifths or
>> more were sure about everything.

>>>
>>> As someone who manufactures opinions for a living, it is my job
>> to be sure. And my standards for the ingredients of an opinion
>> are necessarily low. There may be a few ancient pundits such
>> as George Will who still follow the traditional guild
>> practices: days in the library making notes on index cards, a
>> half-dozen lunches at the club with key sources, an hour spent
>> alone in silence with a martini and one's thoughts -- and only
>> then does a perfectly modulated opinion take its lovely shape.
>> Most of us have no time for that anymore. It's a quick surf
>> around the 'Net, a flip of the coin and out pops an opinion,
>> ready to go except perhaps for a bit of extra last-minute
>> coarsening.

>>>
>>> Still, even the most modern major generalist among the
>> professional commentariat likes to have a little something in
>> the way of knowledge as he or she scatters opinions like bird
>> seed. The general public, or at least the part of it that
>> deals with pollsters, is not so cowardly. Most people, it
>> seems, will happily state a belief on a question of fact that
>> nobody knows the answer to, then just as happily do a double
>> back flip from that shaky platform into a pool of opinions
>> about which they are "sure."

>>>
>>> Pollsters themselves, and the media that report their findings
>> deadpan, are partly responsible for this. Every news report
>> about a poll result reinforces the impression that opinion
>> untethered to reality is valid or even patriotic (and to be
>> "not sure" is shameful). The modern pundit culture is also
>> partly to blame, I suppose, with its emphasis on televised
>> argumentation. Viewers do not always grasp the difference
>> between low standards and no standards.

>>>
>>> Are there weapons of mass destruction in Iraq? Sure there are
>> -- in every sense that matters, reality not being one of them.

>>>
>>> =A9 2003 The Washington Post Company

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

--=20
Kris Juffer, Ph.D.
Senior Research Associate
Evaluation Research Program
WestEd
1726 M Street, N.W., Suite 704
Washington, DC 20036-4502
202/467-0652
202/467-0659-Fax

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

Date: Tue, 24 Jun 2003 12:03:37 -0700
Reply-To: John Fries <jfries@ANR.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: John Fries <jfries@ANR.COM>
Subject: International Introductions

APPORNetters,

I am preparing to undertake an international telephone study spanning nine countries including France, Germany, Spain, Italy, Japan, Taiwan, and Hong Kong. While I have some experience with international surveys, the breadth of this study is taking me into cultures where I am far less fluent.

Basically I want to be sure we follow the appropriate conversational conventions needed to secure cooperation in these other countries. Specifically I am wondering about things like:

Should the interviewer identify themselves (first name? full name?) and our organization upfront? (We will of course provide this information if asked, regardless of whether it is stated in the introduction.)

Should we state the expected survey time upfront?

Should we specifically ask if the respondent is willing to help us out, or is it better to simply move right to the first survey item?

I figure it is at least possible the answer to these questions differ from country to country...or perhaps East to West.

We are working with an excellent international field services center and so I'm sure they will provide insight on these issues as well, but I figured I'd tap AAPOR's collective wisdom and see what we "know" about variation in these introductory components.

As always, any and everything you'd like to share about this topic would be much appreciated.

Thanks!

John

--

John C. Fries
Senior Project Director | Alan Newman Research
<http://www.anr.com> | Market Research Consultants
Phone: 804.272.6100 | FAX: 804.272.7145
Email: <mailto:jfries@anr.com>

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

Date: Wed, 25 Jun 2003 00:49:07 -0400
Reply-To: jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: James Murphy <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Re: Code of Ethics
Comments: To: "Goldenberg, Karen - BLS" <Goldenberg.Karen@BLS.GOV>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The assertion in question . . .

1 - informs readers that standards for professionally executed surveys in fact exist;

2 - links those standards to AAPOR, by name;

3 - directs the reader to resources with which an assessment of soundness (fairness, etc.) can be made; and

4 - exposes the survey company to professional embarrassment, censure, and possibly worse if the work is found to be unsound, thus acting as a deterrent to negligence or fraud.

What's the use of having a code if mentioning it in this way is considered "inappropriate?"

The second issue is more hairy. Many practitioners routinely list professional affiliations when describing their qualifications. Is that claiming competence? If so, what's wrong with it? If not, what kind of statement referring to AAPOR membership would constitute claiming competence?

Clarification would be helpful.
J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY

jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

(610) 408-8800

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

Date: Wed, 25 Jun 2003 11:10:42 -0500
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: FW: Job Posting for List Serv
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Please Respond to Ms. Drinkwater directly! Thank you. =20

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

From: Cherie Drinkwater [mailto:crdrinkwater@nfow.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 18, 2003 5:28 PM
To: Mike Flanagan
Subject: Job Posting for List Serv
Importance: High

NFO WORLDGROUP is one of the world's leading providers of research-based marketing information and counsel. We are "marketing minds specializing in research" TM and have provided Fortune 500 clients with consumer and brand knowledge for more than 50 years. We complete thousands of assignments each year, each one facilitating a client's business decision-making process. We invite you to share in our success, and join our San Francisco, CA facility as a Senior Research Analyst.=20

As a Senior Research Analyst you will work with the Account Executives and clients to provide analysis and insights for research projects conducted by clients within the San Francisco territory.

The ideal candidate will be responsible for:

- * Project and proposal consultation =20
- * Report outline preparation
- * Data analysis and recommendations
- * Written and verbal presentation of reports in

Word/PowerPoint

Minimum skill requirements:=20

- * 5 years' experience in market research, including analyzing and reporting data

- * Excellent verbal, oral, and written communication skills

- * Ability to summarize data into research reports and/or presentations

- * Ability to problem solve

- * Strong knowledge of research and analytical skills

- * Demonstrated experience with Microsoft Office Suite, including Outlook and PowerPoint

- * B.S. or B.A., preferably in Business or Communications, advanced degree preferred

Please send resume to:=20

NFO WorldGroup=20

Ref # 03-3903-04=20

2700 Oregon Road=20

Northwood, OH 43619=20

Email: recruiter4@nfow.com <mailto:recruiter4@nfow.com>=20

Due to volume of resumes, no phone calls please. All NFO WorldGroup companies are Equal Opportunity Employers. No sponsorship or relocation available for this position. Only resumes meeting all of the minimum qualifications will be considered.

Cherie R. Drinkwater, PHR

NFO WorldGroup / Human Resources Consultant

Ph (419) 725-8648

Fax (419) 725-8812

www.nfow.com

This message contains information which may be confidential and = privileged.

Unless you are the intended recipient (or authorized to receive this = message

for the intended recipient), you may not use, copy, disseminate or = disclose

to anyone the message or any information contained in the message. If = you

have received the message in error, please advise the sender by reply e-mail, and delete the message. Thank you very much.

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

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

=====
Date: Thu, 26 Jun 2003 14:00:56 -0400

Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Support for Release of Iranian Pollsters
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Support for Release of Iranian Pollsters
<http://www.mrons.com/drno/news2185.htm>

World research organisations ESOMAR, EFAMRO and WAPOR have this week joined forces in the case of two Iranian survey researchers arrested earlier this month and have addressed the matter to the EU Government, the United Nations, the Iranian Government and other international bodies in order to release the Iranian pollsters.

At the beginning of February two Iranian pollsters who outraged hard-liners with a survey that found strong public support for contacts with the United States were sentenced to prison on charges of selling secrets to groups linked to the CIA. Prosecutors accused the two of holding secret talks and providing information to institutes and individuals affiliated with American, British and Israeli intelligence services - including the Gallup Organization. Richard Burkholder, Gallup's director of international polling, described the sentencing as 'extremely regrettable', indicating the Iranian pollsters were victims of Iran's ongoing power struggle between hard-liners and reformists, who back President Mohammed Khatami's program of social and political freedoms. According to Burkholder, Gallup paid for and designed a poll to find out opinions of people in the Islamic world toward America following the Sept. 11 attacks and the poll did not quiz Iranians on whether they supported dialogue with the United States.

The ESOMAR statement reiterates the fact that the right to conduct and publish polls freely is part of the modern democratic process which allows citizens to voice their opinions as upheld by Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

ESOMAR, EFAMRO and WAPOR support any initiative which ensures that public opinion polls and market and social research projects are conducted to the highest professional standards. This is in the interest of buyers and suppliers of research and in protecting public welfare.

--

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

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

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

Date: Thu, 26 Jun 2003 14:15:15 -0400
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Support for Release of Iranian Pollsters
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I just wanted to apologize for reposting this to the list - for some reason it came up as new again in my Google news search.

Support for Release of Iranian Pollsters
<http://www.mrons.com/drno/news2185.htm>

--

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

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

Date: Thu, 26 Jun 2003 15:11:38 -0500
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: AAPORNet Upgrade
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Dear fellow AAPORNETers,

=20

AAPORNET will be unavailable from 6PM-10PM MST Friday 27 June, while ASU = upgrades the Listserv software. You will not be able to send messages = during this period, nor access the archives.

=20

The upgrade should be transparent to users--the list address will stay = the same, your subscription will stay the same, the archives are intact. = The changes are "behind the scenes" to make Listserv more powerful, more = resistant to spamming and viruses, and faster.

=20

There will be changes to how the web page for the AAPORNET archives =

appears. I have tried to minimize these changes, but will not be able to =
complete work until the production system is on-line. Please let me know =
if you have any difficulty in accessing the archives after next week, or =
any other questions.

=20

Shap Wolf

AAPORNET volunteer administrator
Director, Survey Research Laboratory
Arizona State University

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

Date: Thu, 26 Jun 2003 13:42:52 -0700
Reply-To: Christopher Moore <chrismoore77@YAHOO.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Christopher Moore <chrismoore77@YAHOO.COM>
Subject: Field House Recommendation
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Hello All:

I am a young member of AAPOR who finished his Master's
in Survey Research just last year.

Currently I have an opportunity to do a little
consulting for a political consultant here in NYC. As
I have only little experience outsourcing work to
field houses, I was hoping that the AAPOR community
could suggest some reputable phone rooms that I could
work with.

AAPOR associated phone rooms would be preferred, but
are not necessary.

Thanks for whatever help you can provide,

Chris Moore

Do you Yahoo!?
SBC Yahoo! DSL - Now only \$29.95 per month!
<http://sbc.yahoo.com>

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

Date: Fri, 27 Jun 2003 00:52:01 +0100
Reply-To: wendy.landiers@TALK21.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: wendy.landiers@TALK21.COM
Subject: Alumni surveys - Thanks!

Hello,

Thanks to all who responded to my question.

Some alumni surveys that are done only by mail can have a response rate from 10-45%. If you do a phone survey you can get 50% to 80%. Tracing is the only real problem. Ivy Leagues get a higher response rate than others. The number of contacts drives the response rate.

Wendy Landers

talk21 your FREE portable and private address on the net at
<http://www.talk21.com>

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

Date: Thu, 26 Jun 2003 17:17:12 -0700
Reply-To: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>
Organization: CERC, Inc.
Subject: CAPI Interviewing With PDAs
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Can anyone chime in with a review of software we can install on our personal digital assistants (PDAs) so that we can do man-on-the-street type interviews? Either a Palm or Microsoft platform is fine. Any experience with this would be helpful. Thanks.

John E. Nienstedt, Sr.

<<mailto:john@cerc.net>> john@cerc.net

Get the edge at <<http://www.cerc.net/>> www.cerc.net

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

Date: Thu, 26 Jun 2003 21:01:05 -0700
Reply-To: Victoria Albright <albright@FIELD.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Victoria Albright <albright@FIELD.COM>
Subject: Measures of behavior change in nutrition and activity levels
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Hi!

We are conducting an evaluation of a community intervention targeted at helping people improve their eating habits and levels of exercise. We are looking for some validated scales to measure, in a before-after context, changes in nutritional habits and physical activity levels. Does anyone have any suggestions?

Many thanks, -Vicky

Victoria A. Albright (Albright@Field.com)
VP/Research Director
Field Research Corporation
222 Sutter Street, 7th floor
San Francisco, CA 94108
415 392 5763

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

Date: Fri, 27 Jun 2003 01:01:16 -0400
Reply-To: Stephanie Bushey <Stephanie.Bushey@HOFSTRA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Stephanie Bushey <Stephanie.Bushey@HOFSTRA.EDU>
Subject: Re: AAPORNET Digest - 25 Jun 2003 to 26 Jun 2003 (#2003-145)
(Out

of Office Automated Message)

MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Thank you for your email. I will be out of the office until Monday July 7th.
If you need assistance, please contact Elissa Sharp at 516-463-2804 or
elissa.sharp@hofstra.edu.

Thanks,

Stephanie

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

Date: Fri, 27 Jun 2003 12:22:25 -0400
Reply-To: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>
Subject: CMOR Comments on National Do-Not-Call Registry

MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I'm passing on information below from CMOR about the National Do-Not-Call =

Registry, which began registration today. CMOR has been tracking this = effort on behalf of the survey industry. AAPOR contributes to CMOR.

Update on the National Do-Not-Call=20 Registry and TCPA Changes=20

Yesterday, the Federal Communication=20 Commission (FCC) announced some of its changes to the Telephone Consumer = Protection Act (TCPA) Rules. The Rules, originally promulgated and in=20 effect since 1992, place various restrictions on telemarketing calls = including compliance with do-not-call requests and time of day=20 restrictions. In addition, one section of the TCPA Rules restricts all = calls (including those for survey research purposes) made using an=20 automatic telephone dialing device to a cellular phone where the called = party is charged for the call - a section of the Rules CMOR has been=20 trying to amend (see http://www.cmor.org/govt_affairs_news0802.htm and=20 http://www.cmor.org/industry_related.htm#submits=20 <http://www.cmor.org/industry_related.htm> for further details).=20

Yesterday's FCC announcement focused on=20 its do-not-call changes to the TCPA and the FCC's harmonization with = the=20 soon-to-be created Federal Trade Commission (FTC) do-not-call registry=20 (see http://www.cmor.org/govt_affairs_news0503.htm for details on the=20 FTC do-not-call registry efforts). The full FCC Report and Order=20 regarding changes to the TCPA Rules has not yet been released, and = until=20 it is, we cannot say with any certainty what impact all of the changes=20 will have on survey research calls. What is known, based on the FCC=20 statements made and materials published by the FCC yesterday, is that=20 the FCC has authorized changes to the TCPA to establish a national=20 telemarketing do-not-call registry (calls for survey research purposes=20 are implicitly exempt). The national registry will be harmonized with=20 the FTC telemarketing registry - creating a single, comprehensive,=20 national telemarketing registry that will be administered by the FTC=20 (survey research calls being implicitly exempt from the registry, in = its=20 entirety). Individuals will be able to register their numbers (including=20=

wireless numbers) beginning today and enforcement will begin October 1,=20 2003. The FCC's do-not-call registry action will "fill in the gaps" = left=20 by the jurisdictional limitations of the FTC. The FTC does not have=20 jurisdiction over certain types of telemarketing calls - common=20 carriers, the banking/financial industry, securities brokers/dealers,=20 and intrastate calls -- with the FCC's action, the single do-not-call=20 registry will now cover all such sales calls. The result will be a=20 drastic reduction in the number of calls across the country.=20

The details of the all of changes to the=20 TCPA , including any changes related to the cell phone restrictions,=20 have not yet been made public. When the information is available, CMOR=20

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

A feature story in today's Philadelphia Inquirer outlines the =
legislation, websites, geographic boundaries, etc. And it addresses =
"political and religious" and calls from companies the consumer has a =
pre-existing relationship with. Like many on this list, I scanned =
quickly to see if there would be any mention of market research or =
public opinion polling, only to be disappointed. Why is it so difficult =
to get just a tiny reference to opinion research as an allowed contact =
in these articles read with interest by tens of millions of Americans? =
What a missed opportunity!

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

From: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Date: Friday, June 27, 2003 12:37 PM
Subject: CMOR Comments on National Do-Not-Call Registry

I'm passing on information below from CMOR about the National =
Do-Not-Call Registry, which began registration today. CMOR has been =
tracking this effort on behalf of the survey industry. AAPOR =
contributes to CMOR.

Update on the National Do-Not-Call=20
Registry and TCPA Changes=20

Yesterday, the Federal Communication=20
Commission (FCC) announced some of its changes to the Telephone Consumer =
Protection Act (TCPA) Rules. The Rules, originally promulgated and in=20
effect since 1992, place various restrictions on telemarketing calls =
including compliance with do-not-call requests and time of day=20
restrictions. In addition, one section of the TCPA Rules restricts all =
calls (including those for survey research purposes) made using an=20
automatic telephone dialing device to a cellular phone where the called =
party is charged for the call - a section of the Rules CMOR has been=20
trying to amend (see http://www.cmor.org/govt_affairs_news0802.htm and=20
http://www.cmor.org/industry_related.htm#submits=20
<http://www.cmor.org/industry_related.htm> for further details).=20

Yesterday's FCC announcement focused on=20
its do-not-call changes to the TCPA and the FCC's harmonization with the =

soon-to-be created Federal Trade Commission (FTC) do-not-call registry=20
(see http://www.cmor.org/govt_affairs_news0503.htm for details on the=20
FTC do-not-call registry efforts). The full FCC Report and Order=20
regarding changes to the TCPA Rules has not yet been released, and until =

it is, we cannot say with any certainty what impact all of the changes will have on survey research calls. What is known, based on the statements made and materials published by the FCC yesterday, is that the FCC has authorized changes to the TCPA to establish a national telemarketing do-not-call registry (calls for survey research purposes are implicitly exempt). The national registry will be harmonized with the FTC telemarketing registry - creating a single, comprehensive, national telemarketing registry that will be administered by the FTC (survey research calls being implicitly exempt from the registry, in its

entirety). Individuals will be able to register their numbers (including wireless numbers) beginning today and enforcement will begin October 1, 2003. The FCC's do-not-call registry action will "fill in the gaps" left

by the jurisdictional limitations of the FTC. The FTC does not have jurisdiction over certain types of telemarketing calls - common carriers, the banking/financial industry, securities brokers/dealers, and intrastate calls -- with the FCC's action, the single do-not-call registry will now cover all such sales calls. The result will be a drastic reduction in the number of calls across the country.

The details of the all of changes to the TCPA , including any changes related to the cell phone restrictions, have not yet been made public. When the information is available, CMOR will provide a comprehensive report on all of the modifications to the TCPA Rule, and their impact on the industry.

Both the FTC and the FCC have devoted sections of their sites to the do-not-call registry (see <http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/online/edcams/donotcall/index.html> and <http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/donotcall/>). For further details or any questions

regarding the FTC or FCC actions, please contact CMOR's Director of Government Affairs, Donna Gillin, at dgillin@cmor.org

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

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

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

=====
Date: Fri, 27 Jun 2003 15:19:38 -0400
Reply-To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>
Subject: Re: Those pictures!
Comments: cc: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu>
In-Reply-To: <404167470.1056721456@d-128-55-134.bootp.Virginia.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Agree! The pictures are fabulous....but they just made me sadder than ever not to have joined the throng.

AAPOR'S Web site is also something to be proud of! Attractive, interesting and easy to navigate.

Dick Halpern

At 01:44 PM 6/27/2003 -0400, you wrote:

>Hey, if you haven't already done so, check out the pictures of our
>Nashville convention by Steve Everett. As a sometime amateur shooter, I
>can only say: there's nothing like a pro!

> Tom

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

> CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222

>Center for Survey Research FAX: (434)243-5233

>University of Virginia EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2205 Fontaine Ave

>P. O. Box 400767 Suite 303

>Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767 Charlottesville, VA 22903

> e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

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

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

=====
Date: Fri, 27 Jun 2003 17:06:46 -0400
Reply-To: jellis@saturn.vcu.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jim Ellis <jellis@SATURN.VCU.EDU>
Subject: Re: CMOR Comments on National Do-Not-Call Registry
In-Reply-To: <00b901c33ce2\$39a9a340\$8cfac3d1@default>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The Richmond Times-Dispatch this morning carried an article with the byline of David Ho, Associated Press (Times Dispatch staff writer Carol Hazard contributed to the report), in which the last sentence (its own paragraph) reads: "Charities, surveys and calls on behalf of politicians are exempt."

The on-line version varies
(<http://www.timesdispatch.com/frontpage/MGBSII6JFHD.html>), with this sentence/paragraph appearing about 4 paragraphs before the end of the story.

I clipped it this morning precisely because the mention of the survey exemption was unusual.

Jim Ellis
Virginia Commonwealth University

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of James P. Murphy
Sent: Friday, June 27, 2003 3:28 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: CMOR Comments on National Do-Not-Call Registry

A feature story in today's Philadelphia Inquirer outlines the legislation, websites, geographic boundaries, etc. And it addresses "political and religious" and calls from companies the consumer has a pre-existing relationship with. Like many on this list, I scanned quickly to see if there would be any mention of market research or public opinion polling, only to be disappointed. Why is it so difficult to get just a tiny reference to opinion research as an allowed contact in these articles read with interest by tens of millions of Americans? What a missed opportunity!

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

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

From: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Date: Friday, June 27, 2003 12:37 PM
Subject: CMOR Comments on National Do-Not-Call Registry

I'm passing on information below from CMOR about the National Do-Not-Call Registry, which began registration today. CMOR has been tracking this effort on behalf of the survey industry. AAPOR contributes to CMOR.

Update on the National Do-Not-Call
Registry and TCPA Changes

Yesterday, the Federal Communication Commission (FCC) announced some of its changes to the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) Rules. The Rules, originally promulgated and in effect since 1992, place various restrictions on telemarketing calls including compliance with do-not-call requests and time of day restrictions. In addition, one section of the TCPA Rules restricts all calls (including those for survey research purposes) made using an automatic telephone dialing device to a cellular phone where the called party is charged for the call - a section of the Rules CMOR has been trying to amend (see http://www.cmor.org/govt_affairs_news0802.htm and http://www.cmor.org/industry_related.htm#submits)

<http://www.cmor.org/industry_related.htm> for further details).

Yesterday's FCC announcement focused on its do-not-call changes to the TCPA and the FCC's harmonization with the soon-to-be created Federal Trade Commission (FTC) do-not-call registry (see http://www.cmor.org/govt_affairs_news0503.htm for details on the FTC do-not-call registry efforts). The full FCC Report and Order regarding changes to the TCPA Rules has not yet been released, and until it is, we cannot say with any certainty what impact all of the changes will have on survey research calls. What is known, based on the FCC statements made and materials published by the FCC yesterday, is that the FCC has authorized changes to the TCPA to establish a national telemarketing do-not-call registry (calls for survey research purposes are implicitly exempt). The national registry will be harmonized with the FTC telemarketing registry - creating a single, comprehensive, national telemarketing registry that will be administered by the FTC (survey research calls being implicitly exempt from the registry, in its entirety). Individuals will be able to register their numbers (including wireless numbers) beginning today and enforcement will begin October 1, 2003. The FCC's do-not-call registry action will "fill in the gaps" left by the jurisdictional limitations of the FTC. The FTC does not have jurisdiction over certain types of telemarketing calls - common carriers, the banking/financial industry, securities brokers/dealers, and intrastate calls -- with the FCC's action, the single do-not-call registry will now cover all such sales calls. The result will be a drastic reduction in the number of calls across the country.

The details of the all of changes to the TCPA , including any changes related to the cell phone restrictions, have not yet been made public. When the information is available, CMOR will provide a comprehensive report on all of the modifications to the TCPA Rule, and their impact on the industry.

Both the FTC and the FCC have devoted sections of their sites to the do-not-call registry (see <http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/online/edcams/donotcall/index.html> and <http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/donotcall/>). For further details or any questions regarding the FTC or FCC actions, please contact CMOR's Director of Government Affairs, Donna Gillin, at dgillin@cmor.org.

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

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

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

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

Date: Fri, 27 Jun 2003 15:12:10 -0700
Reply-To: John Oehlert <joehlert@FRISOLUTIONS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: John Oehlert <joehlert@FRISOLUTIONS.COM>
Subject: A business question for independent AAPOR consultants
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Hello to the group,

Bottom line: I need a recommendation on obtaining "General Commercial Liability" insurance. If you think you might be able to help ... please READ ON!

I am relatively new to the organization and a novice in the polling field. After 25 years involved in research projects at Stanford I decided it was time to break out on my own and start my own full-time consulting firm. I joined AAPOR because I became interested in public opinion polls some time back and thought it would be a fun new angle to work. Somewhere where I could use my statistical and data talents while becoming involved in something other than medicine.

Most of what I do involves observational data from patients and/or M.D.s. Some clinical and some laboratory data. Nothing to do with prospective treatments for patients or any type of patient care. No clinical trials. I help people analyze data they have already collected and/or make recommendations on how best for them to capture the data they need to answer the statistical questions they have in mind. Some data mining. In many ways this sort of work is similar to the projects I see discussed on this list. I work from my home office. I do NOT have clients in I always deal with problems over the phone or visit them in their offices. Data handled via FedEx or email. (I LOVE the commute!) No employees to complicate things.

The problem: I have a contract sitting in the "hold bin" because an unnamed university wants me to have a \$1 million "general commercial liability" policy before signing off on the deal. When I asked what they wanted me to insure against their answer was unclear "It's just our policy." I am having difficulty getting insurance because most agents do not have a clue about the work I do. Virtually every agent I speak with wonders why I need insurance after they hear what I do. Nevertheless, it doesn't seem to help. For some reason the term "consultant" seems to send ripples of fear through the insurance companies.

The Questions for any of the AAPOR independent contractors: Has anyone out there obtained such insurance? Can you give me a referral to a knowledgeable agent?

Any comments, guidance, questions, etc.. gratefully accepted.

Thanks in advance,

Appropriations Chairman Talmadge Heflin, R-Houston, submitted an amendment preventing state entities that do political polling from getting state money.

Amid the thousands of issues regarding HB 1, Heflin's proposal went largely unnoticed, not surprising since lawmakers were busy trying to trim \$9.9 billion from the budget.

Besides, nobody was likely to oppose Heflin's amendment. HB 1 was his bill, and Heflin has become a power player, riding Tom Craddick's coattails when Craddick became House speaker this year.

But the amendment attracted the attention of studious state Rep. Scott Hochberg, D-Houston.

Target: Houston pollsters
Hochberg said he immediately thought of Murray, a University of Houston political scientist, and two other Houston academics who conduct polling -- Bob Stein and Steven Klineberg of Rice University.

All three have used their students to help with polling, including extensive work for the Houston Chronicle.

Because the University of Houston and Rice get state money, the amendment would have ended their work as pollsters.

"It looked like someone was after someone else," Hochberg said.

So Hochberg went to Heflin, who declined to identify any target of the amendment.

Those close to the issue, including Murray, think he was the target. Over the years, the unabashed professor has become a political sage, sought out by candidates from all sides for his advice on the region's politics.

Known as candid, often brutally blunt, Murray calls them as he sees them.

"Over the years, I have angered everyone from Jim Mattox to Bill Clements," Murray says. Mattox, a Democratic former attorney general, and Clements, a Republican former governor, were known as fierce partisans.

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

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