

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 LOG0309"

Date: Tue, 2 Sep 2003 11:01:03 -0400
Reply-To: "Carolyn A. Eldred" <celdred@SPRYNET.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Carolyn A. Eldred" <celdred@SPRYNET.COM>
Subject: Certificates of Confidentiality requirements
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

More on "IRB hell," I guess. Has anyone had any recent experience with =
(1) an IRB requiring a Certificate of Confidentiality in order to =
approve procedures for social science survey research, & (2) dealing =
with the cognizant gov't agencies & actually obtaining one?

Is the procedure any less convoluted than it was 5-6 yrs ago (when I =
last had experience with it)? How do respondents react to the very =
legalistic language involved in explaining it?

In the past, Certificates were used specifically for studies (e.g., re =
illicit drug use) that focused mostly on illegal behavior, not those =
that might ask about it as an incidental part of the interview.

In the situation I'm dealing with (on an emergency basis as it turns =
out), the main PI's institution approved the procedures without such a =
requirement, while one of our collaborator's institution introduced the =
add'l requirement.

Your thoughts on this will be most welcome

Carolyn Eldred

Carolyn A. Eldred
Research Consultation
celdred@sprynet.com
Business Voice & Fax: 252.255.3243
Home Phone: 252.255.2008
21 Widgeon Court
Southern Shores, NC 27949-3843

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

Date: Tue, 2 Sep 2003 12:31:16 -0400
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Subject: Polls that Pay
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Advertisement on cbsnews.com

Polls that Pay

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

Want to make money from the comfort of your own home? Kick back, grab a beer, turn on Survivor, and log onto PollsThatPay.com. Our companies will give you money for your opinion. Why would they pay you for your opinion? Simple. Market Research. Companies need people's honest opinion to help them better their products. They are willing to pay you for your time because what they get in return is of more value to them: A warehouse of honest opinions which they can use to help modify their product or marketing campaign.

This isn't a gimmick. Real companies are willing to pay you real cash. Take a look at the money you will be making:

\$5 to \$100 per survey
\$45 to \$150 per hour for participating in online focus groups
\$3 to \$25 per hour for previewing movie trailers

Also make money testing (and keeping) new products

[Click here to fill out a Sample Poll.](#)

All the companies have been reviewed, tested, and are guaranteed to pay you on time! One of the main benefits of PollsThatPay.com is that you can use it whenever you want! Set your own schedule and work from any computer that has Internet access. Work part-time and earn \$200, \$500, or more per month! The more time you put in, the more money you get. Some of our members have informed us that they even quit their full-time job because they ended up making more money using this site.

I, Adrian, have been completing polls, surveys, and participating in online focus groups for almost two years now. I love completing the surveys on my laptop while watching TV - usually during the commercials :). It doesn't even seem like work! This job is perfect for students, stay at home mothers, the nearly retired, or anyone else who is looking for a new, and easily obtainable source of income.

Less than one hour of work can pay for your membership! You do not have to live in the United States to complete the surveys or participate in focus groups because the majority of the questions are of a general nature. You will be paid by the company that you are completing the

survey for. Payments are made by check via postal mail or by PayPal online. Companies will usually send you checks bi-weekly or monthly.

Signup today for only \$29.95 and receive a platinum membership with instant access to hundreds of surveys from companies that will pay you for your opinion!

[Click Here To Register](#)

*All major credit cards accepted including Visa, MasterCard, American Express, Discover, EuroCard, Visa-Debit, MasterCard-Debit, and Novus cards.

C2003 PollsThatPay.com All rights reserved. [Register](#) | [Login](#) | [Contact Us](#)

Mark David Richards

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

Date: Tue, 2 Sep 2003 13:26:32 -0400
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: A question about a poll
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I have read several references in the media and in Usenet recently about a poll that found that 77% of Americans believed it should be legal for the 10 Commandments to be posted in government buildings. A quick search found a UConn poll from earlier this year with 62% of the people supporting this but nothing else.

At least one person on-line has referred to it as a Gallup poll. A quick search of the public part of the Gallup website brought nothing to light.

Does anyone know about this poll and whether it really exists?

--

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, 2 Sep 2003 14:13:47 -0500
Reply-To: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU>
Subject: Re: Researchers help define what makes a political conservative
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <[p05210602bb6c34fea962@\[24.241.225.116\]](mailto:p05210602bb6c34fea962@[24.241.225.116])>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"

For those who had followed the earlier thread on a study about conservative thinking, this response by two of the study's authors presents a useful balance to some of the negative media coverage the study generated originally.

Robert Godfrey

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A56563-2003Aug27.html>

Political Opinion, Not Pathology

By Arie W. Kruglanski and John T. Jost

Thursday, August 28, 2003; Page A27

In the May issue of Psychological Bulletin, we published a review that statistically summarizes dozens of studies conducted over 50 years dealing with psychological differences associated with left-vs. right-wing thinking. Based on this literature, we found that the likelihood of adopting conservative rather than liberal political opinions is significantly correlated, among other psychological dimensions, with a sense of societal instability, fear of death, intolerance of ambiguity, need for closure, lower cognitive complexity and a sense of threat.

Apparently without reading our original articles or attempting to contact any of us, many commentators and syndicated columnists, including Ann Coulter and Cal Thomas -- George Will [op-ed, Aug. 10] apparently read but misunderstood our work -- assumed that such a psychological analysis of ideology entails a judgment that conservatism must be abnormal, pathological or even the result of mental illness. The British media seem to have settled on the highly stigmatized and equally inaccurate term "neuroses." All of this reflects a crude and outdated perception of psychological research.

Historically, some of the better known psychological analyses of right-wing thinking, especially the famous Adorno et al. volume on "The Authoritarian Personality" (1950), assumed that anti-Semitism and racial intolerance were consequences of faulty parenting styles

and traumatic childhood experiences. The German psychologist Erich Jantsch in 1938 had described liberalism as morbid. We part ways with these and other theories based on a "medical model" that ranks political orientations on dimensions of abnormality. All the variables we have reviewed pertain to normal cognitive and motivational functioning. We would argue that all beliefs have a partial basis in one's needs, fears and desires, including beliefs that form one's political ideology. Our research has identified several factors that seem to underlie the propensity to find conservative vs. liberal thought systems appealing.

It's wrong to conclude that our results provide only bad news for conservatives. True, we find some support for the traditional "rigidity-of-the-right" hypothesis, but it is also true that liberals could be characterized on the basis of our overall profile as relatively disorganized, indecisive and perhaps overly drawn to ambiguity -- all of which may be liabilities in mass politics and other public and professional domains. Because we assume that all beliefs (ideological, scientific and otherwise) are partially (but never completely) determined by one's needs, fears and desires, we see nothing pathological about this process. It is simply part of what it means to be human. Our "trade-off" model of human psychology assumes that any trait or motivation has potential advantages and disadvantages, depending on the situation. A heightened sensitivity to threat and uncertainty is by no means maladaptive in all contexts. Even closed-mindedness may be useful, provided one tends to have a closed mind about appropriate values and accurate opinions; a reluctance to abandon one's prior convictions in favor of new fads can be a good thing. The important task for social scientists is to identify the conditions under which each of these cognitive and motivational styles is beneficial, rather than touting one or the other as inherently and invariably superior.

Our findings highlight the importance of situations and historical factors that can produce political shifts by affecting psychological needs pertaining to uncertainty and threat. The need to achieve closure and to resolve ambiguity, for example, are heightened under conditions of destabilizing uncertainty (for example, with the outbreak of terrorism, economic turmoil or political instability). Thus our research is best understood as addressing the cognitive and motivational bases of conservatism (and liberalism) rather than the personalities of conservatives (and liberals).

We readily acknowledge that identifying the motivational underpinnings of a belief system does not constitute a valid argument in a political debate any more than it does in scientific debates. What counts is the cogency of the political arguments and the degree to which they fit with independently verifiable facts and reasonable assumptions. When the dust settles on the current debate, we hope that these important messages will be seen as the real focus of our research.

Arie W. Kruglanski is distinguished university professor of psychology at the University of Maryland. John T. Jost is an

associate professor in Stanford's Graduate School of Business. This article was written in collaboration with Jack Glaser and Frank J. Sulloway, both of the University of California at Berkeley.

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

Date: Tue, 2 Sep 2003 14:56:26 -0400
Reply-To: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>
Subject: Re: A question about a poll
Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

As far as I know, this was a CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll. For what it is worth, a similar poll conducted solely in Alabama found an identical 77% supporting the placement of the Ten Commandments in the courthouse.

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

From: Leo G. Simonetta [<mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>]=20
Sent: Tuesday, September 02, 2003 1:27 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: A question about a poll

I have read several references in the media and in Usenet recently about a poll that found that 77% of Americans believed it should be legal for the 10 Commandments to be posted in government buildings. A quick search found a UConn poll from earlier this year with 62% of the people supporting this but nothing else.

At least one person on-line has referred to it as a Gallup poll. A quick search of the public part of the Gallup website brought nothing to light.

Does anyone know about this poll and whether it really exists?

--

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

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

Date: Tue, 2 Sep 2003 14:33:22 -0500
Reply-To: "Newport, Frank" <Frank_Newport@GALLUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Newport, Frank" <Frank_Newport@GALLUP.COM>
Subject: Re: A question about a poll
Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

CNN/USA TODAY/GALLUP POLL

AUGUST WAVE 1

-- FINAL TOPLINE --

August 25-26, 2003

Results are based on telephone interviews with -1,009-National Adults, aged 18+, conducted August 25-26, 2003. For results based on the total sample of National Adults, one can say with 95% confidence that the margin of sampling error is ?3 percentage points.

For results based on the -514-national adults in the Form A half-sample and -495-national adults in the Form B half-sample, the maximum margins of sampling error are ?5 percentage points.

Q.52-53 SPLIT SAMPLED

52. Do you think federal courts have generally been - [ROTATED: supportive, neutral, or hostile] - toward Christian religions in their rulings?

BASED ON -514-NATIONAL ADULTS IN FORM A

Supportive Neutral Hostile No opinion

2003 Aug 25-26 16 42 33 9

53. Do you approve or disapprove of a federal court decision ordering an Alabama court to remove a monument to the Ten Commandments from public display in its building?

BASED ON -495-NATIONAL ADULTS IN FORM B

Approve Disapprove No opinion

2003 Aug 25-26 19 77 4

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

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

Sent: Tuesday, September 02, 2003 1:27 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: A question about a poll

I have read several references in the media and in Usenet recently about a poll that found that 77% of Americans believed it should be legal for the 10 Commandments to be posted in government buildings. A quick search found a UConn poll from earlier this year with 62% of the people supporting this but nothing else.

At least one person on-line has referred to it as a Gallup poll. A quick search of the public part of the Gallup website brought nothing to light.

Does anyone know about this poll and whether it really exists?

--

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

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

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

Date: Tue, 2 Sep 2003 17:43:00 -0400

Reply-To: Claudia Deane <deanec@WASHPOST.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Claudia Deane <deanec@WASHPOST.COM>

Subject: Huffington transcript now on www.aapor.org

Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Just in time for the California gubernatorial race!

A final transcript of AAPOR's plenary session with columnist turned candidate Arianna Huffington is now available on www.aapor.org, including responses by expert panelists Robert Shapiro, Roger Tourangeau and Richard Morin.

Many thanks to those who worked to have the document transcribed, cleaned up and vetted, particularly Patricia Moy, Nancy Belden and Betsy Martin.

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

Date: Tue, 2 Sep 2003 16:37:25 -0400
Reply-To: Richard Morin <morinr@WASHPOST.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Richard Morin <morinr@WASHPOST.COM>
Subject: New Poll Watchers: 2002 Exit Poll data to be released; Disloyal Partisans
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

A new Poll Watchers column is available on Washingtonpost.com at

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A14843-2003Sep2.html>

In this column:

- * 2002 VNS national exit poll data finally to be released

- * Big majority of "strong" Republicans, Democrats sometimes cross party lines

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

Date: Tue, 2 Sep 2003 14:09:05 -0400
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Please ignore my previous post.
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I found the survey regarding the 10 commandments and it is a CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll from August 25-26.

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

"Do you approve or disapprove of a federal court decision ordering an Alabama court to remove a monument to the Ten Commandments from public display in its building?"

Approve 19%
Disapprove 77%
No Opinion 4%

I swear, it wasn't there when I checked last Friday . . .

--

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: Wed, 3 Sep 2003 11:29:12 -0400
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Survey: Hispanics tough to pigeonhole politically
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

There was also story on this on NPR this morning.

Survey: Hispanics tough to pigeonhole politically
<http://www.thedesertsun.com/news/stories2003/national/20030903031404.shtm>
ml#

Gannett News Service
September 3, 2003

WASHINGTON -- Hispanics don't easily fit into the political mold of traditional Democrats and Republicans, an exhaustive nationwide survey released Tuesday shows.

The National Annenberg Election Survey found that most Hispanics share the opinions of most liberals in calling for more federal spending on health care and schools. But a large number also support school vouchers and a ban on abortion -- issues typically favored by conservatives.

Another finding: Wealthier Hispanics, unlike most wealthy non-Hispanic Americans, identify themselves as Democrats.

In explaining the results, Adam Clymer, the survey's director, suggested that Hispanics may not feel part of the political process and that both

major parties have not connected with them.

"A lot of Hispanics are just not committed to one party," he said.

The findings are sure to confound the campaign strategists of both parties as they try to craft the right message to draw Hispanic voters in 2004.

The survey of 4,676 Hispanics was carried out between November 1999 and January 2001 as part of a larger poll of more than 79,000 Americans that was released last year. The margin of error of the Hispanic survey was plus-or-minus 1 percentage point.

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>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

Date: Wed, 3 Sep 2003 12:16:13 -0400
Reply-To: Ken Winneg <kwinneg@ASC.UPENN.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ken Winneg <kwinneg@ASC.UPENN.EDU>
Subject: National Annenberg Election Survey 2000 Hispanic Analysis
Release
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Below is the full release, for those who are interested, of the National Annenberg Election Survey analysis of the Hispanic sample from our 2000 survey. Ken

EMBARGOED FOR RELEASE after 6:30 p.m. EDT, Tuesday, September 2

For more information, call Adam Clymer at 202-879-6757

Annenberg Study Shows Political Differences

Among Hispanics of various Heritages

As both major political parties intensify their efforts to win votes from Hispanic voters, the nation's largest minority, new poll findings highlight the political differences and similarities among Hispanics of various heritages, with only those of Cuban backgrounds tilting toward Republicans.

On many economic issues, most Hispanics were closer to the views of all Democrats. For example, 48 percent of the public said the federal government should try to reduce differences in income among Americans, while another 48 percent said it should not. But 59 percent of Democrats, 64 percent of all Hispanics and 77 percent of Hispanics from the Caribbean said the government should reduce income disparities.

But Hispanics supported, or went beyond, Republican attitudes on some social issues. For example, 37 percent of all Hispanics and 49 percent of those with Central American heritage said the federal government should ban all abortions, a view held by only 31 percent of all Republicans and 22 percent of all Americans.

"These findings of the National Annenberg Election Survey of 2000 can be considered basically reliable measures of current Hispanic attitudes because

these subjects are more general than those that were asked about particular candidates or issues in 2000 and no dramatic events have intervened that would alter attitudes," said Kathleen Hall Jamieson, director of the Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania.

The results of the Annenberg survey, the largest academic election poll ever conducted, are disclosed in *Capturing Campaign Dynamics: The National Annenberg Election Survey*, by Daniel Romer, Kate Kenski, Paul Waldman, Christopher Adasiewicz and Kathleen Hall Jamieson, just published by Oxford University Press, complete with a CD-Rom containing the data. The survey is a project of the Annenberg Public Policy Center.

-- More --

National Annenberg Election Survey...2

The 2000 survey had more than 79,000 respondents, including panel studies and special polls of primary states, but in the basic rolling cross-section, 4,676 Hispanics were interviewed. The size of the sample made it possible to differentiate among Hispanics who trace their heritage to different countries, groups that would be far too small to measure reliably in most polls. Even the 2000 national exit poll conducted by Voter News Service had only 873 Hispanic respondents in all. Consequently its showing of that 62 percent of them voted for Vice President Al Gore and 35 percent voted for then-Governor George W. Bush of Texas was subject to a margin of sampling error of plus or minus three percentage points.

In the Annenberg survey, the margin of sampling error for all Hispanics was only plus or minus one percentage point. These were the margins of sampling error for Hispanics of particular heritages:

- * Mexican, plus or minus two percentage points
- * Puerto Rican, plus or minus four
- * Central American, plus or minus five
- * South American, plus or minus six
- * Spanish, plus or minus seven
- * Cuban, plus or minus eight
- * Caribbean, plus or minus nine

Democrats and Republicans are both striving to reach more Hispanic voters in 2004. The Democratic National Committee's first two debates among presidential candidates will be held in states with substantial Hispanic populations, in Albuquerque, New Mexico on Thursday and on October 9 in Phoenix, Arizona. New Mexico's Democratic Governor, Bill Richardson has announced plans to organize nationally, telling the Albuquerque Journal not long ago, "Our objective will be to unify the Hispanic community in the country - Cuban-Americans, Mexican-Americans, Hispanics in New Mexico, across the board."

Republicans have made it clear that they will emphasize issues like abortion and school vouchers (favored by 43 percent of all Americans but by 58 percent of Hispanics) to win their votes. Rudy Fernández, the Republican National Committee's Director of Grassroots Development, said recently "President Bush and the Republican Party are committed to continue working so that more Hispanics can send their children to a good school, buy a home, expand their small businesses, and fully achieve the American dream."

Although they played a large role in Richardson's victory in New Mexico in 2002, Hispanics have rarely turned out to vote in large numbers. They amounted to about ten percent of the voting age population in 2000 but cast about 6.5 percent of the votes. One reason may be that politicians paid less attention to them. Just 17 percent of Hispanics said they had been contacted by a presidential campaign in the fall of 2000. Among all Americans, the figure was 32 percent.

-- More --

National Annenberg Election Survey...3

Self-proclaimed political party identification fluctuates during a campaign, although less dramatically than candidate preferences. Among all Americans during the course of the 2000 campaign, 31 percent said they were Democrats and 28 percent said they were Republicans. But 37 percent of Hispanics said they were Democrats and only 18 percent said they were Republicans.

This is the breakdown among various Hispanics:

HERITAGE

Democrats

Republicans

Caribbean

48%

10%

Cuban

25

39

Central American

34

15

Mexican

37

15

Puerto Rican

41

18

South American

37

18

Spanish

34

28

Those who said independent or cited other parties not shown.

The Democratic preference was clearly affected by income; 37 percent of all Americans with household incomes of less than \$25,000 identify with Democrats and just 20 percent with Republicans. Among Hispanics with incomes under \$25,000, 34 percent said Democrat and 14 percent said Republican.

But income is not the whole story. Among all Americans, higher-income respondents identify more with Republicans, compared to Democrats - by 33 to 29 percent among those with incomes of \$50,000 to \$75,000 and 35 to 27 percent among those with household incomes over \$75,000. Among Hispanics generally, the \$50,000 to \$75,000 respondents identified with Democrats by 40 to 23 percent, and those over \$75,000 by 35 to 26 percent. Only among Hispanics of Cuban or Spanish background did the higher income groups tilt toward Republicans.

The survey found important latent support for some arguments made by most Democratic presidential candidates this summer - that the Federal government should spend more money to improve the public schools and more money providing health care for people who do not have it and guaranteeing health insurance for all children. On those questions, Hispanics mirrored the response of Democrats generally, with no statistically significant variations among Hispanics with different heritages.

But abortion was not the only issue where Hispanics came down on the more Republican side of the argument. Fifty-eight percent of all Hispanics, with majorities in all heritage groups ranging up to 71 percent among those with Caribbean backgrounds, said the Federal government should "give tax credits or vouchers to help parents send their children to private schools." Fifty-four percent of all Republicans but only 36 percent of Democrats agreed.

-- More --

There were few foreign policy questions not rooted in the events of 2000, but one remains clearly relevant today. Respondents in the telephone interviews were asked "Should the government use American military forces to stop civil wars in other countries or not?" Overall, 66 percent of the public said no, but Hispanic opposition was not as strong, with 55 percent opposing such use of the military.

National Annenberg Election Survey 2000 - Hispanic Views on Issues

Favor more

Federal spending on public schools

Favor more

Federal spending to cover people without

health insurance

Want Federal government to prohibit abortion

Want Federal government to provide tax credits or vouchers to help parents pay for private schools

Should Federal Government

try to reduce income differences between rich and poor?

Yes

No

All respondents

67%

66%

22%

43%

48%

48%

All Hispanics *

80

75

37

58

64

31

Heritage

Caribbean

85

83

51

71

77

13

Cuban

74

76

24

51

47

43

Central American

84

82

49

64

59 34

Mexican

81

74

41

58

67 29

Puerto Rican

80

79

28

65

66 27

South American

82

80

39

58

65 32

Spanish

75

68

24

52

41 53

Political Party**

All Republicans

55

49

31

54

32 64

All Democrats

77

79

17

36

59 36

All Independents

66

68

18

42

48 49

* Includes all respondents calling themselves Hispanic (regardless of specifying a country of origin).

** Respondents identifying with other parties or saying "don't know" are not included.

###

+++++

Ken Winneg

Managing Director

National Annenberg Election Survey

Annenberg Public Policy Center

University of Pennsylvania

3535 Market Street, Suite 550

Philadelphia, PA 19104

215-898-2641 (o)

215-573-2667 (f)

kwinneg@asc.upenn.edu <mailto:kwinneg@asc.upenn.edu>

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

Date: Mon, 25 Aug 2003 14:14:17 -0700

Reply-To: Kristin Juffer <kjuffer@WESTED.ORG>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Kristin Juffer <kjuffer@WESTED.ORG>

Subject: Re: Government takes over polling agency on eve of elections

Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

This should be of concern to all of AAPOR, and I think our AAPOR and WAPOR Boards should publically object in the LA Times, Wash Post, etc., on behalf of all of us. This is the kind of heavy handed government interference (or worse) that would have prompted Bush's father's administration to step in

and object to the Russian government's action. If there is no public outcry or push back, then it shows the power grab was successful, and others will only try to do more of the same. If it goes without strong objection, it puts all of us at risk.

Kris

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

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

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Monday, August 25, 2003 7:35 AM

Subject: Government takes over polling agency on eve of elections

> Government takes over polling agency on eve of elections

>

> [http://semissourian.com/print.html\\$rec=117911](http://semissourian.com/print.html$rec=117911)

>

>

> Southeast Missourian ~ Sunday, August 24, 2003

>

> By Kim Murphy ~ Los Angeles Times

>

> MOSCOW -- Not long ago, as the upcoming national election campaign got
> under way, the All-Russia Center for the Study of Public Opinion put out
> some polling data.

>

> Only 11 percent of the voters, the nation's most respected polling
> agency found, thought that President Vladimir V. Putin represented the
> interests of "all Russian people." The opposition Communist Party fared
> much better: Nearly 40 percent of those polled said it was on the side
> of ordinary citizens.

>

> It got worse for the government. The data also indicated that the war in
> the republic of Chechnya -- which Putin has made a cornerstone of his
> presidency -- was supported by less than one-third of the population.

>

> What to do with such compelling evidence that the voters and the
> government are not exactly in lock-step? In this case, the government
> has moved to take over the polling company.

>

> Earlier this month, the Labor Ministry informed Yuri A. Levada, widely
> considered Russia's top sociologist, that it was replacing the
> leadership of his independent polling company with a board appointed
> from government ministries and the presidential administration. Levada
> and his deputies, the ministry said, would not be part of the new
> management.

>

> Breaking the mirror

>

> Now the 72-year-old academic, who became famous as a dissident in the
> 1960s, finds himself resorting to "Snow White," not science, when he
> tries to explain what happened.

>

> "It is quite natural. The situation in this country is not very good,"
> Levada said in an interview this week. "The ruler ought to know this,
> and use this in his work. But there are many rulers who like only to
> have a mirror. And as in a fairy tale out of folklore, it is easier to
> break the mirror than change the policies."
>
> In itself, the takeover of a single polling company -- at least 50
> operate in Russia -- would not ring alarm bells. But the action against
> the All-Russia Center is seen by some as the latest in a series of
> measures the Kremlin has taken to quiet opposing voices in the run-up to
> parliamentary elections in December and presidential balloting in March.
>
>
> SNIP
>
> Times staff writer Sergei L. Loiko and Alexei V. Kuznetsov of The Times'
> Moscow Bureau contributed to this report. 8
>
>
> --
> 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>
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
>
>
>
>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
=====

Date: Wed, 3 Sep 2003 13:28:53 -0500
Reply-To: Timothy Johnson <tjohnson@SRL.UIC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Timothy Johnson <tjohnson@SRL.UIC.EDU>
Subject: Field Operations Manager position open at the Univ of Illinois
at

Chicago
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu, deanec@WASHPOST.COM
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable
Content-disposition: inline

Field Operations Manager =20

The Survey Research Laboratory of the University of Illinois has an immediate opening for a Field Operations Manager at its Chicago office who will be responsible for the operation and supervision of the SRL Field section. For a detailed job description and instructions on how to apply, please visit our web site: <http://www.srl.uic.edu/jobs/jobs.htm>.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

Date: Wed, 3 Sep 2003 15:56:51 -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: A question about a poll
Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, aapornet@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <004301c37177\$5a6e97b0\$130a010a@LEO>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Leo -- The question about the federal courts decision is from CNN/USA Today/Gallup 8/25-26. Freqs below from National Journal's Polltrack:

(Form A, 514 adults) Do you think federal courts have generally been supportive, neutral or hostile toward Christian religions in their rulings?

Supportive	16%
Neutral	42
Hostile	33
No opinion	9

(Form B, 495 adults) Do you approve or disapprove of a federal court decision ordering an Alabama court to remove a monument to the Ten Commandments from public display in its building?

Approve	19%
Disapprove	77
No opinion	4

Leo G. Simonetta wrote:

> I have read several references in the media and in Usenet recently about
> a poll that found that 77% of Americans believed it should be legal for
> the 10 Commandments to be posted in government buildings. A quick
> search found a UConn poll from earlier this year with 62% of the people
> supporting this but nothing else.
>
> At least one person on-line has referred to it as a Gallup poll. A

> quick search of the public part of the Gallup website brought nothing to
> light.

>
> Does anyone know about this poll and whether it really exists?

>
> --

> 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
>

--
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>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

Date: Wed, 3 Sep 2003 17:11:06 -0400
Reply-To: Ron Czaja <Ronc@SERVER.SASW.NCSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ron Czaja <Ronc@SERVER.SASW.NCSU.EDU>
Subject: Assistant Professor position
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

North Carolina State University. The Department of Sociology and Anthropology invites applicants with primary specialization in quantitative analysis for a tenure-track position (rank Assistant Professor) to begin August 2004. A PhD in sociology is preferred. The primary responsibilities of this position include teaching our graduate-level introduction to quantitative analysis course, teaching a second graduate course in some quantitative specialty (e.g., multilevel analysis, analysis of categorical data, SEM, etc.), teaching undergraduate and graduate courses in your substantive area, and active engagement in research and service. The normal teaching load is two courses per semester. Substantive specialization is open but preference will be given to candidates with interests consistent with the strengths of the department (see our department graduate web page at <http://sa.ncsu.edu/s&a/gradhome.htm> for further information).

Candidates must show clear evidence of outstanding teaching and scholarship. The department consists of 34 faculty, of whom 27 are sociologists. NC State offers competitive salaries, administrative commitment to facilitate research productivity and excellent area amenities. Formal screening of applicants begins November 17, 2003.

Send curriculum vita; a letter of application outlining your research agenda, quantitative courses you are able and willing to teach (enclose syllabi for graduate quantitative courses, if available), and your teaching philosophy; and three letters of reference to: Chair, Quantitative Recruitment Committee, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, 2400 Founders Drive, 1911 Bldg., Rm. 301, Box 8107, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695-8107. NCSU is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. NC State welcomes all persons without regard to sexual orientation. For ADA accommodations, individuals with disabilities should contact: Bruce Cheek, (919) 515-3180; e-mail: wbcheek2@sa.ncsu.edu.

Ronald Czaja
North Carolina State Univ.
Dept. of Sociology
Box 8107
Raleigh, NC 27695
Phone 919.515.9002; Fax 919.515.2610
ronc@sa.ncsu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

=====

Date: Thu, 4 Sep 2003 13:44:45 -0400
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Kaiser Family Foundation and Harvard School of Public Health
Survey
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Public Cool to Medicare Drug Bills, Survey Finds
Wed Sep 3, 4:26 PM ET Add Health - Reuters to My Yahoo!

By Julie Rovner

WASHINGTON (Reuters Health) - As negotiators from the US House and Senate settle down to try to resolve the differences between the Medicare prescription drug bills passed by each chamber in June, a new poll suggests the public is likely to be unhappy with whatever final

product emerges from the talks.

The survey was conducted by the Kaiser Family Foundation and Harvard School of Public Health.

After being told that the bills would allocate \$400 billion to a new outpatient prescription drug benefit over the next decade, but both would also leave many seniors still paying more than half the cost of their medications, 57 percent of those surveyed said Congress should scrap the current bill.

SNIP

In fact, the poll found, only a small proportion of the public has any idea that there are major differences between the House and Senate bills, much less what those differences are. Nearly 70 percent of seniors said they did not know whether the differences between the House and Senate-passed measures are large, small, or nonexistent.

One thing the public does support, according to the poll, is for Congress to make it easier for Americans to purchase drugs from Canada, where medications often sell for a fraction of their U.S. prices. Even after being told that easing current restrictions "could lead to unsafe drugs being imported into the country," 63 percent of those surveyed said they still favored the change.

SNIP

Full Study available at:
<http://www.kff.org/content/2003/20030903a/>

--

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>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

Date: Thu, 4 Sep 2003 16:42:32 -0400
Reply-To: Claudia Deane <deanec@WASHPOST.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Claudia Deane <deanec@WASHPOST.COM>
Subject: Passing on a question
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu

Comments: cc: llancas@us.ibm.com
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Passing on a question from:

Larry Lancaster
Certified Project Manager, Lotus Complaints/Critical Situations, IBM

Please reply directly to: llancas@us.ibm.com

General question : Is there data that shows email surveys to a computer literate population provide as good ,or better, survey response than cold call telephone survey methods?

Background: I work at IBM in a group that handles corporate complaints. Our customers are IT Managers and their staff. After a resolution to the complaint has been supplied to the customer , a telephone survey is conducted by our Marketing Intelligence folks, asking their satisfaction with the supplied resolution. It is an unscheduled call, with the hope that the customer will be in his office and agree to take the survey. The contact success rate is about 20% and I am looking at ways to improve that percentage.

I am under the impression that among computer literate people who regularly use email, a email survey would provide a better success ratio than the current voice contact method (current methods do not leave phone mail - if the customer is not in, they are called 9 more times before giving up).

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

=====
Date: Fri, 5 Sep 2003 13:47:35 -0400
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: VNS 2002 Exit Poll highlights
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

See also
<http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/national/AP-2002-Exit-Polls.html>

Highlights of Newly Released 2002 Nation
By THE ASSOCIATED PRESS
<http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/national/AP-Exit-Polls-Glance.html>

Filed at 1:01 p.m. ET

Highlights from the newly released national exit poll of voters in the Nov. 5, 2002, elections for U.S. House:

-- 40 percent identified themselves as Republican, up from 36 percent in each of the two previous midterm elections. Democrats made up 38 percent of the electorate in 2002, 37 percent in 1998 and 36 percent in 1994. Self-identified political independents declined to 22 percent in 2002 from 27 percent each in 1998 and 1994.

-- 49 percent of women reported voting Republican for House, up slightly from the two previous midterms (46 percent in 1998, 47 percent in 1994).

-- 35 percent of Jews said they voted Republican. In previous midterm and presidential years since 1992 that number ranged from 21 percent to 26 percent.

-- 30 percent of all voters said the economy was the most important issue in their House vote. Health care, terrorism, education and Social Security registered between 11 percent and 14 percent each. Only 3 percent cited Iraq and 4 percent said corporate reform was the top issue.

-- 36 percent said their vote for House was intended to express support for President Bush, 18 percent to show opposition. At that time 64 percent said they approved of how Bush was handling his job as president; recent national telephone polling has Bush approval ranging from the low to high 50s.

Exit polls conducted by Voter News Service for The Associated Press and television networks. In 2002 the sample included 16,428 voters in 200 precincts nationwide. Sample sizes were 10,017 in 1998 and 10,426 in 1994. Sampling error for each of the surveys is a little more than plus or minus 1 percentage point for the full sample, larger for subgroups.

--

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: Fri, 5 Sep 2003 15:32:42 -0700
Reply-To: Joel Bloom <jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joel Bloom <jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU>
Subject: Call For Papers

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Dear AAPORians,

For the first time in living memory, the Western Political Science Association Annual Meeting will feature an organized section on "Public Opinion and Political Psychology."

The section has been allocated 4 panels, but with co-sponsoring with related panels that could go as high as 8. (I've already spoken to section heads on elections and political behavior, parties, and race and ethnicity; others are of course possible as well depending on the proposals we get.)

The deadline for on-line submissions is next Friday, September 12th. The conference is in Portland, Oregon, March 11-13, 2004.

WPSA is a very nice-sized meeting, roughly comparable to AAPOR. Portland, of course, is a gorgeous city and this represents a great opportunity for those of you on the West Coast or the Pacific Rim to attend a conference that isn't an extra several time zones (and connecting flights) away.

Association dues are minimal (and include a subscription to Political Research Quarterly); the conference registration fee is pretty standard. Don't worry if you're not a political scientist -- just about any topic related to public opinion would be relevant to political scientists.

WPSA's online submission form is pretty user-friendly. The exception is that there is no formal way to propose a whole panel. Unfortunately, you would have to submit each paper separately and send me an e-mail to let me know you want it as a panel. For more information about the conference, and to get to the on-line submission forms, go to:

<http://www.csus.edu/ORG/WPSA/mtgs.stm>

If you have any questions, please don't be shy about contacting me directly. Thanks, and I look forward to hearing from some of you!

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

Date: Fri, 5 Sep 2003 18:48:19 -0400
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Subject: electronic market
Comments: To: aapornet <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Do AAPORites have an opinion on the Iowa Electronic Market?

--

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
38 Greene St - 4th fl.
New York NY 10013-2505 USA
voice +1-212-219-0010
fax +1-212-219-0098
cell +1-917-865-2813
email <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>
web <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>

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

Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2003 11:07:46 +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: KIIS Ukraine Fall omnibus survey
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear Colleagues,

Between September 22 and October 10 Kiev International Institute of Sociology will conduct an omnibus-survey of the adult population of Ukraine.

The deadline to provide questions is September 22th, 2003

Results Available: October 10th-13th, 2003

Sample:
2,000 respondents aged 16 years and older, living in Ukraine.
Sample is based on random selection of 200 sampling points (post-office districts) all over Ukraine (in all 24 oblasts of Ukraine and Crimea).

Costs per one question - \$260

Discounts and other details are in our WEB site:

<http://www.kiis.com.ua>

We are inviting you to take part in this survey.

Sincerely yours,

Volodimir Paniotto

For more information you may also write or call

Natalya Kharchenko, Deputy Director of KIIS

Office phone / fax: (380-44)-463-5868, 238-2567, 238-2568

E-mail: nkh@kiis.com.ua

Copy to: office@kiis.com.ua

omnlist@kiis.com.ua

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>

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

Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2003 12:29:16 -0400

Reply-To: "Mariolis, Peter" <pxm1@CDC.GOV>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Mariolis, Peter" <pxm1@CDC.GOV>

Subject: Position Available: Survey Sampling Statistician

Comments: To: "AAPORNET (aapornet@asu.edu)" <aapornet@asu.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain

The Office on Smoking and Health at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in Atlanta has an opening for a Survey Sampling Statistician .

The primary duties of the incumbent are to provide sampling and weighting support for school-based state-wide Youth Tobacco Surveys. Approximately 20 states conduct a Youth Tobacco Survey each year. A formal position

description and application information may be found at

<http://www2.cdc.gov/hrmo/viewdetail.asp?AnnouncementNumber=1-03-1368>

aW9uIGFuZCBhbGwgY29waWVzIHRoZXJlb2YsIGluY2x1ZGluZyBhdHRhY2htZW50cy4gDQoNCg==

Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2003 12:50:24 -0500
Reply-To: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Susan Carol Losh <slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU>
Subject: Workshops for Reporters
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain
Content-transfer-encoding: binary
Content-disposition: inline

I think this is a TERRIFIC idea. I heartily second the motion.

Any time I have worked with the press, it has become an introductory statistics/methods section.

Most reporters really want to know the basic nuts and bolts. Not all have journalism degrees where they often receive methods training.

I believe this is a NCPP booklet that has "20 questions" for reporters to ask also. I have used this one with classes in the past.

Susan

Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.
American Statistical Association/NSF-SRS Research Fellow 2003-2004
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>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2003 15:43:07 -0400
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Subject: Re: Huffington transcript now on www.aapor.org
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <4E6F22AE2717564287952C727F796F931669D9@fscmail.fsc.local>
MIME-version: 1.0

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

Leora Lawton wrote:

>onsider this: A friend who is a retired AP reporter told me that the
>with the exception of some specialized departments, the overwhelming
>majority of reporters she's met do not have a grasp on basic
>statistics, that's why they misinterpret them so much, or don't
>understand the salience of the results.

I write about economics, and I can second the notion that most reporters, even those on business beats, don't understand statistics. And that's not just in the technical sense, of knowing what a r^2 or a standard error is - it's how to read a report heavy on stats, how to interpret numbers, how to think about the validity of results, etc. They need "experts" to do these things for them, which in a lot of cases, means people with a spin (Wall Street economists, political consultants). But experts are often set up to deal with reporters' questions - a call placed to Heritage or Cato is quickly returned with a pundit on offer. If pollsters don't like the way reporters report polls, then you've got to hold their hands and explain things slowly to them.

--

Doug Henwood
Left Business Observer
38 Greene St - 4th fl.
New York NY 10013-2505 USA
voice +1-212-219-0010
fax +1-212-219-0098
cell +1-917-865-2813
email <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>
web <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>

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

Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2003 15:41:39 -0400
Reply-To: BLUMWEP@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Micheline (Mickey) Blum" <BLUMWEP@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: Workshops for Reporters
Comments: To: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I agree that reporter workshops at AAPOR would be great, and I would also like to suggest that polling workshops be offered at conferences held by journalists associations. When Susan Pinkus, Doug Schwartz and I spoke at the Asian American Journalists Association conference in August, we were asked many questions about polling methodology and how to read, evaluate, and report on

polls--even though we were there to speak about bilingual polling. We answered the questions and then directed our audience to the "20 Questions" and to both the NCPP and AAPOR websites for more information. Perhaps AAPOR could make polling workshops available to these associations.

Mickey Blum

Micheline Blum
President
Blum & Weprin Associates, Inc.
212-929-6510 phone
212-929-6518 fax
blumwep@aol.com
blumandweprin.com

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

Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2003 16:48:48 -0400
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Unprecedented California Recall Vote Makes Extra Work for
Pollsters, Emphasizes Polling's Flaws
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Just Guessing . . .

Unprecedented California Recall Vote Makes Extra Work for Pollsters,
Emphasizes Polling's Flaws
<http://printerfriendly.abcnews.com/printerfriendly/Print?fetchFromGLUE=true&GLUEService=ABCNewsCom>

The Associated Press

SACRAMENTO, Calif. Sept. 8 -
Polls are playing a prominent albeit capricious role in this year's gubernatorial race, as voters face an unprecedented recall election and a colorful cast of 135 replacement candidates.

SNIP

But just when polls have become most essential, many say they have become the most unreliable. Changes in the way Californians and Americans live have made calls from opinion pollsters unwelcome intrusions, forcing them to make more calls and take more time to get what they hope is a representative sample of public opinion.

"Polling has always been difficult to do, but it is just getting that much worse I think half the time these guys are just guessing," said Allan Lichtman, a historian and political scientist at American University in Washington, D.C. "It's really an art not a science."

So few people vote these days that polltakers are lucky to judge who will vote and who won't, Lichtman said. Since most people now don't focus on campaigns until just before Election Day, he said, it's also unclear about what is being measured.

"Look at the Bush-Gore election and how wildly the polls changed day to day," he said. "That's a presidential election which is far less volatile than what is going on out in California with 135 candidates and everything else."

SNIP

Three surveys taken within a couple days of one another came to three different conclusions: the Public Policy Institute of California poll had Republican actor Arnold Schwarzenegger ahead; the Los Angeles Times poll said Democratic Lt. Gov. Cruz Bustamante was leading; and a Field Poll measured Bustamante and Schwarzenegger nearly in a dead heat.

SNIP

Determining the recall's turnout is just guesswork, said Walter Stone, a University of California at Davis political scientist. "If you look at the history of where polls have gone astray in the past it is on this question of turnout."

A far bigger problem facing pollsters, however, is finding people willing to be interviewed for the polls. Polls are based on the theory that a small number of people randomly contacted and interviewed can represent the opinions of the broader electorate.

Now, however, many families have two working parents who struggle to keep up with chores and children and don't want to share their free time for a poll.

Twenty years ago, 70 percent of those people called agreed to be interviewed, said Mark DiCamillo, director of the Field Poll. Today pollsters are lucky if half of those called will talk, which means DiCamillo's staff must make many more calls to obtain the number of qualified responses needed for a scientifically accurate poll.

SNIP

But that doesn't mean polls are less accurate now than in 1970s, DiCamillo said, only that they take more time to complete.

The new federal no-call list for telemarketing, which doesn't apply to pollsters, should help, said Richard Hertz, a pollster based in Petaluma. But polltakers will still be facing busy, stressed-out people on the other end of the phone line.

Hertz and other pollsters have begun using a Web-based system for conducting polls. Working with a Bay Area television station, his system invites viewers to log on to the polling site and sign up as part of a permanent pool of voters that can be tested just like any other survey sample.

Critics question whether a self-selected pool of voters can provide the same survey results as a pool randomly drawn. But Hertz contends that tests of the Web-based system show it works, at least in the tech-savvy Bay Area.

"People had some of the same issues when polls went from interviewing people in the street to calling people on the phone," he said.

Copyright 2003 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed

--
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: Mon, 8 Sep 2003 16:50:04 -0400
Reply-To: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>
Subject: Position Available
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

The Center for Applied Demography & Survey Research, University of Delaware has two positions available.
The description is posted at <http://www.cadsr.udel.edu/ltr.htm>.

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

=====
Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2003 17:19:27 -0400
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Re: Huffington transcript now on www.aapor.org
Comments: To: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To: <4E6F22AE2717564287952C727F796F931669D9@fscmail.fsc.local>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Leora,

I think you are missing the point of the unhappiness with Huffington. In her columns she blamed the polls and the pollsters and advocates that the public not respond. When she addressed AAPOR she shifted the blame to the media. This was more than a little disingenuous. She was unwilling to repeat her charges against the polls in front of the AAPOR audience. Two of the three discussants gave talks that critiqued what they thought she was going to say based on her columns, which fell flat as she said nothing that night that related to their remarks. The third discussant engaged her and she was less than forthright in her reply to his remarks. I agree that she is engaging, bright and has remarks worth hearing. But what she said had nothing to do with what she has been writing about polls.

As for education workshops for journalists, the National Council on Public Polls has done these many times. Very few journalists attend. The place to start is in the universities. Working journalists don't seem to have the time or the interest.

warren mitofsky

At 10:06 AM 9/8/2003 -0700, Leora Lawton wrote:

>Folks,

>

> I attended AAPOR this spring and heard Arianna Huffington talk. I
> had never heard her speak before, although I had liked her columns and
> was aware of some aspects of her background, though not many. I liked
> what she had said, and I was somewhat surprised by the suspicious and
> derogatory manner in which some aaporites expressed themselves about Ms
> Huffington.

>

> It's true that she has advocated not taking surveys, and her
> website does say that as well, and for that reason I believe that it was
> important for her to come to AAPOR. (It seems to me that those who
> decided to invite her as a speaker were acting in the interests of our
> profession, and I commend them for that.) But what she said in her talk
> (e.g., pg 8-9) was that it's not the polls per se that are problematic,
> it's the way in which the media report the results that distort reality.

MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL

1776 Broadway, Suite 1708

New York, NY 10019

212 980-3031 Phone

212 980-3107 Fax

mitofsky@mindspring.com

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: Mon, 8 Sep 2003 16:50:47 -0400
Reply-To: MDonatello@borrelassociates.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Donatello <Mike.Donatello@MARKETDATAANALYSIS.COM>
Subject: Re: Workshops for Reporters
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <200309081750.h88HoOF25630@fire3.fsu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Phil Meyer at UNC used to -- and still may -- offer a course for reporters and editors that comprised an intro to basic polling and math concepts. When I was at The (Raleigh, NC) News & Observer a decade ago, the executive editor brought Phil in to get the editorial staff up to speed. Because Phil had an editorial background - and because participation was mandated by editorial management - I believe the effect was more positive than if a "non-editorial" person had made the presentation. That is, it became more informational and, perhaps, less instructional.

This brings me to two suggestions: First, perhaps Phil could chime in with some recommendations regarding marketing of such a program. Second, I believe that something like this would have greater effect if AAPOR created buy-in at the editorial management level (i.e., mandated trickle-down), rather than aiming mainly for journalists themselves. Most journalists who believe they need to know this information already do...

--
Mike Donatello
Senior Partner, Vice President of Research
Borrell Associates Inc.
Executive Strategies for Local Media
2902 Mother Well Ct., Oak Hill, VA 20171-4065
V 703.582.5680 F 703.832.8630
MDonatello@borrelassociates.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Susan Carol Losh
Sent: Monday, 08 September, 2003 13:50
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Workshops for Reporters

I think this is a TERRIFIC idea. I heartily second the motion.

Any time I have worked with the press, it has become an introductory statistics/methods section.

Most reporters really want to know the basic nuts and bolts. Not all have journalism degrees where they often receive methods training.

I believe this is a NCPP booklet that has "20 questions" for reporters to ask also. I have used this one with classes in the past.

Susan

Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.
American Statistical Association/NSF-SRS Research Fellow 2003-2004
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>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2003 16:35:34 -0500
Reply-To: Lydia_Saad@GALLUP.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Lydia Saad <Lydia_Saad@GALLUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Unprecedented California Recall Vote Makes Extra Work for
Pol

lsters, Emphasizes Polling's Flaws
Comments: To: simonetta@ARTSCI.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

A few reactions:

1. There is no connection between the unique methodological difficulties in polling on the California recall and the problem of non-response facing the industry more generally. It's too bad that distinction gets blurred at the beginning and end of this article. It would have been nice to see a more cogent discussion of the polling challenges presented by the two-stage nature of the vote, and the laundry list of candidate names.

The following statements by Prof. Lichtman are demonstrably false:

2. "Half the time these (ahem) guys are just guessing...it's really an art not a science" in reference to election pollsters.

3. So few people vote these days that polltakers are lucky to judge who will vote and who won't...

4. Most people now don't focus on campaigns until just before Election Day

5. "Look at the Bush-Gore election and how wildly the polls changed day to day"

And then of course we are treated to assertion that the "tech savvy" nature of people in the Bay area is somehow supposed to overcome the sampling bias inherent in a self-selected web-based election survey being sponsored by a Bay area local TV station.

"Critics question whether a self-selected pool of voters can provide the same survey results as a pool randomly drawn. But Hertz contends that tests of the Web-based system show it works, at least in the tech-savvy Bay Area. "People had some of the same issues when polls went from interviewing people in the street to calling people on the phone," he said."

Who wrote this "news story" for the AP?

Lydia Saad

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

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

Sent: Monday, September 08, 2003 4:49 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Unprecedented California Recall Vote Makes Extra Work for Pollsters, Emphasizes Polling's Flaws

Just Guessing . . .

Unprecedented California Recall Vote Makes Extra Work for Pollsters, Emphasizes Polling's Flaws

<http://printerfriendly.abcnews.com/printerfriendly/Print?fetchFromGLUE=true&GLUEService=ABCNewsCom>

The Associated Press

SACRAMENTO, Calif. Sept. 8 -

Polls are playing a prominent albeit capricious role in this year's gubernatorial race, as voters face an unprecedented recall election and a colorful cast of 135 replacement candidates.

SNIP

But just when polls have become most essential, many say they have become the most unreliable. Changes in the way Californians and Americans live have made calls from opinion pollsters unwelcome intrusions, forcing them to make more calls and take more time to get what they hope is a representative sample of public opinion.

"Polling has always been difficult to do, but it is just getting that

much worse I think half the time these guys are just guessing," said Allan Lichtman, a historian and political scientist at American University in Washington, D.C. "It's really an art not a science."

So few people vote these days that polltakers are lucky to judge who will vote and who won't, Lichtman said. Since most people now don't focus on campaigns until just before Election Day, he said, it's also unclear about what is being measured.

"Look at the Bush-Gore election and how wildly the polls changed day to day," he said. "That's a presidential election which is far less volatile than what is going on out in California with 135 candidates and everything else."

SNIP

Three surveys taken within a couple days of one another came to three different conclusions: the Public Policy Institute of California poll had Republican actor Arnold Schwarzenegger ahead; the Los Angeles Times poll said Democratic Lt. Gov. Cruz Bustamante was leading; and a Field Poll measured Bustamante and Schwarzenegger nearly in a dead heat.

SNIP

Determining the recall's turnout is just guesswork, said Walter Stone, a University of California at Davis political scientist. "If you look at the history of where polls have gone astray in the past it is on this question of turnout."

A far bigger problem facing pollsters, however, is finding people willing to be interviewed for the polls. Polls are based on the theory that a small number of people randomly contacted and interviewed can represent the opinions of the broader electorate.

Now, however, many families have two working parents who struggle to keep up with chores and children and don't want to share their free time for a poll.

Twenty years ago, 70 percent of those people called agreed to be interviewed, said Mark DiCamillo, director of the Field Poll. Today pollsters are lucky if half of those called will talk, which means DiCamillo's staff must make many more calls to obtain the number of qualified responses needed for a scientifically accurate poll.

SNIP

But that doesn't mean polls are less accurate now than in 1970s, DiCamillo said, only that they take more time to complete.

The new federal no-call list for telemarketing, which doesn't apply to pollsters, should help, said Richard Hertz, a pollster based in Petaluma. But polltakers will still be facing busy, stressed-out people on the other end of the phone line.

Hertz and other pollsters have begun using a Web-based system for conducting polls. Working with a Bay Area television station, his system invites viewers to log on to the polling site and sign up as part of a permanent pool of voters that can be tested just like any other survey sample.

Critics question whether a self-selected pool of voters can provide the same survey results as a pool randomly drawn. But Hertz contends that tests of the Web-based system show it works, at least in the tech-savvy Bay Area.

"People had some of the same issues when polls went from interviewing people in the street to calling people on the phone," he said.

Copyright 2003 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed

--
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

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

=====
Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2003 15:17:12 -0700
Reply-To: "Pinkus, Susan" <Susan.Pinkus@LATIMES.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Pinkus, Susan" <Susan.Pinkus@LATIMES.COM>
Subject: Re: Workshops for Reporters
Comments: To: "MDonatello@borrellassociates.com"
<MDonatello@borrellassociates.com>,
"AAPORNET@asu.edu" <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

I have been on a mission at the LA Times to give poll workshops to reporters and editors on the good and bad of polling and explain to them what they should be looking for when a poll or press release crosses their desk. It seems to be working -- i vet a lot of bad polls that I keep out of the paper. But more work needs to be done, especially with papers without polling units.

Susan Pinkus

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

From: Mike Donatello [mailto:Mike.Donatello@MARKETDATAANALYSIS.COM]
Sent: Monday, September 08, 2003 1:51 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Workshops for Reporters

Phil Meyer at UNC used to -- and still may -- offer a course for reporters and editors that comprised an intro to basic polling and math concepts. When I was at The (Raleigh, NC) News & Observer a decade ago, the executive editor brought Phil in to get the editorial staff up to speed. Because Phil had an editorial background - and because participation was mandated by editorial management - I believe the effect was more positive than if a "non-editorial" person had made the presentation. That is, it became more informational and, perhaps, less instructional.

This brings me to two suggestions: First, perhaps Phil could chime in with some recommendations regarding marketing of such a program. Second, I believe that something like this would have greater effect if AAPOR created buy-in at the editorial management level (i.e., mandated trickle-down), rather than aiming mainly for journalists themselves. Most journalists who believe they need to know this information already do...

--
Mike Donatello
Senior Partner, Vice President of Research
Borrell Associates Inc.
Executive Strategies for Local Media
2902 Mother Well Ct., Oak Hill, VA 20171-4065
V 703.582.5680 F 703.832.8630
MDonatello@borrellassociates.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Susan Carol Losh
Sent: Monday, 08 September, 2003 13:50
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Workshops for Reporters

I think this is a TERRIFIC idea. I heartily second the motion.

Any time I have worked with the press, it has become an introductory statistics/methods section.

Most reporters really want to know the basic nuts and bolts. Not all have journalism degrees where they often receive methods training.

I believe this is a NCPP booklet that has "20 questions" for reporters to ask also. I have used this one with classes in the past.

Susan

Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.
American Statistical Association/NSF-SRS Research Fellow 2003-2004
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>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

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

Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2003 23:13:33 -0400
Reply-To: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Subject: Re: Workshops for Reporters
Comments: To: MDonatello@borrellassociates.com
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To:
<NHEGLIPPKAMDAANEJMFHGEEMDEAA.Mike.Donatello@MarketDataAnalysis.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

NCPP used to do some pretty good election-year training sessions for journalists. Investigative Reporters and Editors (IRE) has a technical-training arm, and I've helped them with some week-long summer sessions on research methods and SPSS. But the biggest demand for my services these days is teaching 6th-grade math to newspaper staffs.

Journalism schools, if we're typical, do okay at the professional M.A. level, but not well at all with undergraduates. Every university needs someplace for mathphobes to hide out, and, too often, it's the J-School. I'm trying to get the art department to take over that role, but no luck so far.

The underlying problem, of course, is that the media industry doesn't spend much on training, relying mostly on charity to get it done. A lot of good people come to mid-career training opportunities on their own time and expense, however, and AAPOR could tap some of that energy.

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Voice: 919 962-4085 Fax: 919 962-1549
Cell: 919 906-3425 URL: www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

On Mon, 8 Sep 2003, Mike Donatello wrote:

> Date: Mon, 08 Sep 2003 16:50:47 -0400
> From: Mike Donatello <Mike.Donatello@MARKETDATAANALYSIS.COM>
> Reply-To: MDonatello@borrellassociates.com
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Re: Workshops for Reporters
>
> Phil Meyer at UNC used to -- and still may -- offer a course for reporters
> and editors that comprised an intro to basic polling and math concepts.
> When I was at The (Raleigh, NC) News & Observer a decade ago, the executive
> editor brought Phil in to get the editorial staff up to speed. Because Phil
> had an editorial background - and because participation was mandated by
> editorial management - I believe the effect was more positive than if a
> "non-editorial" person had made the presentation. That is, it became more
> informational and, perhaps, less instructional.
>
> This brings me to two suggestions: First, perhaps Phil could chime in with
> some recommendations regarding marketing of such a program. Second, I
> believe that something like this would have greater effect if AAPOR created
> buy-in at the editorial management level (i.e., mandated trickle-down),
> rather than aiming mainly for journalists themselves. Most journalists who
> believe they need to know this information already do...
>
> --
> Mike Donatello
> Senior Partner, Vice President of Research
> Borrell Associates Inc.
> Executive Strategies for Local Media
> 2902 Mother Well Ct., Oak Hill, VA 20171-4065
> V 703.582.5680 F 703.832.8630
> MDonatello@borrellassociates.com
>
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of Susan Carol Losh
> Sent: Monday, 08 September, 2003 13:50
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Workshops for Reporters
>
> I think this is a TERRIFIC idea. I heartily second the motion.
>
> Any time I have worked with the press, it has become an introductory
> statistics/methods section.
>
> Most reporters really want to know the basic nuts and bolts. Not all have

> journalism degrees where they often receive methods training.
>
> I believe this is a NCPP booklet that has "20 questions" for reporters to
> ask also. I have used this one with classes in the past.
>
> Susan
>
>
>
>
>
> Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.
> American Statistical Association/NSF-SRS Research Fellow 2003-2004
> 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>
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

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

Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2003 08:54:56 -0400
Reply-To: "Mariolis, Peter" <pxm1@CDC.GOV>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Mariolis, Peter" <pxm1@CDC.GOV>
Subject: Position Available: Survey Sampling Statistician
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

The Office on Smoking and Health at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in Atlanta has an opening for a Survey Sampling Statistician . The primary duties of the incumbent are to provide sampling and weighting support for school-based state-wide Youth Tobacco Surveys. Approximately 20 states conduct a Youth Tobacco Survey each year. A formal position description and application information may be found at <http://www2.cdc.gov/hrmo/viewdetail.asp?AnnouncementNumber=1-03-1368>. The deadline for submission of an application is September 25, 2003.

Peter Mariolis

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2003 07:51:31 -0500
Reply-To: Rob Daves <daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Rob Daves <daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM>
Subject: Re: Workshops for Reporters
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu, slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Content-disposition: inline

Susan and other AAPORnetters:

Currently planners are putting together short courses for AAPOR's 2004 Phoenix conference, and one of the ideas on the table is some sort of workshop for reporters that covers the basics of poll methodology and how to write about polls. We're not far enough along to have details yet, but know that the notion is falling on very receptive ears (and computer screens).

Thanks for your suggestions.

All best wishes...

Rob Daves
2004 Conference Conference

>>> Susan Carol Losh <slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU> 09/08/03 12:50PM >>>
I think this is a TERRIFIC idea. I heartily second the motion.

Any time I have worked with the press, it has become an introductory statistics/methods section.

Most reporters really want to know the basic nuts and bolts. Not all have journalism degrees where they often receive methods training.

I believe this is a NCPP booklet that has "20 questions" for reporters to ask also. I have used this one with classes in the past.

Susan

Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.
American Statistical Association/NSF-SRS Research Fellow 2003-2004

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

=====
Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2003 11:18:49 -0400
Reply-To: BLUMWEP@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Micheline (Mickey) Blum" <BLUMWEP@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: Workshops for Reporters
Comments: To: daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Rob--et al,

Perhaps once this workshop is set up for AAPOR, it could be a traveling road show-- going to national conferences of journalists and even to local AAPOR chapters.

Mickey

Micheline Blum
President
Blum & Weprin Associates, Inc.
212-929-6510 phone
212-929-6518 fax
blumwep@aol.com
blumandweprin.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet
=====

"Micheline (Mickey) Blum" <BLUMWEP@AOL.COM>
Sent by: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
09/09/2003 11:18 AM
Please respond to BLUMWEP

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
cc:
Subject: Re: Workshops for Reporters

Rob--et al,

Perhaps once this workshop is set up for AAPOR, it could be a traveling road show-- going to national conferences of journalists and even to local AAPOR chapters.

Mickey

Micheline Blum
President
Blum & Weprin Associates, Inc.
212-929-6510 phone
212-929-6518 fax
blumwep@aol.com
blumandweprin.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2003 12:45:23 -0400
Reply-To: KentofCT@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Kent Jamison <KentofCT@AOL.COM>
Subject: AAPOR: Workshops for Reporters
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The Hartford Courant here puts on a major writers conference in March. A lot of big names and very well attended -- 400 plus attendees. Covers fiction, nonfiction and everything else, not just journalists but I would say two-thirds of the audience are reporters. Such a workshop would hit a wider audience and might be well received.

Kent Jamison

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

=====

Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2003 12:01:33 -0400
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: More fun for Russian Pollsters
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Note that it bans forecasting results.

Putin puts 'Soviet' bar on poll coverage

Nick Paton Walsh in Moscow
Tuesday September 9, 2003
The Guardian
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/russia/article/0,2763,1038428,00.html>

The Kremlin has introduced a draconian election law which threatens the media with closure if they give details of candidates' personal lives or analyse their policies.

SNIP

The decree, signed by President Vladimir Putin, places a blanket ban during campaigning on forecasting results and requires candidates to be given equal coverage - a practical impossibility because there are 44 parties.

A media outlet can be shut during the electoral campaign after two warnings.

"The law substantially limits press freedoms," said Alexander Shishlov, a senior member of Yabloko, Russia's leading liberal party.

He said the law was even more draconian when the Kremlin presented it to parliament, and MPs removed some of its harsher clauses.

"Yet the law retains its repressive character," he said. "Its adoption is a very alarming sign [for Russia's future]."

The existence of the decree came to light after Mr Putin began the electoral campaign last week when he announced parliamentary elections on December 7.

The presidential election, which analysts consider a foregone conclusion for Mr Putin, is in March.

SNIP

Journalists in St Petersburg have been the first to face the new restrictions.

One newspaper left its front page blank in protest while filling its inside pages with articles about a fictional election in a faraway land - in reality the St Petersburg vote, but with candidates' names changed.

--

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>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

=====
Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2003 11:48:34 -0700
Reply-To: Kristin Juffer <kjuffer@WESTED.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Kristin Juffer <kjuffer@WESTED.ORG>
Subject: Re: Workshops for Reporters
Comments: To: "Richards, Clay F" <Clay.Richards@QUINNIPIAC.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=utf-8
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

If there is such a workshop, I would recommend that care be taken to present the info in a way that would be highly practical for journalists from their perspective -- such as how to quickly discern what is "good" polling research? And how to identify identify polls or results that have been "spun" vs. legitimate polls. Providing them examples of both and providing them practice in identifying each.

From my experience inside news organizations, I believe they'd be interested

in knowing what 2-3 basic questions to ask to verify the above and what kinds of answers to expect from a "good" or valid poll. They would like appreciate a quick primer on "the bare basics" and a "transportable" definition of key terms in the form of something like a handy pocket reference -- the kind medical practitioners use.

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

From: "Richards, Clay F" <Clay.Richards@QUINNIPIAC.EDU>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Tuesday, September 09, 2003 9:02 AM

Subject: Re: Workshops for Reporters

> Mickey and all,

>

> When I started as polling editor at Newsday in 1987, barely able to know the difference between sample size and margin of error, I attended a four day polling seminar for journalists during the summer at Williams College sponsored by the Knight Ridder Foundation. I returned the next year as a "graduate student". That turned out to be the last one as foundation funding halted. There were more than a dozen speakers as well as a dreadful few hours spent on the phone doing actual polling. I remember being particularly impressed by a gentleman named Bud Roper and some guy named Mitofsky. One of my fellow "students" was Gary Langer, who had just started the polling beat at the AP. This might be something AAPOR wants to consider. About a dozen reporters/editors attended and paid a fairly hefty fee for the course, which helped offset expenses, though obviously the foundation contributed a hefty amount.

>

> Clay Richards

> Assistant Director

> Quinnipiac Polling Institute

> 631-757-1213

> clay.richards@quinnipiac.edu

>

>

>

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

> From: Micheline (Mickey) Blum [mailto:BLUMWEP@AOL.COM]

> Sent: Tue 9/9/2003 11:18 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Cc:

> Subject: Re: Workshops for Reporters

>

>

>

> Rob--et al,

>

> Perhaps once this workshop is set up for AAPOR, it could be a traveling road

> show-- going to national conferences of journalists and even to local

> AAPOR

> chapters.

>

> Mickey

>
> Micheline Blum
> President
> Blum & Weprin Associates, Inc.
> 212-929-6510 phone
> 212-929-6518 fax
> blumwep@aol.com
> blumandweprin.com

>
>
>
>
> -----

> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet

>
>
>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

=====
Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2003 14:53:25 -0400
Reply-To: POAPATRICKH@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "D. Patrick Hoey" <POAPATRICKH@AOL.COM>
Subject: African-American Republicans
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I am trying to find recent research and demographic analysis of one of the rarest voters today, African-Americans who voted for Republican George W. Bush in 2000, or who identify themselves politically as Republican.

Anyone with info on this subject is asked to respond directly to me at:

POAPATRICKH@AOL.COM

Thanks,

Patrick Hoey,
Adjunct Professor of Political Science, Nassau Community College, NY

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

=====
Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2003 15:05:48 -0400

Reply-To: Claudia Deane <deanec@WASHPOST.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Claudia Deane <deanec@WASHPOST.COM>
Subject: AAPOR and journalists
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

I'm this year's Publications Chair, and am desperately interested in figuring out how to make AAPOR's website more 'journalist friendly.'

Part of this is a matter of navigation: there is some pertinent info already on the site, including the infamous "20 questions" brochure, and this can be re-grouped into one spot and more clearly labeled.

The other part is figuring out what new content needs to be created (or what existing content we can link to.)

I'd love to hear from folks who have ideas about this or would be willing to volunteer to find relevant resources or write new content.

Responses off line please, to save everyone else the traffic:
deanec@washpost.com

Thanks very much,

Claudia

Claudia Deane
The Washington Post
ph: 202-334-6325
fax: 202-496-3544

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2003 14:20:43 -0500
Reply-To: "Stuefen, Randy" <rstuefen@USD.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Stuefen, Randy" <rstuefen@USD.EDU>
Subject: Info for Journalists
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

All,

Wouldn't it make sense on the homepage for AAPOR to have a tab marked "Info for Journalists" that would take them to the 20 questions on the NCCP web site?

<http://www.ncpp.org/qajsa.htm> <<http://www.ncpp.org/qajsa.htm>>

I doubt that many journalists will discover the reference to "20 Questions A Journalist Should Ask About a Poll" on our AAPOR site. It is half way down the page under "Resources on the Web" just below the listing of research organizations and just above Statistical Data on the United States.

http://www.aapor.org/default.asp?page=survey_methods/resources_on_the_web
<http://www.aapor.org/default.asp?page=survey_methods/resources_on_the_web>

Visitors to our website not certain that this information is there somewhere to be found will likely not come across the reference by chance.

Best,
Randy

Randall M. Stuefen
Director of Research

Business Research Bureau Voice 605-677-5287
414 East Clark Street Fax 605-677-5427
University of South Dakota 57069 rstuefen@usd.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

=====
Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2003 13:33:51 -0700
Reply-To: "Pinkus, Susan" <Susan.Pinkus@LATIMES.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Pinkus, Susan" <Susan.Pinkus@LATIMES.COM>
Subject: Re: Workshops for Reporters
Comments: To: "Traugott, Michael" <mtrau@UMICH.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Mike: I remember that session. Unfortunately a lot of reporters don't attend AAPOR -- it has to be publicized and put together as a 1 or 2- day workshop. Clay Richards' email was interesting and for the newly arrived reporters, that kind of workshop would be so beneficial (as well as for all reporters).

Susan

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

From: Traugott, Michael [<mailto:mtrau@UMICH.EDU>]
Sent: Tuesday, September 09, 2003 8:44 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Workshops for Reporters

In 2001, I presented a workshop at the AAPOR conference in Montreal under the heading of "Reporting on Public Opinion." It was designed as an introduction to reporting on polls for journalists and others who have to interpret poll results.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2003 14:53:38 -0700
Reply-To: "Pinkus, Susan" <Susan.Pinkus@LATIMES.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Pinkus, Susan" <Susan.Pinkus@LATIMES.COM>
Subject: Re: AAPOR: Workshops for Reporters
Comments: To: "KentofCT@AOL.COM" <KentofCT@AOL.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Talk to the Roper Center and let them set up a panel or workshop

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

From: Kent Jamison [<mailto:KentofCT@AOL.COM>]
Sent: Tuesday, September 09, 2003 9:45 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: AAPOR: Workshops for Reporters

The Hartford Courant here puts on a major writers conference in March. A lot of big names and very well attended -- 400 plus attendees. Covers fiction, nonfiction and everything else, not just journalists but I would say two-thirds of the audience are reporters. Such a workshop would hit a wider audience and might be well received.

Kent Jamison

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2003 17:08:25 -0400
Reply-To: Ashley Bowers <afbowers@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ashley Bowers <afbowers@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Subject: SAPOR 2003 Annual Conference: Advance Registration
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Southern Association for Public Opinion Research
2003 Annual Conference

October 2 & 3, 2003
University Club
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina

The Southern Association for Public Opinion Research will be holding its annual meeting on October 2 and 3 in Raleigh, beginning with afternoon sessions on Thursday and featuring a keynote address that evening by Dr. Don Dillman who will be speaking on "Unexpected Fallout from Internet Surveys: Advances in Understanding How Question Format Influences Respondents' Answers". The conference will continue Friday morning and conclude at lunch.

Registration (if you submit your registration form before September 15) is \$45.00, which includes the Thursday dinner and continental breakfast and lunch on Friday. Student registration is \$15.00 before the 15th. Payment does not need to be submitted by September 15, SAPOR only needs your completed registration form by the 15th to ensure that you receive the reduced registration rate.

Please contact Ashley Bowers (ashley_bowers@unc.edu) for more information about the conference, the preliminary agenda, a list of area attractions, and a conference registration form.

We look forward to the cooler weather October brings to North Carolina and the warm hospitality of SAPOR! We hope to see you in Raleigh on October 2.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

=====
Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2003 16:34:47 -0700
Reply-To: Fred Solop <Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Fred Solop <Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU>
Subject: AAPOR: Workshops for Reporters
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

In 1999, Kristi Hagen and I presented a paper at AAPOR titled: Polling and the Media: Is It Time to Clean the Mirror of Reality? In this paper we analyzed media coverage of polling stories and identified a series of common problems.

The common problems included:

- (1) Misleading Headlines
- (2) Inaccurate Interpretations of Data
- (3) Failure to Include Research Findings
- (4) Failure to Include Methodological Information

In this paper we called for the polling community to hold workshops with reporters and editors. We also included a proposed workshop outline in the paper.

If anyone is interested in seeing this paper, please e-mail me at Fred.Solop@nau.edu and I'll forward you a pdf version.

Fred

Frederic I. Solop, Ph.D.
Professor, Department of Political Science
Director, Social Research Laboratory
PO Box 15301
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, AZ 86011
(928) 523-3135 - office
(928) 523-6777 - fax
www.nau.edu/srl

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
signoff aapornet

=====
Date: Mon, 8 Sep 2003 23:36:06 -0500
Reply-To: Mary.Losch@uni.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mary Losch <mary.losch@UNI.EDU>
Subject: Re: Help with Participation Estimates
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear Colleagues,
We have been asked to provide an estimate for recruiting participants into a study of a weight loss intervention. The investigator has been asked by NIH grant reviewers to utilize RDD rather than advertisements, etc. If anyone has experience with this technique of recruiting for a long-term study (16 weekly visits to a

medical center as much as an hour away), please let me know. There will be modest compensation for time. We're trying to take a stab as estimating participation rates/dials needed in order to provide a cost estimate. The targeted population is adults with BMI over 25. The good news/bad news is that Iowa is one of the heaviest states so the chances of dialing a household with an eligible respondent will be fairly high. Thanks in advance for your help.

Mary Losch

~~~~~  
Mary E. Losch, Ph.D.  
Assistant Director/Associate Professor  
Center for Social and Behavioral Research  
Department of Psychology  
University of Northern Iowa  
221 Sabin Hall  
Cedar Falls, IA 50614  
mary.losch@uni.edu

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2003 20:50:25 -0400  
Reply-To: "Traugott, Michael" <[mtrau@UMICH.EDU](mailto:mtrau@UMICH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Traugott, Michael" <[mtrau@UMICH.EDU](mailto:mtrau@UMICH.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR and journalists  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"  
Content-transfer-encoding: base64

SGVyZSBhemUgdHdvIHRoaW5ncyB0aGF0IG1pZ2h0IGh1bHAgaGZ2V0IHRoaW5ncyBzdGFydGVkLiAg  
Rmlyc3QsIGEd2ViIHNdGUgZnJvbSBXQVBPUEiB0aGF0IHdhcyBzZXR1cCBmb3Igam91cm5hbGlz  
dHMuICBUb20gU21pdGggd2FzIGluc3RydW1lbnRhbCBpbjBkZXZlbG9waW5nIHRoaXMsIEkgYmVs  
aWV2ZT0NCg0KaHR0cDovL3d3dy51bmwuZWR1L1dBUE9SL2pvdXJuYWxpc3RzLmRvYw0KDQogDQoN  
CINIY29uZGx5LCBJIHdhcyBhc2tlZCBmb3IgaW5mb3JtYXRpb24gYWJvdXQgdGh1IEFBUE9SIHNI  
bWluYXlulCBIZXZlIGlzhIRoZSBQb3dlclBvaW50IEkgdXNlZC4gIEI0J3MgbGFyZ2UgYmVjYXVz  
ZSBvZiBwaWN0dXJlcy9ncmFwaGljcy4NCg0KIA0KDQo=

=====  
Date: Tue, 9 Sep 2003 13:51:49 -0400  
Reply-To: Ailsa Henderson <[ahenders@WLU.CA](mailto:ahenders@WLU.CA)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Ailsa Henderson <[ahenders@WLU.CA](mailto:ahenders@WLU.CA)>  
Subject: youth survey consent  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Hello,  
I'm looking for information on youth surveys and am wondering if anyone



can direct me towards academic works, lessons of best practice or legislation that touches on issues of consent for those under 18. The survey will be conducted by a government department in northern Canada (Nunavut), possibly for children as young as 13, and will cover a wide range of attitudes and behaviours.

Any responses - off list - would be greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,  
Ailsa Henderson  
ahenders@wlu.ca

Ailsa Henderson, PhD  
Department of Political Science  
Wilfrid Laurier University  
Waterloo, ON N2L 3C5  
Canada  
(519) 884 0710 Ext 3896  
ahenders@wlu.ca

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

---

Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2003 07:50:28 -0400  
Reply-To: "Traugott, Michael" <mtrau@UMICH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Traugott, Michael" <mtrau@UMICH.EDU>  
Subject: PowerPoint  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"  
Content-transfer-encoding: base64

SSdsbCB0cnkgdGhpcyB0cmFuc21pc3Npb24gYWdhW4uDQo=

---

Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2003 09:47:46 -0400  
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <cporter@HP.UFL.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Colleen Porter <cporter@HP.UFL.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Workshops for Reporters  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-disposition: inline

I definitely have an opinion on this one, since I am both a survey =  
researcher and a journalist (part-time editorial writer and columnist). =  
=20

As far as outreach, I do think that streamlining/expanding the web site =  
would be a powerful tool. Last AAPOR conference, Gary Langer and Daniel =  
Merkle of ABC News gave a really wonderful presentation about evaluating =

poll data, entitled "Parsing the Polls." Rather than getting up and just = talking like some of us do, they actually wrote this talk down, with all = the references. It could easily be edited (adding links to the articles = they are discussing, etc.) for inclusion on the web page. I think that = kind of thing could be very instructive to journalists, because it gave so = many clear examples. =20

But we need to go beyond offering a clearly identified "press" section of = our web page. What we are giving journalists is not just information, but = rather a tool that will help them in evaluating information from other = sources. As such, a link to our section should be on the web page of = every journalism organization. They all have "resource" pages and = "helpful links," so AAPOR should directly contact groups like the Society = of Professional Journalists, the National Conference of Editorial Writers, = the Association of Health Care Journalists, journalism schools, etc. and = invite them to link to our page.

I also think that if AAPOR could come up with a standardized presentation = of what journalists should know, maybe based on Fred's outline, and if = AAPOR develops a 40-minute presentation with power-point provided, then = many of us could become ambassadors in our own communities, offering to do = inservice for the local newspaper or nearby J-school classes. Lots of us = could afford a couple hours once a year, if most of the prep work had = already been done. We could have a link on the AAPOR web page that folks = could click if they wanted a guest speaker, and then AAPOR could contact a = member in the requester's area to go do the presentation. =20

Although this discussion started around the issue of election polling, = please let's keep in mind that news outlets report on all kind of survey = data. In the Langer/Merkle presentation, quite a few of their examples = were research findings rather than political polls. And in my humble = career doing health insurance surveys, we've also been burned by journalist= s who didn't quite understand what was going on with the survey. =20

A few months after the results of our statewide Florida Health Insurance = Study were released, the Palm Beach Post ran an article that was highly = critical of our work:

"Officials at the county's Health Care District \*were scratching their = heads at that figure\*

" 'I was looking forward to using this (new) study as a basis for some = management decisions,' said Cecil Bennett, the district's chief executive. = "It looks like it's flawed somewhat.'

"For example, it appears the state estimated Palm Beach County's population= to be 794,702, even though recent studies have pegged the total at more = than 1 million."

What is the deal here? Well, in the U.S., most everyone age 65 or older = is covered by Medicare. Therefore, those of us conducting health = insurance surveys often focus our efforts on those under age 65. Federal = reports also give estimates for those under age 65. It's a pretty common = concept for anyone who knows about health insurance surveys. =20

How could they have messed up so badly? Well, they relied on one expert, = which can be dangerous. That guy seemed well qualified (from the = journalist's point of view), and was absolutely certain that our survey = was bad. Myself, I would suspect that if the data were off by that much, = I would want to know the reason, and I would not run the story without = having an explanation (because the explanation might be as important as = the criticism itself).=20

Later in the article the journalist states that the state agency that = commissioned the survey was not available for comment that day. This = false sense of deadline is another cause of mistakes. In truth, our data = had been out for a couple months at that point, and the newspaper did not = have to run the story that day--it was not like a train wreck. =20

And no, the journalist was not some young kid just out of school. He is = actually on the board of a journalism professional organization.

Beyond this issue of knowledge about surveys is the systemic problem of = arrogance of some journalists. They really think they can write about = anything. One of my concerns about giving them a "pocket guide" is that = they may sophomorically think they know enough then. =20

On the listserv for the Association of Health Care Journalists, there are = ongoing debates over the issue of "editorial previewing," whether one = should show copy to a source (someone you interviewed) to check for = accuracy. Those who started as nurses and pharmacists and then became = writers do this all the time. Those who started as journalists think it = is unethical. =20

I do this all the time, when I'm writing about technical things in other = fields like organ transplants and the state's formula for school funding. = I may only show them the section that applies to them, and I am clear that = they are only checking the facts, not influencing my story. But I know = that sometimes the exact wording can change the accuracy. =20

In reporting on my surveys, it makes a difference if one writes, "34 = percent reported they were in good health," versus "34 percent were = reported to be in good health." If there were some proxy responses in the = survey (one household member reporting on the others), then the latter = would be more accurate although more cumbersome. =20

Okay, that's a little thing, and probably too nitpicky to teach journalists = to watch out for. But if they had shown me the copy, I could point it = out to them.=20

Colleen K. Porter  
Project Coordinator, University of Florida  
Colleen Kay Porter  
editorial writer and columnist, the Gainesville Sun

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

signoff aapornet

---

Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2003 14:42:57 -0400  
Reply-To: Phillip Downs <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Phillip Downs <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>  
Subject: Russia  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Can anyone recommend a firm in Russia with whom we can partner on qualitative research in Moscow and St. Petersburg? 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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2003 15:28:20 -0400  
Reply-To: "Ronald E. Langley" <langley@UKY.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Ronald E. Langley" <langley@UKY.EDU>  
Subject: Survey instruments measuring marital quality  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Greetings! Our center is working with an author, Neil Chethik, to develop a national telephone survey of married men about the 'quality' of their marriages. He is requesting help from the list about any survey instruments that have been administered to men or women that have a/n effective measure(s) of marital quality. Neil has published a previous book incorporating survey data (FatherLoss) and is undertaking a similar venture with our center for a new book to be published in 2005.

If anyone has any helpful cites or survey questions, or any other suggestions or comments for consideration in such a survey, please reply to me, or if you prefer, Neil at [Nchet@aol.com](mailto:Nchet@aol.com)

Thanks in advance for your collective wisdom.  
Ron

Author Neil Chethik ("FatherLoss") is working with the University of Kentucky Survey Research Center to develop a telephone survey of married men. The results will be used in a new book called "HusbandSpeak" (Simon & Schuster, 2005). Neil is interested in hearing from any researchers who have surveyed married men and/or married women. He'd like to review results of those surveys, and to learn about survey instruments that effectively measure marital quality. Any other suggestions and comments on the topic are welcome. You may contact Neil directly at Nchet@aol.com.

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>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2003 15:54:31 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Workshops for Reporters  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[sf5ef34c.040@fuji.hp.ufl.edu](mailto:sf5ef34c.040@fuji.hp.ufl.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I've been restraining a desire to chime in here but I can no longer resist:

One of the things that I have always done when interacting with reporters is to tell them if they ever have a poll or survey that they are unsure about or have questions about to give me a call (this worked best when I worked at university survey centers). I've been called with questions like "Is this a push poll" <not usually>, is this question(naire) biased? <not usually> and is X people enough to be representative of Y? <usually>.

Also when I see the phrase push poll misused I generally refer the writer to the AAPOR definition - I have no idea if this does any good but it makes me feel better.

In particularly egregious cases I have even been known to write a letter to the editor.

--

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 Colleen Porter

> Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2003 9:48 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Workshops for Reporters

>

> I definitely have an opinion on this one, since I am both a survey  
> researcher and a journalist (part-time editorial writer and  
columnist).

>

> As far as outreach, I do think that streamlining/expanding the web  
site

> would be a powerful tool. Last AAPOR conference, Gary Langer and  
Daniel

> Merkle of ABC News gave a really wonderful presentation about  
evaluating

> poll data, entitled "Parsing the Polls." Rather than getting up and  
just

> talking like some of us do, they actually wrote this talk down, with  
all

> the references. It could easily be edited (adding links to the  
articles

> they are discussing, etc.) for inclusion on the web page. I think  
that

> kind of thing could be very instructive to journalists, because it  
gave so

> many clear examples.

>

> But we need to go beyond offering a clearly identified "press" section  
of

> our web page. What we are giving journalists is not just information,  
but

> rather a tool that will help them in evaluating information from other

> sources. As such, a link to our section should be on the web page of

> every journalism organization. They all have "resource" pages and

> "helpful links," so AAPOR should directly contact groups like the  
Society

> of Professional Journalists, the National Conference of Editorial  
Writers,

> the Association of Health Care Journalists, journalism schools, etc.  
and

> invite them to link to our page.

>

> I also think that if AAPOR could come up with a standardized  
presentation

> of what journalists should know, maybe based on Fred's outline, and if

> AAPOR develops a 40-minute presentation with power-point provided, then

> many of us could become ambassadors in our own communities, offering to do

> inservice for the local newspaper or nearby J-school classes. Lots of us

> could afford a couple hours once a year, if most of the prep work had already been done. We could have a link on the AAPOR web page that folks

> could click if they wanted a guest speaker, and then AAPOR could contact a

> member in the requester's area to go do the presentation.

>

> Although this discussion started around the issue of election polling, please let's keep in mind that news outlets report on all kind of survey

> data. In the Langer/Merkle presentation, quite a few of their examples

> were research findings rather than political polls. And in my humble career doing health insurance surveys, we've also been burned by

> journalists who didn't quite understand what was going on with the survey.

>

> A few months after the results of our statewide Florida Health Insurance

> Study were released, the Palm Beach Post ran an article that was highly

> critical of our work:

>

> "Officials at the county's Health Care District \*were scratching their heads at that figure\*

>

> "I was looking forward to using this (new) study as a basis for some management decisions," said Cecil Bennett, the district's chief executive.

> "It looks like it's flawed somewhat."

>

> "For example, it appears the state estimated Palm Beach County's population to be 794,702, even though recent studies have pegged the total

> at more than 1 million."

>

> What is the deal here? Well, in the U.S., most everyone age 65 or older

> is covered by Medicare. Therefore, those of us conducting health insurance surveys often focus our efforts on those under age 65.

Federal

> reports also give estimates for those under age 65. It's a pretty common

> concept for anyone who knows about health insurance surveys.

>

> How could they have messed up so badly? Well, they relied on one expert,

> which can be dangerous. That guy seemed well qualified (from the

> journalist's point of view), and was absolutely certain that our survey  
> was bad. Myself, I would suspect that if the data were off by that much,  
> I would want to know the reason, and I would not run the story without  
> having an explanation (because the explanation might be as important as  
> the criticism itself).  
>  
> Later in the article the journalist states that the state agency that  
> commissioned the survey was not available for comment that day. This  
> false sense of deadline is another cause of mistakes. In truth, our data  
> had been out for a couple months at that point, and the newspaper did not  
> have to run the story that day--it was not like a train wreck.  
>  
> And no, the journalist was not some young kid just out of school. He is  
> actually on the board of a journalism professional organization.  
>  
> Beyond this issue of knowledge about surveys is the systemic problem of  
> arrogance of some journalists. They really think they can write about  
> anything. One of my concerns about giving them a "pocket guide" is that  
> they may sophomorically think they know enough then.  
>  
> On the listserv for the Association of Health Care Journalists, there are  
> ongoing debates over the issue of "editorial previewing," whether one  
> should show copy to a source (someone you interviewed) to check for  
> accuracy. Those who started as nurses and pharmacists and then became  
> writers do this all the time. Those who started as journalists think it  
> is unethical.  
>  
> I do this all the time, when I'm writing about technical things in other  
> fields like organ transplants and the state's formula for school funding.  
> I may only show them the section that applies to them, and I am clear that  
> they are only checking the facts, not influencing my story. But I know  
> that sometimes the exact wording can change the accuracy.  
>  
> In reporting on my surveys, it makes a difference if one writes, "34  
> percent reported they were in good health," versus "34 percent were  
> reported to be in good health." If there were some proxy responses in the  
> survey (one household member reporting on the others), then the latter  
> would be more accurate although more cumbersome.  
>



> Okay, that's a little thing, and probably too nitpicky to teach  
> journalists to watch out for. But if they had shown me the copy, I  
could  
> point it out to them.  
>  
> Colleen K. Porter  
> Project Coordinator, University of Florida  
> Colleen Kay Porter  
> editorial writer and columnist, the Gainesville Sun  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
=====

Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2003 15:47:52 -0500  
Reply-To: "Thomas F. Klobucar" <[tklobucar@VERNONRESEARCH.COM](mailto:tklobucar@VERNONRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Thomas F. Klobucar" <[tklobucar@VERNONRESEARCH.COM](mailto:tklobucar@VERNONRESEARCH.COM)>  
Organization: Vernon Research Group  
Subject: Ascribe  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[007701c377d5\\$59fedc40\\$130a010a@LEO](mailto:007701c377d5$59fedc40$130a010a@LEO)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Has anyone out there used this program called Ascribe for the collapsing and analysis of open-ended questions? if so, what did you think?

thanks

tom klobucar

Thomas F. Klobucar, Ph. D.

Director of Research

Vernon Research Group

1962 First Avenue NE

Cedar Rapids, IA 52402

Tel: (319) 364 7278 x109

Fax: (319) 364 7307

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2003 14:42:39 -0400  
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Organization: Rider University  
Subject: NJAAPOR program for October 2, 2003  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: QUOTED-PRINTABLE

The New Jersey Association for Public Opinion Research is proud to present its first program for the year

93 Making Informed Survey Management Decisions:  
Uses of Process Data from Computer Assisted Face-to-Face Surveys 94

Grant Benson, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan

Location: Wallace Hall, Room 300  
Woodrow Wilson School  
Princeton University

Date: October 2, 2003  
Time: 5:30 Reception  
Presentation: 6:00

Cost: \$5 for members and \$10 for non-members

This should be an exciting, informative, and useful program!

For further information, contact Dr. Frank L. Rusciano, at [rusciano@rider.edu](mailto:rusciano@rider.edu),  
or 609 896 5264

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

Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2003 20:06:19 -0400  
Reply-To: [RFunk787@AOL.COM](mailto:RFunk787@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "G. Ray Funkhouser" <[RFunk787@AOL.COM](mailto:RFunk787@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: You report, We decide  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

TWO TAKES ON THE SAME POLL Is the glass half empty, or half full (or just twice as large as it needs to be)?

Ray Funkhouser

(from The Wall Street Journal)

What Iraqis Really Think  
We asked them. What they told us is largely reassuring.

BY KARL ZINSMEISTER

Wednesday, September 10, 2003 12:01 a.m. EDT

America, some say, is hobbled in its policies toward Iraq by not knowing much about what Iraqis really think. Are they on the side of radical Islamists?

What kind of government would they like? What is their attitude toward the U.S.?

Do the Shiites hate us? Could Iraq become another Iran under the ayatollahs? Are the people in the Sunni triangle the real problem? Up to now we've only been able to guess. We've relied on anecdotal temperature-takings of the Iraqi public, and have been at the mercy of images presented to us by the press. We all know that journalists have a bad-news bias: 10,000 schools being rehabbed isn't news; one school blowing up is a weeklong feeding frenzy. And some of us who have spent time recently in Iraq--I was an embedded reporter during the war--have been puzzled by the postwar news and media imagery, which is much more

negative than what many individuals involved in reconstructing Iraq have been telling us. Well, finally we have some evidence of where the truth may lie.

Working with Zogby International survey researchers, The American Enterprise magazine has conducted the first scientific poll of the Iraqi public. Given the

state of the country, this was not easy. Security problems delayed our intrepid fieldworkers several times. We labored at careful translations, regional

samplings and survey methods to make sure our results would accurately reflect the views of Iraq's multifarious, long-suffering people. We consulted Eastern European pollsters about the best way to elicit honest answers from those

conditioned to repress their true sentiments.

Conducted in August, our survey was necessarily limited in scope, but it reflects a nationally representative sample of Iraqi views, as captured in four disparate cities: Basra (Iraq's second largest, home to 1.7 million people, in the far south), Mosul (third largest, far north), Kirkuk (Kurdish-influenced oil city, fourth largest) and Ramadi (a resistance hotbed in the Sunni triangle). The results show that the Iraqi public is more sensible, stable and moderate than commonly portrayed, and that Iraq is not so fanatical, or resentful of the U.S., after all. o Iraqis are optimistic. Seven out of 10 say they expect their country and their personal lives will be better five years from now. On both fronts, 32% say things will become much better. o The toughest part of reconstructing their nation, Iraqis say by 3 to 1, will be politics, not economics. They are nervous about democracy. Asked which is closer to their own view--"Democracy can work well in Iraq," or "Democracy is a Western way of doing things"--five out of 10 said democracy is Western and won't work in Iraq. One in 10 wasn't sure. And four out of 10 said democracy can work in Iraq. There were interesting divergences. Sunnis were negative on democracy by more than 2 to 1; but, critically, the majority Shiites were as likely to say democracy would work for Iraqis as not. People age 18-29 are much more rosy about democracy than other Iraqis, and women are significantly more positive than men. o Asked to name one country they would most like Iraq to model its new government on from five possibilities--neighboring, Baathist Syria; neighbor and Islamic monarchy Saudi Arabia; neighbor and Islamist republic Iran; Arab lodestar Egypt; or the U.S.--the most popular model by far was the U.S. The U.S. was preferred as a model by 37% of Iraqis selecting from those five--more than Syria, Iran and Egypt put together. Saudi Arabia was in second place at 28%. Again, there were important demographic splits. Younger adults are especially favorable toward the U.S., and Shiites are more admiring than Sunnis. Interestingly, Iraqi Shiites, coreligionists with Iranians, do not admire Iran's Islamist government; the U.S. is six times as popular with them as a model for governance. o Our interviewers inquired whether Iraq should have an Islamic government, or instead let all people practice their own religion. Only 33% want an Islamic government; a solid 60% say no. A vital detail: Shiites (whom Western reporters frequently portray as self-flagellating maniacs) are least receptive to the idea of an Islamic government, saying no by 66% to 27%. It is only among the minority Sunnis that there is interest in a religious state, and they are split evenly on the question. o Perhaps the strongest indication that an Islamic government won't be part of Iraq's future: The nation is thoroughly secularized. We asked how often our respondents had attended the Friday prayer over the previous month. Fully 43% said "never." It's time to scratch "Khomeini II" from the

list of morbid fears. o You can also cross out "Osama II": 57% of Iraqis with an opinion have an unfavorable view of Osama bin Laden, with 41% of those saying it is a very unfavorable view. (Women are especially down on him.) Except in the Sunni triangle (where the limited support that exists for bin Laden is heavily concentrated), negative views of the al Qaeda supremo are actually quite lopsided in all parts of the country. And those opinions were collected before Iraqi police announced it was al Qaeda members who killed worshipers with a truck bomb in Najaf. o And you can write off the possibility of a Baath revival. We asked "Should Baath Party leaders who committed crimes in the past be punished, or should past actions be put behind us?" A thoroughly unforgiving Iraqi public stated by 74% to 18% that Saddam's henchmen should be punished. This new evidence on Iraqi opinion suggests the country is manageable. If the small number of militants conducting sabotage and murder inside the country can gradually be eliminated by American troops (this is already happening), then the mass of citizens living along the Tigris-Euphrates Valley are likely to make reasonably sensible use of their new freedom. "We will not forget it was the U.S. soldiers who liberated us from Saddam," said Abid Ali, an auto repair shop owner in Sadr City last month--and our research shows that he's not unrepresentative.

None of this is to suggest that the task ahead will be simple. Inchoate anxiety toward the U.S. showed up when we asked Iraqis if they thought the U.S. would help or hurt Iraq over a five-year period. By 50% to 36% they chose hurt over help. This is fairly understandable; Iraqis have just lived through a war in which Americans were (necessarily) flinging most of the ammunition. These experiences may explain why women (who are more antimilitary in all cultures) show up in our data as especially wary of the U.S. right now. War is never pleasant, though U.S. forces made heroic efforts to spare innocents in this one, as I illustrate with firsthand examples in my book about the battles. Evidence of the comparative gentleness of this war can be seen in our poll. Less than 30% of our sample of Iraqis knew or heard of anyone killed in the spring fighting. Meanwhile, fully half knew some family member, neighbor or friend who had been killed by Iraqi security forces during the years Saddam held power. Perhaps the ultimate indication of how comfortable Iraqis are with America's aims in their region came when we asked how long they would like to see American and British forces remain in their country: Six months? One year? Two years or more? Two thirds of those with an opinion urged that the coalition troops should stick around for at least another year. We're making headway in a benighted part of the world. Hang in there, America.

Mr. Zinsmeister, editor in chief of The American Enterprise magazine and holder of the J.B. Fuqua chair at the American Enterprise Institute, is the author

of "Boots on the Ground: A Month With the 82nd Airborne in the Battle for Iraq," just out from St. Martin's Press.

(from The Financial Times -- UK)

Iraqis do not trust Americans, says poll  
By Guy Dinmore in Washington

Braving bullets, arrests and hot pursuit while carrying out the first scientific survey of Iraqi public opinion, pollsters commissioned by a conservative US think-tank have discovered that most Iraqis do not trust Americans and want to be left alone.

John Zogby, president of Zogby International which completed the poll last month, summed up the findings on Wednesday, saying that, like most Arabs, Iraqis want to "control their own destiny", without the intervention of outside forces, and are confident in their own ability.

"Now that tyranny is over," he said, "it is time to move forward but not as a colony."

In that sense Iraqis broadly agree, but for different reasons, with the Bush administration's stated goal of handing over power and getting out as soon as possible.

Commissioned by the American Enterprise Institute, the pollsters sought to survey a representative cross-section of Iraqi society by going to four cities: Mosul and Kirkuk in the north, Ramadi in the mostly anti-US Sunni area of central Iraq, and Basra in the Shia south. A total of 600 people were interviewed in public places.

In Ramadi the pollsters were caught in crossfire in an ambush of US forces. One was arrested by Kurds in the north, while others were chased by car. In Basra some were detained for 24 hours.

Asked if the US and UK should help make sure a fair government is set up in Iraq, or should the Iraqis work this out themselves, 31.5 per cent wanted help while 58.5 per cent did not.

Some 38.2 per cent agreed that democracy could work well in Iraq, while 50.2 per cent agreed with the statement that "democracy is a western way of doing things and it will not work here".

Asked whether in the next five years the US would "help" Iraq, 35.3 per cent said yes while 50 per cent said the US would "hurt" Iraq. Asked the same of

the UN, the figures were almost reversed, with 50.2 per cent saying it would help and 18.5 per cent the opposite.

Regarding US and British troops, some 31 per cent wanted them to leave in six months and a total of 65.5 per cent in a year. Some 25 per cent said they should stay two years or more.

Interviewees were given a list of five countries they would like to model Iraq after.

A total of 36 per cent chose the four Middle Eastern countries listed (16 per cent for Saudi Arabia, 11 per cent for Syria, 6.5 per cent for Egypt and 2.8 per cent for Iran) while 21.5 per cent settled for the US, the only western country listed.

Seven out of 10 Iraqis think their country and their personal lives will be better five years from now.

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

---

Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2003 17:33:01 -0700  
Reply-To: Michelle Salinardi <[msa@CBDMP.ORG](mailto:msa@CBDMP.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Michelle Salinardi <[msa@CBDMP.ORG](mailto:msa@CBDMP.ORG)>  
Subject: monitoring interviews for quality control  
Comments: To: "AAPORNET@asu.edu" <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

Can anyone provide me with information as to what industry standards are for monitoring interviews? We are looking at conducting 400 interviews per year over 5 years and each interview takes approximately 1-1.25 hours. We are looking at the number of interviews per year we need to monitor and whether or not the entire interview needs to be monitored.

I am also interested in supporting literature on this subject.

Thanks,

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

---

Date: Thu, 11 Sep 2003 19:51:10 -0600  
Reply-To: Corinne Kirchner <[corinne@AFB.NET](mailto:corinne@AFB.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Corinne Kirchner <[corinne@AFB.NET](mailto:corinne@AFB.NET)>  
Subject: Sad News: Dorothy Jones Jessop  
Comments: To: [AAPORnet@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORnet@asu.edu)





-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2003 10:47:58 -0700  
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <[leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM](mailto:leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leora Lawton <[leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM](mailto:leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM)>  
Subject: survey research center director position  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I happened to notice that Cal State Sacramento is hiring:  
<http://www.csus.edu/fas/vacancies/Director,%20ISR.htm>

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](http://www.populationresearchsystems.com)

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2003 16:34:38 -0500  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>

From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>  
Subject: Job Announcement  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

SRL has an immediate opening at its Chicago office for a full-time Field =  
Operations Manager, who will oversee the operation of the SRL field =  
section. Responsibilities include training field coordinators, field =  
supervisors, and interviewers on computer-assisted telephone =  
interviewing (CATI) and face-to-face interview methods and preparation =  
of field reports and budgets.

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS FOR POSITION: BS/BA degree with at least 4 years =  
experience in research methods, questionnaire development, data =  
collection procedures and techniques (including CATI operations and =  
management), survey research management, and other supervisory =  
responsibilities.=20

For full consideration, send your resume and a detailed cover letter =  
outlining your qualifications by September 22, 2003 to=20

Dr. Linda Owens  
Assistant Director  
Survey Research Laboratory (MC 442)  
505 E. Green St., Ste. 3  
Champaign, IL 61820  
Fax: 217-244-4408 =20

NO PHONE CALLS OR E-MAILS WILL BE ACCEPTED. To learn more about the =  
Survey Research Laboratory, visit our Web site at [www.srl.uic.edu](http://www.srl.uic.edu) =  
<<http://www.srl.uic.edu>>.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Fri, 12 Sep 2003 14:53:03 -0700  
Reply-To: Kurt Lang <[lang@u.washington.edu](mailto:lang@u.washington.edu)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Kurt Lang <[lang@U.WASHINGTON.EDU](mailto:lang@U.WASHINGTON.EDU)>  
Subject: False Name Recognition  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="Windows-1252"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I am desperately seeking the bilbiographical reference to a study that =  
identified a level of "false name recognition" -- responses to =  
fictitious names -- in a survey as a parallel to responses to =  
non-existing issues. Any leads will be appreciated

Kurt Lang  
Prof. emeritus, Univ. Washington  
Home: 1249 20th Ave E.  
Seattle, WA 98112-3530

Tel. (206) 325-4569  
Fax (at UW) (206) 543-2516=

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Wed, 10 Sep 2003 23:04:20 -0700  
Reply-To: Mike O'Neil <[mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU](mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike O'Neil <[mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU](mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU)>  
Subject: The 15-second elevator speech  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

This is a follow-up observation on upgrading the image of our profession among the general public.

How many of us, after we tell someone what we do, hear something like “Oh, you are the people who call us at dinner time.” Often followed by “I never answer surveys”.

I have never been satisfied with the answer I have been able to conjure up on the spot. Usually mumble something about how many surveys serve a useful social purpose. But I don't think I have been very convincing.

If the thousand or so of us on AAPORNET get asked such a question once a day, that is about a million impressions every three years (1,000 x 365 x 3). Not an insignificant opportunity to promote our undertaking to the broader public (indeed, enhanced by the fact that we are more likely to interact with opinion leaders.

If we all had a very convincing and memorable response to this type of inquiry and used it regularly, it could have a real impact.

My proposal is this: with all the collective wisdom out there, can someone come up with a VERY, VERY SHORT response to the inquiry about what it is that we do. One that cites some of the uses of surveys that would be most likely to be perceived as valuable. Something like

“While we might call at dinnertime, we prefer to think of ourselves as folks who sometimes help governments understand where they are meeting citizens needs and how they would like their tax money spent, companies understand how good their customer service is and what improvements consumers would like in their products. Without surveys, they could just guess or infer whatever they wanted about the answers to such questions. We think both government and corporate America would probably be a lot less responsive to their constituencies”.

But perhaps someone could improve on this?

Mike O'Neil  
www.oneilresearch.com <<http://www.oneilresearch.com/>>

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

---

Date: Sun, 14 Sep 2003 10:19:47 -0500  
Reply-To: [Jack\\_Ludwig@GALLUP.COM](mailto:Jack_Ludwig@GALLUP.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jack Ludwig <[Jack\\_Ludwig@GALLUP.COM](mailto:Jack_Ludwig@GALLUP.COM)>  
Subject: Re: The 15-second elevator speech  
Comments: To: [mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU](mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Mike,

You've reminded me of a note on AAPORNET last fall, alerting AAPORites about an article in "Women's Day" suggesting that readers "Just Say No to Surveys." I responded to Women's day with the note I've pasted below... a bit long for a conversation that must be packed into an interval between floors, but some of the ideas are relevant. At 85 words (and the last one weighing in at 5 syllables) even your more streamlined suggestion may still be a little overweight, but your idea of trying to find the the simplest, most succinct and persuasive form this message could take? ...I wonder what a list of the 5 most important things that survey reasearch has taught us in the past decade (that we could not have found out in any other practical way) would look like...?

Jack

[Jack\\_Ludwig@Gallup.com](mailto:Jack_Ludwig@Gallup.com)

My letter To Women's Day:

Dear Editor:

Karen J. Bannan, in her recent article "26 Ways to Be Safer; What you need to know to protect yourself, your family and your home," recommended that readers "Just say no to phone surveys." I am writing to voice an alternative point of view. In the interest of full disclosure, I should mention that I am employed by the Gallup Organization, and have been involved in conducting surveys, including telephone surveys, for more than 20 years.

In view of current events, concerns for personal safety are completely understandable, and any attentive defender of surveys must acknowledge that the American public's willingness to cooperate with surveys is frequently abused by telemarketers and unscrupulous others whose only interest is personal gain. But please reconsider your suggestion that your readers

refuse all survey requests.

Surveys are used to collect information and gain insight into important political, social, and public health-related opinions and behaviors. By asking important questions of a representative sample of those we are trying to understand, we can learn things that can not be discovered in any other practical way. Just ask those at the Centers for Disease Control about the value of their Behavioral Risk Factors Surveys, which provide input for public health planning. In a different arena, voters' preferences among political candidates are evident from election outcomes, but political opinion surveys can find out which of the candidate's positions on a welter of issues were popular, and among what kind of people--this is much more useful and enlightening information. Customer surveys help companies to improve the products and services they provide to people like you. And the list can go on....

Knives are used as weapons, but we don't consider supporting a "Just say no to knives" campaign. We all have them in our kitchens because the likelihood that they will be used to hurt or kill us is vastly outweighed by their usefulness. So be wary, and by all means withhold information that could put you or your family in danger, say no to telemarketers if you resent their intrusion, but consider that surveys benefit customers, improve public health, and strengthen our democracy. Surveys amplify the views of those who participate, giving a voice (and an interested audience) to ordinary people who too often feel that their views don't matter. I urge your readers to take the opportunity to make them matter--to consider saying "yes."

Jack Ludwig

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

From: Mike O'Neil [mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU]

Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2003 2:04 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: The 15-second elevator speech

This is a follow-up observation on upgrading the image of our profession among the general public.

How many of us, after we tell someone what we do, hear something like "Oh, you are the people who call us at dinner time." Often followed by "I never answer surveys".

I have never been satisfied with the answer I have been able to conjure up on the spot. Usually mumble something about how many surveys serve a useful social purpose. But I don't think I have been very convincing.

If the thousand or so of us on AAPORNET get asked such a question once a day, that is about a million impressions every three years (1,000 x 365 x 3). Not an insignificant opportunity to promote our undertaking to the broader public (indeed, enhanced by the fact that we are more likely to interact with opinion leaders.

If we all had a very convincing and memorable response to this type of inquiry and used it regularly, it could have a real impact.

My proposal is this: with all the collective wisdom out there, can someone come up with a VERY, VERY SHORT response to the inquiry about what it is that we do. One that cites some of the uses of surveys that would be most likely to be perceived as valuable. Something like

"While we might call at dinnertime, we prefer to think of ourselves as folks who sometimes help governments understand where they are meeting citizens needs and how they would like their tax money spent, companies understand how good their customer service is and what improvements consumers would like in their products. Without surveys, they could just guess or infer whatever they wanted about the answers to such questions. We think both government and corporate America would probably be a lot less responsive to their constituencies".

But perhaps someone could improve on this?

Mike O'Neil

[www.oneilresearch.com](http://www.oneilresearch.com) <<http://www.oneilresearch.com/>>

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

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

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

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

=====  
Date: Sun, 14 Sep 2003 10:53:35 -0500  
Reply-To: [Jack\\_Ludwig@GALLUP.COM](mailto:Jack_Ludwig@GALLUP.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jack Ludwig <[Jack\\_Ludwig@GALLUP.COM](mailto:Jack_Ludwig@GALLUP.COM)>  
Subject: Re: The 15-second elevator speech  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

APOLOGIES TO ALL - My earlier note was sent inadvertently while I was still editing

> Mike,  
>  
> You've reminded me of a note on AAPORNET last fall, alerting AAPORites  
> about an article in "Women's Day" suggesting that readers "Just Say No to  
> Surveys." I responded to Women's day with the note I've pasted below... a  
> bit long for a conversation that must be packed into an interval between  
> floors, but some of the ideas are relevant. At 85 words (and the last one  
> weighing in at 5 syllables) even your more streamlined suggestion may  
> still be a little overweight, but I like your idea of trying to find the  
> simplest, most succinct and persuasive form this message could take ...I

> wonder what a list of the 5 most important things that survey research  
> has taught us in the past decade (that we could not have found out in any  
> other practical way) would look like...?  
>  
> Jack  
>  
> Jack\_Ludwig@Gallup.com  
>  
>  
> My letter To Women's Day:  
>  
> Dear Editor:  
>  
> Karen J. Bannan, in her recent article "26 Ways to Be Safer; What you need  
> to know to protect yourself, your family and your home," recommended that  
> readers "Just say no to phone surveys." I am writing to voice an  
> alternative point of view. In the interest of full disclosure, I should  
> mention that I am employed by the Gallup Organization, and have been  
> involved in conducting surveys, including telephone surveys, for more than  
> 20 years.  
>  
> In view of current events, concerns for personal safety are completely  
> understandable, and any attentive defender of surveys must acknowledge  
> that the American public's willingness to cooperate with surveys is  
> frequently abused by telemarketers and unscrupulous others whose only  
> interest is personal gain. But please reconsider your suggestion that  
> your readers refuse all survey requests.  
> Surveys are used to collect information and gain insight into important  
> political, social, and public health-related opinions and behaviors. By  
> asking important questions of a representative sample of those we are  
> trying to understand, we can learn things that can not be discovered in  
> any other practical way. Just ask those at the Centers for Disease  
> Control about the value of their Behavioral Risk Factors Surveys, which  
> provide input for public health planning. In a different arena, voters'  
> preferences among political candidates are evident from election outcomes,  
> but political opinion surveys can find out which of the candidate's  
> positions on a welter of issues were popular, and among what kind of  
> people--this is much more useful and enlightening information. Customer  
> surveys help companies to improve the products and services they provide  
> to people like you. And the list can go on....  
>  
> Knives are used as weapons, but we don't consider supporting a "Just say  
> no to knives" campaign. We all have them in our kitchens because the  
> likelihood that they will be used to hurt or kill us is vastly outweighed  
> by their usefulness. So be wary, and by all means withhold information  
> that could put you or your family in danger, say no to telemarketers if  
> you resent their intrusion, but consider that surveys benefit customers,  
> improve public health, and strengthen our democracy. Surveys amplify the  
> views of those who participate, giving a voice (and an interested  
> audience) to ordinary people who too often feel that their views don't  
> matter. I urge your readers to take the opportunity to make them  
> matter--to consider saying "yes."  
>  
> Jack Ludwig

>  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Mike O'Neil [mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU]  
> Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2003 2:04 AM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: The 15-second elevator speech  
>  
>  
> This is a follow-up observation on upgrading the image of our profession  
> among the general public.  
>  
> How many of us, after we tell someone what we do, hear something like "Oh,  
> you are the people who call us at dinner time." Often followed by "I  
> never  
> answer surveys".  
>  
> I have never been satisfied with the answer I have been able to conjure up  
> on the spot. Usually mumble something about how many surveys serve a  
> useful  
> social purpose. But I don't think I have been very convincing.  
>  
> If the thousand or so of us on AAPORNET get asked such a question once a  
> day, that is about a million impressions every three years (1,000 x 365 x  
> 3). Not an insignificant opportunity to promote our undertaking to the  
> broader public (indeed, enhanced by the fact that we are more likely to  
> interact with opinion leaders.  
>  
> If we all had a very convincing and memorable response to this type of  
> inquiry and used it regularly, it could have a real impact.  
>  
> My proposal is this: with all the collective wisdom out there, can someone  
> come up with a VERY, VERY SHORT response to the inquiry about what it is  
> that we do. One that cites some of the uses of surveys that would be most  
> likely to be perceived as valuable. Something like  
>  
> "While we might call at dinnertime, we prefer to think of ourselves as  
> folks who sometimes help governments understand where they are meeting  
> citizens needs and how they would like their tax money spent, companies  
> understand how good their customer service is and what improvements  
> consumers would like in their products. Without surveys, they could just  
> guess or infer whatever they wanted about the answers to such questions.  
> We  
> think both government and corporate America would probably be a lot less  
> responsive to their constituencies".  
>  
> But perhaps someone could improve on this?  
>  
> Mike O'Neil  
> www.oneilresearch.com <<http://www.oneilresearch.com/>>  
>  
>  
>  
> -----



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

---

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

---

Date: Sun, 14 Sep 2003 12:03:36 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Subject: Re: The 15-second elevator speech  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[CDEAJOODPEAJFKJABHJJEEPIDBAA.mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu](mailto:CDEAJOODPEAJFKJABHJJEEPIDBAA.mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Mike O'Neil wrote:

>This is a follow-up observation on upgrading the image of our profession  
>among the general public.  
>  
>How many of us, after we tell someone what we do, hear something like =93Oh=  
,  
>you are the people who call us at dinner time.=94 Often followed by =93I n=  
ever  
>answer surveys=94.

One problem with your profession, which is really a function of the larger political culture, is that lots of people feel that their opinions don't really matter, and that the political class is only interested in finding out how they can put one over on them. In other words, the public opinion industry is less an adjunct to democracy than to the marketing of policies that have already been decided upon. Nothing you could say in an elevator could address that issue, unless the elevator got stuck between floors for a few hours.

--

Doug Henwood  
Left Business Observer  
38 Greene St - 4th fl.  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
voice +1-212-219-0010  
fax +1-212-219-0098  
cell +1-917-865-2813  
email <<mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>>  
web <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>>

---

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

---

Date: Sun, 14 Sep 2003 12:17:44 -0400

Reply-To: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>  
Subject: Re: The 15-second elevator speech  
Comments: To: Mike O'Neil <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Why not something simple:

Isn't it important to know what the average person in the country thinks and believes rather than relying only on the views of politicians, the media elites, and advertisers?

Ed Ratledge

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

From: Mike O'Neil [mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU]  
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2003 2:04 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: The 15-second elevator speech

This is a follow-up observation on upgrading the image of our profession among the general public.

How many of us, after we tell someone what we do, hear something like "Oh, you are the people who call us at dinner time." Often followed by "I never answer surveys".

I have never been satisfied with the answer I have been able to conjure up on the spot. Usually mumble something about how many surveys serve a useful social purpose. But I don't think I have been very convincing.

If the thousand or so of us on AAPORNET get asked such a question once a day, that is about a million impressions every three years (1,000 x 365 x 3). Not an insignificant opportunity to promote our undertaking to the broader public (indeed, enhanced by the fact that we are more likely to interact with opinion leaders.

If we all had a very convincing and memorable response to this type of inquiry and used it regularly, it could have a real impact.

My proposal is this: with all the collective wisdom out there, can someone come up with a VERY, VERY SHORT response to the inquiry about what it is that we do. One that cites some of the uses of surveys that would be most likely to be perceived as valuable. Something like

"While we might call at dinnertime, we prefer to think of ourselves as folks who sometimes help governments understand where they are meeting citizens needs and how they would like their tax money spent, companies understand how good their customer service is and what improvements consumers would like in their products. Without surveys, they could just guess or infer whatever they wanted about the answers to such questions. We

think both government and corporate America would probably be a lot less responsive to their constituencies".

But perhaps someone could improve on this?

Mike O'Neil

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

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

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

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

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

=====  
Date: Sun, 14 Sep 2003 12:51:12 -0400  
Reply-To: "Dietram A. Scheufele" <[das72@CORNELL.EDU](mailto:das72@CORNELL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Dietram A. Scheufele" <[das72@CORNELL.EDU](mailto:das72@CORNELL.EDU)>  
Subject: WAPOR - Call for papers  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

## CALL FOR PAPERS -- WAPOR ANNUAL CONFERENCE

Phoenix, Arizona (USA)  
May 12-13, 2004

The World Association for Public Opinion Research (<http://www.wapor.org>) will hold its annual conference in May 2004 in Phoenix, AZ (USA) in connection with AAPOR's annual meeting. WAPOR seeks proposals for original research papers to be presented at this conference. Papers authored by graduate students will be considered for the prize for the "best student paper." We welcome proposals on the following themes as well as other topics that may be of interest to WAPOR members:

- Communication Research
- Public Opinion on Social, Economic and Political Issues
- Research Methodology
- Comparative Research
- Public Opinion Theory
- Survey Research
- Media and Public Opinion
- Internet Polling

Proposals should include a general description of the research paper (research topic, specific research questions or hypotheses, methods and results), as well as full contact information (mailing address, e-mail address and telephone number) for each co-author on a separate sheet. The abstract should not exceed three double-spaced pages or 750 words.

Proposals should be mailed, faxed, or emailed. All submissions must be received by December 1, 2003 (5:00pm, EST). If you mail proposals from abroad, please plan accordingly. Confirmation of receipt will be sent within two weeks, and the final decisions about the program will be made by January 31, 2004. If your proposal is accepted we will expect the text of the full paper by April 15, 2004.

Please send paper proposals by December 1, 2003 to the conference chair at the address below:

Dietram A. Scheufele  
Department of Communication  
Cornell University  
308 Kennedy Hall  
Ithaca, NY 14853 (USA)  
Telephone: +1.607.255.2603  
Fax: +1.607.254.1322  
Email: dietram.scheufele@cornell.edu

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

Date: Sun, 14 Sep 2003 13:41:39 -0400  
Reply-To: [andy@troll.soc.qc.edu](mailto:andy@troll.soc.qc.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
Subject: I don't answer at dinnertime  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear All:

It is fine that surveys, along with Police Benevolent Associations and various charities have been exempted from "Do Not Call" lists, but there is no good answer to bothering someone at dinner and asking them to spend some of their time, usually unpaid, to answer questions that are being asked for pay, on behalf of an entity either a politician or a for profit institution that wants to use the results to either win an election or make money.

If polls were publically important, it seems to me that pollsters would do them for free. Most surveys, of course, are product related. Much public opinion polling is actually done as a loss leader to try to get the reputation of the polling firm enhanced so they can make more money doing product or service oriented surveys.

This is a for profit industry. And it should be.

Andy Beveridge

Andrew A. Beveridge

Professor of Sociology  
Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY  
209 Kissena Hall  
64-19 Kissena Blvd  
Flushing, NY 11367  
Phone: 718-997-2837  
FAX: 718-997-2820  
email: [beveridg@optonline.net](mailto:beveridg@optonline.net)  
web: [www.socialexplorer.com](http://www.socialexplorer.com)

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

Date: Sun, 14 Sep 2003 15:44:24 -0400  
Reply-To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <[tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu](mailto:tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <[tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: The 15-second elevator speech  
Comments: To: "Ratledge, Edward" <[ratledge@UDEL.EDU](mailto:ratledge@UDEL.EDU)>,  
AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[FCDC58EC0F22D4119F0800A0C9E58995D24C3F@exchange.chep.udel.edu](mailto:FCDC58EC0F22D4119F0800A0C9E58995D24C3F@exchange.chep.udel.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

I think Ed sounds the right note. And here it is in six words:  
"We give voice to the many."  
Aren't you tired of hearing from only the few?  
Tom

Full disclosure: I came up with that phrase when our center was seeking to write a mission statement. The staff didn't much go for that phrase, but it might just work in the right 'elevator moment.'

--On Sunday, September 14, 2003 12:17 PM -0400 "Ratledge, Edward" <[ratledge@UDEL.EDU](mailto:ratledge@UDEL.EDU)> wrote:

> Why not something simple:  
>  
> Isn't it important to know what the average person in the country thinks  
> and believes rather than relying only on the views of politicians, the  
> media elites, and advertisers?  
>  
> Ed Ratledge  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Mike O'Neil [<mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>]  
> Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2003 2:04 AM  
> To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
> Subject: The 15-second elevator speech  
>



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

Date:        Sun, 14 Sep 2003 17:12:33 -0500  
Reply-To:    slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu  
Sender:     AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From:       Susan Carol Losh <slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU>  
Subject:    Re: The 15-second elevator speech  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain  
Content-transfer-encoding: binary  
Content-disposition: inline

We give voice to the many. Aren't you tired of hearing from only the few?

I think it's a terrific candidate for the 2004 t-shirt so please remember to submit it! (Maybe just the first part?) And that way, you wear the shirt on the elevator and just turn around.

Susan

On Sun, 14 Sep 2003 15:44:24 -0400 "Thomas M. Guterbock" wrote:

> I think Ed sounds the right note. And here it is in six words:  
> "  
>                                      Tom  
>  
> Full disclosure: I came up with that phrase when our center was  
> seeking to  
> write a mission statement. The staff didn't much go for that phrase, but  
> it might just work in the right 'elevator moment.'  
>  
>  
> --On Sunday, September 14, 2003 12:17 PM -0400 "Ratledge, Edward"  
> <ratledge@UDEL.EDU> wrote:  
>  
>> Why not something simple:  
>>  
>> Isn't it important to know what the average person in the country thinks  
>> and believes rather than relying only on the views of politicians, the  
>> media elites, and advertisers?  
>>  
>> Ed Ratledge  
>>  
>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: Mike O'Neil [mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU]  
>> Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2003 2:04 AM  
>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>> Subject: The 15-second elevator speech  
>>  
>>  
>> This is a follow-up observation on upgrading the image of our profession  
>> among the general public.  
>>  
>> How many of us, after we tell someone what we do, hear something  
> like "Oh,  
>> you are the people who call us at dinner time." Often followed by "I  
>> never answer surveys".  
>>  
>> I have never been satisfied with the answer I have been able to  
> conjure up  
>> on the spot. Usually mumble something about how many surveys serve a  
>> useful social purpose. But I don't think I have been very convincing.  
>>  
>> If the thousand or so of us on AAPORNET get asked such a question once a  
>> day, that is about a million impressions every three years (1,000 x  
> 365 x  
>> 3). Not an insignificant opportunity to promote our undertaking to the  
>> broader public (indeed, enhanced by the fact that we are more likely to  
>> interact with opinion leaders.  
>>  
>> If we all had a very convincing and memorable response to this type of  
>> inquiry and used it regularly, it could have a real impact.  
>>  
>> My proposal is this: with all the collective wisdom out there, can  
> someone  
>> come up with a VERY, VERY SHORT response to the inquiry about what it is  
>> that we do. One that cites some of the uses of surveys that would  
> be most  
>> likely to be perceived as valuable. Something like  
>>  
>> "While we might call at dinnertime, we prefer to think of ourselves as  
>> folks who sometimes help governments understand where they are meeting  
>> citizens needs and how they would like their tax money spent, companies  
>> understand how good their customer service is and what improvements  
>> consumers would like in their products. Without surveys, they  
> could just  
>> guess or infer whatever they wanted about the answers to such questions.  
>> We think both government and corporate America would probably be a lot  
>> less responsive to their constituencies".  
>>  
>> But perhaps someone could improve on this?  
>>  
>> Mike O'Neil  
>> www.oneilresearch.com <<http://www.oneilresearch.com/>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> -----



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

Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.  
American Statistical Association/NSF-SRS Research Fellow 2003-2004  
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>  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu  
=====

Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2003 09:45:13 -0400  
Reply-To: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>  
Subject: Re: The 15-second elevator speech  
Comments: To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu>,  
AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Great line Tom. Can I use it in a speech I am giving next week?

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

From: Thomas M. Guterbock [mailto:tmg1p@cms.mail.virginia.edu]  
Sent: Sunday, September 14, 2003 3:44 PM  
To: Ratledge, Edward; AAPORNET  
Subject: Re: The 15-second elevator speech

I think Ed sounds the right note. And here it is in six words:

"We give voice to the many."

Aren't you tired of hearing from only the few?

Tom

Full disclosure: I came up with that phrase when our center was seeking to write a mission statement. The staff didn't much go for that phrase, but it might just work in the right 'elevator moment.'

--On Sunday, September 14, 2003 12:17 PM -0400 "Ratledge, Edward"  
<ratledge@UDEL.EDU> wrote:

> Why not something simple:

>

> Isn't it important to know what the average person in the country thinks

> and believes rather than relying only on the views of politicians, the

> media elites, and advertisers?

>

> Ed Ratledge

>

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

> From: Mike O'Neil [mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU]

> Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2003 2:04 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: The 15-second elevator speech

>

>

> This is a follow-up observation on upgrading the image of our profession

> among the general public.

>

> How many of us, after we tell someone what we do, hear something like "Oh,

> you are the people who call us at dinner time." Often followed by "I

> never answer surveys".

>

> I have never been satisfied with the answer I have been able to conjure up

> on the spot. Usually mumble something about how many surveys serve a

> useful social purpose. But I don't think I have been very convincing.

>

> If the thousand or so of us on AAPORNET get asked such a question once a

> day, that is about a million impressions every three years (1,000 x 365 x

> 3). Not an insignificant opportunity to promote our undertaking to the

> broader public (indeed, enhanced by the fact that we are more likely to

> interact with opinion leaders.

>

> If we all had a very convincing and memorable response to this type of

> inquiry and used it regularly, it could have a real impact.

>





>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Mike O'Neil [mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU]  
> Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2003 2:04 AM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: The 15-second elevator speech  
>  
>  
> This is a follow-up observation on upgrading the image of our  
profession  
> among the general public.  
>  
> How many of us, after we tell someone what we do, hear something like  
"Oh,  
> you are the people who call us at dinner time." Often followed by "I  
> never answer surveys".  
>  
> I have never been satisfied with the answer I have been able to  
conjure up  
> on the spot. Usually mumble something about how many surveys serve a  
> useful social purpose. But I don't think I have been very convincing.  
>  
> If the thousand or so of us on AAPORNET get asked such a question once  
a  
> day, that is about a million impressions every three years (1,000 x  
365 x  
> 3). Not an insignificant opportunity to promote our undertaking to  
the  
> broader public (indeed, enhanced by the fact that we are more likely  
to  
> interact with opinion leaders.  
>  
> If we all had a very convincing and memorable response to this type of  
> inquiry and used it regularly, it could have a real impact.  
>  
> My proposal is this: with all the collective wisdom out there, can  
someone  
> come up with a VERY, VERY SHORT response to the inquiry about what it  
is  
> that we do. One that cites some of the uses of surveys that would be  
most  
> likely to be perceived as valuable. Something like  
>  
> "While we might call at dinnertime, we prefer to think of ourselves  
as  
> folks who sometimes help governments understand where they are meeting  
> citizens needs and how they would like their tax money spent,  
companies  
> understand how good their customer service is and what improvements  
> consumers would like in their products. Without surveys, they could  
just  
> guess or infer whatever they wanted about the answers to such  
questions.  
> We think both government and corporate America would probably be a lot



October 2 & 3, 2003  
University Club  
North Carolina State University  
Raleigh, North Carolina

The annual conference of the Southern Association for Public Opinion Research will be held on October 2 & 3, 2003 in Raleigh, North Carolina. The deadline for early registration (lower rates) is September 15, 2003. See the SAPOR website <<http://www.irss.unc.edu/irss/sapor/>> for more information about the conference, the preliminary agenda, a list of area attractions, and a conference registration form. Questions can be addressed to me at [ashley\\_bowers@unc.edu](mailto:ashley_bowers@unc.edu). Please join us!

Ashley Bowers  
Operations Director  
Survey Research Unit, Department of Biostatistics  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
730 Airport Road, Suite 103  
CB #2400, UNC-CH  
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-2400  
(p) 919-966-0476  
(f) 919-966-2221  
[ashley\\_bowers@unc.edu](mailto:ashley_bowers@unc.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

=====

Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2003 09:12:21 -0700  
Reply-To: Jon Cohen <[cohen@PPIC.ORG](mailto:cohen@PPIC.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jon Cohen <[cohen@PPIC.ORG](mailto:cohen@PPIC.ORG)>  
Subject: PAPOR 2003!  
Comments: cc: "AAPORNET@asu.edu" <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

Please find below and attached the preliminary program for the annual meeting of the Pacific Chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research (PAPOR). The conference will take place on Thursday October 23 and Friday October 24 at the Sheraton Universal Hotel in Universal City, California, and we look forward to seeing you there!

Thursday, October 23<?xml:namespace prefix = o ns =  
"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />

1:00-4:00 pm           Short Course: Internet Surveys

R. Michael Alvarez-California Institute of Technology

4:00-4:15            Break

4:15- 5:45 pm        Session I: California's Historic Recall Election

Chair/Moderator: Ann Crigler-University of Southern California

Mark DiCamillo-The Field Institute

Susan Pinkus and Jill Richardson-Los Angeles Times

Mark Baldassare and Jonathan Cohen-Public Policy Institute of California

5:45 - 6:30 pm        Reception

6:30-7:30 pm        Dinner

8:00-10:00 pm        PAPOR 2003 Plenary: Census 2000 and Survey Research

Elizabeth Martin-U.S. Census Bureau

Mary Heim-California State Department of Finance

Chris De Angelis-Survey Sampling Inc.



Dessert & Coffee

Friday, October 24th

7:30-8:30 am          Breakfast

8:45-10:15 am          Session II: New Technologies in Survey Research

Chair/Moderator: Jennifer Franz-JD Franz Research, Inc.

Lisel Blash-Public Research Institute/SFSU

Using GIS for Survey Research

Thad Kousser-University of California, San Diego

Turning Out To Turn Him Out: The Causes and Consequences of Voter  
Participation in the Recall?

Stefan Subias-Knowledge Networks

Results of Survey Experiments Relating to the California Special Election

10:15-10:30 am          Break

10:30-12:00 pm          Session III: Surveying Special Populations

Chair/Moderator: Vicky Albright-The Field Institute

Vicky Albright-The Field Institute

Gay and Lesbian Populations

Mollyann Brodie and Rebecca Levin-Kaiser Family Foundation

National Latino Sampling

Kathy Dykeman and Rick Li-Knowledge Networks

Longitudinal and Complex Survey Designs using a Web-Enabled Panel

Jill Richardson and Susan Pinkus-Los Angeles Times

Asian Sampling

12:00-1:00 pm      Lunch

1:30-3:00 pm      Session IV: Confidence in Leaders and Institutions

Family Foundation      Chair/Moderator: Mollyann Brodie -Kaiser

Angeles Times      Jill Richardson and Susan Pinkus-Los

Catholic Priests

Douglas Strand-University of California, Berkeley

Biting or just barking? The impact of political cynicism on congressional vote choice

Thomas Lamatsch and Joseph S. Strother-University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Southern Nevada and "Rally around the Flag"

Laura Frey-University of California, Santa Barbara

Measuring the Impact of Crisis Events on Presidential Approval: An Objective Approach to the Rally Phenomenon

3:30-4:30 pm Chapter Meeting

Please find a registration form for the conference on our new website: <http://www.papor.org/> www.papor.org. We would appreciate registration for the conference by Friday September 19, 2003.

PAPOR has blocked rooms at the Sheraton Universal Hotel for a discounted rate of \$139/night. Please book your rooms before September 22 to guarantee the rate. The hotel's direct line is 818.980.1212 and the Sheraton's central reservation office can be reached at 800.325.3535. Discounted tickets to Universal Studios will be available.

The 2003 PAPOR student paper competition remains open. All papers authored by undergraduate or graduate students attending colleges and universities in the Pacific region are eligible for PAPOR's Student Paper Competition. Authors of the top two papers will win a cash prize and provided with travel expenses to attend and participate in the 2003 conference. To submit a paper for the competition, send four copies of the completed paper by September 24 to:

Rebecca Levin

C/o The Kaiser Family Foundation

2400 Sand Hill Road, Menlo Park, CA 94025.

For questions about the conference, please contact Conference Chair Jon Cohen ( <<mailto:cohen@ppic.org>> cohen@ppic.org).

Thanks much, and see you in Universal City!

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

Tel: 415.291.4437  
Fax: 415.291.4401  
[cohen@ppic.org](mailto:cohen@ppic.org)

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

=====

Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2003 12:53:30 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Subject: Re: The 15-second elevator speech  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[FCDC58EC0F22D4119F0800A0C9E58995D24C40@exchange.chep.udel.edu](mailto:FCDC58EC0F22D4119F0800A0C9E58995D24C40@exchange.chep.udel.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

It's pretty amusing that you're congratulating each other on giving voice to the many when you ignore the message of your critics. You may not like Arianna, but she's not stupid. And you had no reaction to my criticism of the public opinion profession - that it's widely perceived as a marketing operation, designed to sell policies that have already been decided upon rather than to read the opinions of the masses. Coming up with a tagline rather than trying to process why people don't like pollsters is a perfect example of what I'm talking about.

--

Doug Henwood  
Left Business Observer

38 Greene St - 4th fl.  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
voice +1-212-219-0010  
fax +1-212-219-0098  
cell +1-917-865-2813  
email <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>  
web <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2003 18:26:30 +0100  
Reply-To: Nick Moon <N.Moon@NOPWORLD.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nick Moon <N.Moon@NOPWORLD.COM>  
Subject: Re: The 15-second elevator speech  
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

> It's pretty amusing that you're congratulating each other on giving  
> voice to the many when you ignore the message of your critics. You  
> may not like Arianna, but she's not stupid. And you had no reaction  
> to my criticism of the public opinion profession - that it's widely  
> perceived as a marketing operation, designed to sell policies that  
> have already been decided upon rather than to read the opinions of  
> the masses. Coming up with a tagline rather than trying to process  
> why people don't like pollsters is a perfect example of what I'm  
> talking about.

One of the reasons many people don't like polling is because rich people with a lot of access to media like Ms Huffington carry on running very simplistic but repetitive campaigns blaming polls for "the crisis of leadership" that has led to things being in such a bad state.

As was apparent from Nashville, she may not be stupid, but she is a little lacking in the ethics department. She was smart enough to pretend to an audience of pollsters that she wasn't anti-polls per se, merely how they were used. Then she agreed that it would be terrible if serious social research suffered as a result of her campaign, and that she would drop her blanket "Just say no to pollsters" line in future; only to reinstate it in columns and on her website as soon as our backs were turned.

She may be influential, but that doesn't make her right

\*\*\*\*\*

Any views or opinions are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of NOP World or any of its associated companies.

\*\*\*\*\*

The information transmitted is intended only for

the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please do not read, copy, use or disclose this communication and notify the sender immediately. It should be noted that any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited.

\*\*\*\*\*

Recipients are warned that NOP World cannot guarantee that attachments or enclosures are secure or error-free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, or contain viruses

\*\*\*\*\*

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2003 13:41:11 -0400  
Reply-To: Philip Meyer <[pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU](mailto:pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Philip Meyer <[pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU](mailto:pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: The 15-second elevator speech  
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[p05200f03bb8b9e7dd9d0@\[192.168.0.196\]](mailto:p05200f03bb8b9e7dd9d0@[192.168.0.196])>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Don't forget Edmund Burke. It's nobler to use polls to sell policy already decided upon than to slavishly follow popular delusions. Even liberals (and I am one) need polls to see how their messages are getting across.

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

On Mon, 15 Sep 2003, Doug Henwood wrote:

> Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2003 12:53:30 -0400  
> From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
> To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
> Subject: Re: The 15-second elevator speech  
>  
> It's pretty amusing that you're congratulating each other on giving

> voice to the many when you ignore the message of your critics. You  
> may not like Arianna, but she's not stupid. And you had no reaction  
> to my criticism of the public opinion profession - that it's widely  
> perceived as a marketing operation, designed to sell policies that  
> have already been decided upon rather than to read the opinions of  
> the masses. Coming up with a tagline rather than trying to process  
> why people don't like pollsters is a perfect example of what I'm  
> talking about.

> --

>  
> Doug Henwood  
> Left Business Observer  
> 38 Greene St - 4th fl.  
> New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
> voice +1-212-219-0010  
> fax +1-212-219-0098  
> cell +1-917-865-2813  
> email <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>  
> web <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>

>

> -----

> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet  
>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2003 11:09:44 -0700  
Reply-To: [mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Subject: ABCNEWS.com:  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

You have received this ABCNEWS.com mail from:

Warren Mitofsky  
[mitofsky@mindspring.com](mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com)

I thought you might find this story interesting.

[http://abcnews.go.com/sections/politics/DailyNews/title=A friend wants you to see this!](http://abcnews.go.com/sections/politics/DailyNews/title=A%20friend%20wants%20you%20to%20see%20this!)

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2003 14:35:07 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: The 15-second elevator speech  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[p05200f03bb8b9e7dd9d0@\[192.168.0.196\]](mailto:p05200f03bb8b9e7dd9d0@[192.168.0.196])>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I have frequently heard the complaint that public opinion researchers are a slave to whoever is paying the bills or to their own twisted political beliefs (I was called a shill for a former governor of New Hampshire, a communist and a bad scientist to name but a few). But in each case these were people with axes of their own to grind - The Union Leader Editorial staff, an NRA member and a spokesman for the Tobacco Institute (respectively).

And I had one reporter who questioned me extensively about why Bill Clinton's peccadillo's didn't have a greater effect on his popularity (especially with women) and why wasn't the public opinion polling showing more effect. Because he thought it should show more effects.

I have never heard a member of the general public say that their problem with public opinion polls was that they were used to sell policy already decided upon - I realize of course there is a subset of polls that does precisely that but I have never heard anyone (outside of AAPORistas and politics junkies) complain about this sort of thing. Don't forget not long ago (about 2 weeks ago) 2/3s of registered voters could not name a single Democratic presidential candidate.

Now I am (largely) out of political polling and the complaints may have changed.

But the complaints I am used to hearing are:

You call too many times.

You won't take no for an answer.

You call at the wrong time.

Your survey takes too long.

Your survey is dull.

Your survey asks the wrong questions.

Your survey is too liberal/conservative.

Actually a complaint I have often heard is "How come you guys never call me?"

--

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 Doug Henwood

> Sent: Monday, September 15, 2003 12:54 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: The 15-second elevator speech

>

> It's pretty amusing that you're congratulating each other on giving  
> voice to the many when you ignore the message of your critics. You  
> may not like Arianna, but she's not stupid. And you had no reaction  
> to my criticism of the public opinion profession - that it's widely  
> perceived as a marketing operation, designed to sell policies that  
> have already been decided upon rather than to read the opinions of  
> the masses. Coming up with a tagline rather than trying to process  
> why people don't like pollsters is a perfect example of what I'm  
> talking about.

> --

>

> Doug Henwood

> Left Business Observer

> 38 Greene St - 4th fl.

> New York NY 10013-2505 USA

> voice +1-212-219-0010

> fax +1-212-219-0098

> cell +1-917-865-2813

> email <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>

> web <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>

>

> -----

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

> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

> signoff aapornet

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2003 14:30:35 -0400

Reply-To: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>

Subject: Re: The 15-second elevator speech

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Philip Knight wrote in part,

> Don't forget Edmund Burke. It's nobler to use polls to sell policy  
>already decided upon than to slavishly follow popular delusions.

I guess so (if that forced choice is offered), but would Burke have called the former "giving voice to the many"?

I'll venture the general value judgments that (1) giving voice to the many seems like a Good Thing, and (2) I don't think that everything public opinion researchers do is all that good. I think some of it is good and most of the rest is more or less harmless. Alas, that doesn't make much of a T-shirt slogan.

Mark Lindeman  
Bard College

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2003 12:09:34 -0700  
Reply-To: "Voigt, Lynda" <[lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG](mailto:lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Voigt, Lynda" <[lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG](mailto:lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG)>  
Subject: question about computer dialer  
Comments: To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

We have developed an in-house RDD CATI system from scratch. We would like to add on a computer dialer so that the interviewers do not have to manually dial each number. It must be completely quiet - i.e., no "clicks" etc that can be heard by the person on the other end of the line. I would appreciate any suggestions regarding where we could purchase a dialer. The CATI interfaces are written in C# and will be used by interviewers who work from their own homes. The data are uploaded/downloaded from a central SQL server.

Thanks for any advice you can give us.

Lynda Voigt

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

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2003 17:27:30 -0400  
Reply-To: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>  
Subject: FW: I don't answer at dinnertime  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

>  
> Hi Andy, education is quite important, do you teach for free?

But those who are called on the phone, generally are expected to participate for free, and have their dinner or TV watching or whatever else they are doing disrupted for the private benefit of the pollster and his or her client.

> --  
> Paolo A. Gardinali  
> Associate Director  
> UCSB Social Science Survey Center  
> <http://www.survey.ucsb.edu>  
>  
>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
-----

Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2003 14:41:24 -0700  
Reply-To: Paolo Gardinali <paolo@SURVEY.UCSB.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Paolo Gardinali <paolo@SURVEY.UCSB.EDU>  
Subject: Re: I don't answer at dinnertime  
Comments: To: Andrew A Beveridge <beveridg@optonline.net>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
In-Reply-To: <KLEOLNOOPOCIGAODMGOHCEKHEOAA.beveridg@optonline.net>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Mon, 15 Sep 2003, Andrew A Beveridge wrote:

>> Hi Andy, education is quite important, do you teach for free?  
>  
> But those who are called on the phone, generally are expected to participate  
> for free, and have their dinner or TV watching or whatever else they are  
> doing disrupted for the private benefit of the pollster and his or her  
> client.

Note: my personal (and ironic) message has been redistributed to AAPORNET without my permission, and I have also been misquoted.

For the sake of precision this is what I was answering to:

> If polls were publically important, it seems to me that pollsters would  
> do  
> them for free.

[...]

> This is a for profit industry. And it should be.

Note that obviously "public importance" does not imply free labor, and there are many of us who work for nonprofits. Respondents are often unpaid, and their contribution is very important for the constitution of a body of knowledge that benefits all (=public goods)

Cheers,

--

Paolo A. Gardinali  
Associate Director  
UCSB Social Science Survey Center  
<http://www.survey.ucsb.edu>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2003 19:11:06 -0400  
Reply-To: [mark@bisconti.com](mailto:mark@bisconti.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mark David Richards <[mark@BISCONTI.COM](mailto:mark@BISCONTI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: The 15-second elevator speech  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[p05200f03bb8b9e7dd9d0@\[192.168.0.196\]](mailto:p05200f03bb8b9e7dd9d0@[192.168.0.196])>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I like the 15-sec. speech and would like to see it on a t-shirt! But what follows is the 15-min. bus stop one.

Arianna is a smart woman and made excellent points. C. Wright Mills made a similar criticism of survey research in *The Power Elite* (1956) -- in fact, as I recall he specifically criticized early survey research pioneers because he felt they were becoming "captive" to the interests of large federal bureaucracies, beginning with the War Department in World War II.

But I think the role of survey research is more dynamic than that. No one group or organization controls public opinion research.

--The media conducts public opinion research, usually on topics that have been deemed part of the "issue agenda" ... issues that are "hot" in the current climate. If Congress launches an impeachment, or if the government starts a war, the media will probably ask people what they think about it. Research is one of a number of ways the fourth estate uses to gauge of public opinion and we can be thankful for that.

--The government conducts an immense amount of opinion research--in part because they have been given Executive orders to get feedback from their "customers" about how responsive they are. Also so that they know what kind of job they're doing and make projections.

--Special and public interest groups conduct research to find out where people stand on their issues and use the findings to help frame their issue so they can more effectively "sell" their ideas and mold public opinion and policy debates. If they were sure a decision had already been made in their favor, they wouldn't bother doing public opinion research.

--City government sometimes does research to understand its customers. It could just as easily skip the research and go by its public hearings--would that more effectively represent public opinion? Not from I can tell. Political and media elites may be terribly critical of the police chief and the mayor, but ask the public and see what they think -- and the result will be instructive. (Perhaps it will be instructive about how well the chief and mayor manage or do not manage their image and perhaps it will relate to actual performance.)

Certainly, those with economic power have a greater ability to conduct research and ask about their interests. But the fact that anyone can look at the method, the questions asked, and the results--and compare the information to research conducted by other organizations--allows one to make an informed judgment... that is part of what makes the survey research field useful and practical. No one question or survey necessarily gets at public opinion, but put all the studies together and we get a much clearer picture.

Public opinion may not stop power elites from using their resources to implement their objectives and sustain their power, but public opinion does set some constraints on anyone making claims about public opinion... and about the direction public policy should take. Those who control the instruments of the media (and those who know how to work the "spin cycle") can mold public opinion. Pollsters can get an idea about how public opinion is being molded and by whom.

I find it more alarming when someone says, "Who cares what the public thinks; they're ignorant and don't know enough to have an opinion, so why bother asking?" Granted, I have no desire to use survey research to inform engineers about how to make power plants run safely; but I appreciate it when organizations care enough to find out what people are thinking and why. Sometimes there is huge amount of misinformation or misunderstanding about a topic that it is important for one group to understand another group and why they are thinking what they are.

That people want to know what the public is thinking suggests that public opinion, ultimately expressed at the ballot box, is important and that it matters.

Media elites are constantly telling its audiences what the public thinks, often based on the most active and vocal members of society. If more media elites learn how to use survey research, they would better serve their customers.

The most frequent criticisms and questions I hear, usually from those who disagree with the findings but not always, are:

--pollsters ask questions in a way to get the answer they want.  
--nobody ever calls me (how do you pick the people you call)?  
--how can you claim findings are representative with a sample of only 500/1,000; why aren't more interviews better?

Cheers, mark

-----  
Mark David Richards

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Doug Henwood  
Sent: Monday, September 15, 2003 12:53 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: The 15-second elevator speech

It's pretty amusing that you're congratulating each other on giving voice to the many when you ignore the message of your critics. You may not like Arianna, but she's not stupid. And you had no reaction to my criticism of the public opinion profession - that it's widely perceived as a marketing operation, designed to sell policies that have already been decided upon rather than to read the opinions of the masses. Coming up with a tagline rather than trying to process why people don't like pollsters is a perfect example of what I'm talking about.

--

Doug Henwood  
Left Business Observer  
38 Greene St - 4th fl.  
New York NY 10013-2505 USA  
voice +1-212-219-0010  
fax +1-212-219-0098  
cell +1-917-865-2813  
email <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>  
web <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Mon, 15 Sep 2003 16:16:44 -0700  
Reply-To: "Voigt, Lynda" <[lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG](mailto:lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Voigt, Lynda" <[lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG](mailto:lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG)>  
Subject: clarification about computer dialer question  
Comments: To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Thanks for the responses that I've received to my question. I wasn't very clear about what I'm looking for. We are not looking for anything that will do predictive calling, managed calling or even automated call managing. Our interviewers dial one number at time, resolve that number, then go to the next one. Each interviewer works independently from his/her own home. We just want to eliminate the manual dialing of the phone number - nothing else.

Thanks for any leads you can give me.

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2003 05:44:34 -0700  
Reply-To: Hank Zucker <[hank@surveysystem.com](mailto:hank@surveysystem.com)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Hank Zucker <[hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM](mailto:hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM)>  
Subject: Re: I don't answer at dinnertime  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Actually, respondents do often get something out of participating for free - they get their particular opinions counted. That can have real value.

A response to the "why should I give my time for free" question could be something like:

"Would you like your opinions to help shape government policies, what kinds

of products you can buy, and what you can see on TV, or would you rather someone else's opinion was counted?"

Hank

Hank Zucker, Ph.D.

Creative Research Systems

makers of The Survey System: Survey software that makes you look good

www.surveysystem.com

(707) 765-1001

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

From: "Andrew A Beveridge" <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Monday, September 15, 2003 2:27 PM

Subject: FW: I don't answer at dinnertime

>>

>> Hi Andy, education is quite important, do you teach for free?

>

> But those who are called on the phone, generally are expected to participate

> for free, and have their dinner or TV watching or whatever else they are

> doing disrupted for the private benefit of the pollster and his or her

> client.

>

>> --

>> Paolo A. Gardinali

>> Associate Director

>> UCSB Social Science Survey Center

>> <http://www.survey.ucsb.edu>

>>

>>

>

> -----

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

> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

> signoff aapornet

>

>

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2003 09:29:44 -0400

Reply-To: [mmichaels@michaelsresearch.com](mailto:mmichaels@michaelsresearch.com)

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Maureen Michaels <[mmichaels@MICHAELSRESEARCH.COM](mailto:mmichaels@MICHAELSRESEARCH.COM)>

Organization: Michaels Opinion Reserach, Inc.



Subject: Re: The 15-second elevator speech  
Comments: To: mark@bisconti.com, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <007701c37bde\$a7cef420\$6701a8c0@mark>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Nancy Belden will surely correct me if I have this wrong, but I believe Joe Belden expressed it best many years ago in his great "Guide to Interviewing": "We [pollsters] have every right to ask your opinion and you have every right not to respond."

Maureen Michaels

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Mark David Richards  
Sent: Monday, September 15, 2003 7:11 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: The 15-second elevator speech

I like the 15-sec. speech and would like to see it on a t-shirt! But what follows is the 15-min. bus stop one.

Arianna is a smart woman and made excellent points. C. Wright Mills made a similar criticism of survey research in *The Power Elite* (1956) -- in fact, as I recall he specifically criticized early survey research pioneers because he felt they were becoming "captive" to the interests of large federal bureaucracies, beginning with the War Department in World War II.

But I think the role of survey research is more dynamic than that. No one group or organization controls public opinion research.

--The media conducts public opinion research, usually on topics that have been deemed part of the "issue agenda" ... issues that are "hot" in the current climate. If Congress launches an impeachment, or if the government starts a war, the media will probably ask people what they think about it. Research is one of a number of ways the fourth estate uses to gauge of public opinion and we can be thankful for that.

--The government conducts an immense amount of opinion research--in part because they have been given Executive orders to get feedback from their "customers" about how responsive they are. Also so that they know what kind of job they're doing and make projections.

--Special and public interest groups conduct research to find out where people stand on their issues and use the findings to help frame their issue so they can more effectively "sell" their ideas and mold public opinion and policy debates. If they were sure a decision had already been made in their favor, they wouldn't bother doing public opinion

research.

--City government sometimes does research to understand its customers. It could just as easily skip the research and go by its public hearings--would that more effectively represent public opinion? Not from I can tell. Political and media elites may be terribly critical of the police chief and the mayor, but ask the public and see what they think -- and the result will be instructive. (Perhaps it will be instructive about how well the chief and mayor manage or do not manage their image and perhaps it will relate to actual performance.)

Certainly, those with economic power have a greater ability to conduct research and ask about their interests. But the fact that anyone can look at the method, the questions asked, and the results--and compare the information to research conducted by other organizations--allows one to make an informed judgment... that is part of what makes the survey research field useful and practical. No one question or survey necessarily gets at public opinion, but put all the studies together and we get a much clearer picture.

Public opinion may not stop power elites from using their resources to implement their objectives and sustain their power, but public opinion does set some constraints on anyone making claims about public opinion... and about the direction public policy should take. Those who control the instruments of the media (and those who know how to work the "spin cycle") can mold public opinion. Pollsters can get an idea about how public opinion is being molded and by whom.

I find it more alarming when someone says, "Who cares what the public thinks; they're ignorant and don't know enough to have an opinion, so why bother asking?" Granted, I have no desire to use survey research to inform engineers about how to make power plants run safely; but I appreciate it when organizations care enough to find out what people are thinking and why. Sometimes there is huge amount of misinformation or misunderstanding about a topic that it is important for one group to understand another group and why they are thinking what they are.

That people want to know what the public is thinking suggests that public opinion, ultimately expressed at the ballot box, is important and that it matters.

Media elites are constantly telling its audiences what the public thinks, often based on the most active and vocal members of society. If more media elites learn how to use survey research, they would better serve their customers.

The most frequent criticisms and questions I hear, usually from those who disagree with the findings but not always, are:

--pollsters ask questions in a way to get the answer they want. --nobody ever calls me (how do you pick the people you call)? --how can you claim findings are representative with a sample of only 500/1,000; why aren't more interviews better?

Cheers, mark

---

Mark David Richards

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Doug Henwood

Sent: Monday, September 15, 2003 12:53 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: The 15-second elevator speech

It's pretty amusing that you're congratulating each other on giving voice to the many when you ignore the message of your critics. You may not like Arianna, but she's not stupid. And you had no reaction to my criticism of the public opinion profession - that it's widely perceived as a marketing operation, designed to sell policies that have already been decided upon rather than to read the opinions of the masses. Coming up with a tagline rather than trying to process why people don't like pollsters is a perfect example of what I'm talking about.

--

Doug Henwood

Left Business Observer

38 Greene St - 4th fl.

New York NY 10013-2505 USA

voice +1-212-219-0010

fax +1-212-219-0098

cell +1-917-865-2813

email <mailto:dhenwood@panix.com>

web <http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com>

---

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text: signoff

aapornet

---

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text: signoff

aapornet

---

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

signoff aapornet

---

Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2003 11:13:39 -0400

Reply-To: [rys4@COLUMBIA.EDU](mailto:rys4@COLUMBIA.EDU)

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Robert Y. Shapiro" <[rys4@COLUMBIA.EDU](mailto:rys4@COLUMBIA.EDU)>

Subject: Book Award Announcement (fwd)

Comments: To: AAPORNET <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Forwarding.

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2003 07:54:34 -0700

From: Summer Espinoza <Summer\_Espinoza@PITZER.EDU>

To: ISPPM@LISTSERV.PITZER.EDU

Subject: Book Award Announcement

Announcement of the Alexander L. George Book Award:

### The Alexander L. George Book Award

The International Society of Political Psychology is pleased to announce the establishment of the Alexander L. George Book Award. Beginning with the 2004 ISPP Annual Scientific Meeting, this award will be given for the best book published in the field of political psychology during the previous calendar year. The first award will be for the best book published in 2003. Befitting the extraordinary and far-reaching contributions to scholarship of Alexander George, the award winning work should be one that demonstrates the highest quality of thought and makes a major substantive book-length contribution to the field of political psychology, broadly defined. As judged by the award committee, the book should increase substantially our understanding of an issue (or issues) that is central to the concerns of political psychology and the world in which we live.

The award winner will be determined by a interdisciplinary committee consisting of at least four members, at least two of whom are normally drawn from lists of past winners of ISPP major awards--Sanford, Lasswell, Erikson--and former ISPP presidents.

Nominations, along with copies of the books being nominated, should be sent to EACH of the award committee members below. Inquiries should be addressed to the chair of the award committee, Robert Shapiro. The deadline for nominations is December 15,2003.

### AWARD COMMITTEE

Professor Robert Shapiro (award committee chair)

Department of Political Science

Columbia University

420 West 118th Street, MC 3320

711 International Affairs Building

New York, N.Y. 10027

phone: (212) 854-3944

fax: (212) 222-0598

e-mail: rys3@columbia.edu.edu

Professor Fred I. Greenstein

Director, Program in Leadership Studies

Woodrow Wilson School

Princeton University

Princeton, N.J. 08544  
ph (609) 258-4938  
fax (609) 258-5014

Professor Helen Haste  
Department of Psychology  
University of Bath  
Bath BA2 7AY  
England  
Phone: +44 1225 420230  
Fax: +44 1225 482046

Professor Deborah Larson  
University of California, Los Angeles  
Department of Political Science  
4289 Bunche Hall  
Box 951472  
Los Angeles, CA. 90095-1472  
Office phone:(310) 267-5411, (310) 825-4331.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2003 12:35:42 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: U.S. Officials Pull Questions From Surveys About Children  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

September 16, 2003  
U.S. Officials Pull Questions From Surveys About Children  
By DIANA JEAN SCHEMO  
<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/09/16/education/16SURV.html>

WASHINGTON, Sept. 15 - The board that oversees national achievement tests has moved to curtail sharply the background surveys of students, teachers and principals that accompany the examinations, alarming researchers and others who rely on the surveys as an important source of information.

The surveys have provided information on factors like television viewing habits and the performance of children in single-parent households. The questions are administered along with the National Assessment of Educational Progress, or N.A.E.P., commonly known as "the nation's report card."

But the board, which took control over the questionnaires under the No

Child Left Behind Act, said the surveys were becoming too intrusive and burdensome and had little to do with the primary mission of the examination, to give a snapshot of achievement, with information on demographic and other factors.

The board also said it feared the drawing of cause-and-effect conclusions from the results, which are intended to show just correlations.

The new policy was released on Friday in final form.

The chairman of the National Assessment Governing Board, Darvin M. Winick, said collecting information to offer a context for the test results - for example, the time spent on homework - was a "legitimate use." But Dr. Winick said researchers were relying on the surveys as an omnibus research project at taxpayer expense.

#### SNIP

A transcript of a meeting of the governing board from August 2002 on background questions shows lengthy discussion about asking teachers and principals about accountability in February 2003. When panel members turned to Peggy G. Carr, associate commissioner for assessments, she said she had "some good news and some bad news."

The good news was that the Education Department had withdrawn the questions. "The bad news," Dr. Carr said, was that the survey was conducted last year.

"That doesn't mean that we have to report on it," Dr. Carr added.

"It's just the beginning of what we know is going to happen in the future," Dr. Harold H. Wenglinsky, a professor at Bernard Baruch College in Manhattan, said. "They're not reporting the results of questions they've asked, and soon they're going to stop asking the questions."

#### SNIP

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>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
=====

Date: Tue, 16 Sep 2003 14:26:32 -0700

Reply-To: "P. Moy" <pmoy@U.WASHINGTON.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "P. Moy" <pmoy@U.WASHINGTON.EDU>  
Subject: University of Washington Conference on Political Communication  
Comments: To: crtnet@natcom.org, aapornet@asu.edu, wapornet@listserv.unc.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

## Call for Papers for Political Communication Conference

### "Voice and Citizenship: Re-thinking Theory and Practice in Political Communication"

As the field of political communication grows, its boundaries shift, its ideas are challenged, and its work advances. We reformulate longstanding political communication theories and generate new ones. In particular our understanding of communication, media, and politics are changing as we reexamine traditional concepts, such as voice, citizenship, and democracy.

The Department of Communication at the University of Washington invites political communication scholars and practitioners to discuss new theories and research at a three-day conference to be held April 22-24, 2004 in Seattle. We are particularly interested in proposals regarding the exercise of voice and citizenship, theories of contemporary political communication practices, or new methods for political communication research. The conference is likely to address the following topics:

- changing roles for political actors, media, and citizens in public discourse and deliberation
- globalization and the internationalization of political communication processes
- theories of public opinion formation and management
- the ideal role and actual impact of new media communication technologies
- the influence of social, economic, and cultural power differences on the practice of political communication

All proposals should include a paper title, abstract, mailing address, email address, and telephone number for each co-author or participant. Proposal abstracts should not exceed 1,000 words. Please send all submissions by mail or email to:

Professor David Domke  
Department of Communication  
University of Washington  
Box 353740  
Seattle, Washington 98195-3740 U.S.A.  
Email: domke@u.washington.edu

Submissions should be received by Monday, January 15, 2004. Final decisions about the conference program will be made by early February 2004. The Department of Communication will provide all first authors with accommodations for three nights.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
=====

Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2003 08:56:11 -0400  
Reply-To: Chris McCarty <[chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU](mailto:chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Chris McCarty <[chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU](mailto:chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU)>  
Subject: OMB response rate requirement  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Hi All,

=20

Does anyone know where I can find (hopefully online) the actual Office of Management and Budget document that states their response rate requirements? I have seen references to this from others, some quoting 65% and others 75%, but am having a lot of trouble locating the official language. It is supposedly part of the Paperwork Reduction Act, and while that document does talk about response rates, it has no specifics.

=20

I would very much appreciate any help with this.

=20

Regards,

=20

chris

=20

=20

Chris McCarty, Survey Director

University of Florida Survey Research Center

Bureau of Economic and Business Research

PO Box 117145

University of Florida

Gainesville, FL 32611-7145



Phone: (352) 392-2908 x101

FAX: (352) 392-4739

=20

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
=====

Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2003 09:31:45 -0400  
Reply-To: [rusciano@rider.edu](mailto:rusciano@rider.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Subject: NYTimes.com Article: A Chink in the Armor  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

This article from NYTimes.com  
has been sent to you by [rusciano@rider.edu](mailto:rusciano@rider.edu).

Andrew Kohut contributes an excellent article to the New York Times today.

[rusciano@rider.edu](mailto:rusciano@rider.edu)

/----- advertisement -----\  
/

Explore more of Starbucks at Starbucks.com.  
<http://www.starbucks.com/default.asp?ci=1015>  
\  
/

A Chink in the Armor

September 18, 2003  
By ANDREW KOHUT

WASHINGTON - Two years after 9/11 and one year before the presidential election, concern about terrorism continues to dominate American politics. For President Bush no less than his Democratic challengers, it is an unpredictable issue.

The president now faces at least two problems politically. The first is the effect of the war in Iraq on the fight against terrorism. The second is the declining importance of terrorism on the public agenda as the attacks recede and

the election approaches.

With Americans increasingly critical of the situation in Iraq, opinion is now shifting on how the war has affected the likelihood of another terrorist attack in the United States. In April, an ABC News survey found, 58 percent thought the war reduced the chances of an attack, while only 29 percent thought it made domestic terrorism more likely. Now those figures are 40 percent and 48 percent, respectively.

Obviously, events could change these perceptions, like the capture or killing of Saddam Hussein or a marked improvement in the situation in Iraq. What's more, the president - especially a Republican president - almost always enjoys the benefit of the doubt on national security issues.

As the public turns its attention to other issues, however, Mr. Bush's position weakens. According to a Newsweek poll this month, his approval ratings on domestic issues are dismal: 32 percent on the budget, 38 percent on health care, 41 percent on the economy, 42 percent on energy policy.

These issues are becoming more prominent as terrorism loses some relative standing on the public agenda. In a Gallup poll last month, just 12 percent cited terrorism as the country's foremost problem, compared with 48 percent who named an economic issue. Also in August, a Pew survey found that 57 percent of Americans said it was more important for Mr. Bush to focus on the economy than on terrorism.

Of course, the president still benefits from the transformation of his image that occurred after 9/11. Three-quarters of the public see him as a decisive and forceful leader, according to a recent Gallup poll, compared with only 55 percent before the attacks. And public worry about the threat of terrorism remains substantial: that August Pew survey found 75 percent of respondents saying the world is a more dangerous place than it was a decade ago, compared with 53 percent two years earlier.

Even if the economy does not improve, concern over terrorism will play a significant role in the campaign. On this issue, President Bush remains a formidable candidate, and the task for the Democrats will be to nominate a challenger whom voters see as a strong leader. If the Democrats do, and the war in Iraq continues to create controversy, then they might find that the debate over America's response to terrorism isn't so lopsided after all.

Andrew Kohut is director of the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/09/18/opinion/18KOHU.html?ex=1064891905&ei=1&en=7b791c2698cdac6a>

-----  
Get Home Delivery of The New York Times Newspaper. Imagine reading The New York Times any time & anywhere you like! Leisurely catch up on events & expand your horizons. Enjoy now for 50% off Home Delivery! Click here:

<http://www.nytimes.com/ads/nytcirc/index.html>

## HOW TO ADVERTISE

-----

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

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

Copyright 2003 The New York Times Company

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

=====

Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2003 11:05:56 -0400  
Reply-To: "Feld, Karl" <[kfeld@RTI.ORG](mailto:kfeld@RTI.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Feld, Karl" <[kfeld@RTI.ORG](mailto:kfeld@RTI.ORG)>  
Subject: I Want To Hire Someone....  
Comments: To: "[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)" <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

Hi everyone,

I have an opening coming up for a new hire. I thought I'd send this out to AAPORNet ask you to pass it on to anyone you know who might be interested. Resumes should go to Derek Schuchman at [dschuchman@rti.org](mailto:dschuchman@rti.org) and reference "CCS Job". Thanks!

Karl G. Feld, Manager

Call Center Services

Survey Research Division

RTI International

p: 919-248-4557

kfeld@rti.org

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Thu, 18 Sep 2003 12:02:24 -0400  
Reply-To: "Feld, Karl" <kfeld@RTI.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Feld, Karl" <kfeld@RTI.ORG>  
Subject: Re: I Want To Hire Someone....  
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

Looks like the job announcement didn't go through the listserv to some folks, so I have pasted it in here.

Thanks again.

Karl G. Feld, Manager  
Call Center Services  
Survey Research Division  
RTI International  
p: 919-248-4557  
kfeld@rti.org

Client Services Manager, Call Center Services  
RTI International  
[www.rti.org](http://www.rti.org)

**PURPOSE:**

Collaborate with a variety of internal RTI clientele (project managers, data collection task leaders, etc.) on the design, costing, proposal and implementation of CCS projects. Directly monitor all CCS projects to ensure project specifications and daily reporting requirements are fulfilled; assist in daily execution of survey projects by providing technical feedback, guidance and recommendations to call center supervisory staff and project management; and collaborate on the continual improvement of CCS internal and outward-facing quality control and informational reporting systems.

## WORK PERFORMED:

- \* Plan CCS projects in collaboration with project management teams and leaders
- \* Make recommendations regarding training programs, operational strategies, staff training, and software
- \* Provide cost estimates and discuss and approve costs relative to budget for CCS in relation to project-specific objectives
- \* Develop or assist project leaders in the development of work specifications, technical project manuals, and cost proposals
- \* Provide instruction and guidance to employees regarding project performance
- \* Review project performance and reporting to ensure quality and that goals are met
- \* Manage project workflow processes
- \* Participate in CCS departmental and across-project planning and operations
- \* Forecast short term CCS workloads, plan with available resources and communicate with project management appropriately
- \* Review project production rates and make recommendations or adjustments as needed
- \* Modify existing or develop new departmental policies and procedures
- \* Keep Department Manager abreast of unit activities on a regular basis
- \* Serve as liaison between RTI-CCS and project staff within RTI and RTI off-site offices. Receive requests from internal clients and respond
- \* Set up and monitor projects to ensure project specs. are adequately met; document troubleshoot, and recommend courses of action for problems
- \* Monitor cost and production reports. Keep internal and external clientle apprised of problems
- \* Develop project-specific data collection procedures and protocols and sample management strategies
- \* Evaluate staffing requirements for assigned projects and coordinate modifications in resource needs with clientle, Department Manager and Site Managers
- \* Actively develop own and others' professional and technical knowledge and skills to increase competency
- \* Increase RTI-CCS' internal and external recognition by assisting in preparation of papers t be presented at in-house seminars or professional meetings
- \* Complete other tasks as directed from time to time by the CCS Manager

## KNOWLEGDE, SKILLS and ABILITIES REQUIRED:

- \* Working knowledge and skill in using applicable software and ancillary system software to include dialer systems, computer-assisted telephone interviewing software, sample management, personnel scheduling software and telephony
- \* Working knowledge of the principles, processes, and methods of survey research especially telephone data collection, IVR and tracing practices
- \* Working knowledge of employment law and practices
- \* Skill in budget management, reporting systems, cost estimation, and evaluation of costs and product data

- \* Skill in time management, personal organization and setting priorities to meet project requirements
- \* Communication and interpersonal skills, primarily required to guide, moderate and exchange information
- \* Supervisory, team building and leadership skills
- \* Ability to adapt to rapid changes in workload, workflow, and project assignment specifications
- \* Ability to establish and maintain effective working relationships with supervisor, coworkers and other RTI staff under stressful conditions
- \* Proficiency with MS Office applications, especially Excel, and MS Outlook

#### SUPEVISORY CONTROLS:

This position is highly autonomous, but coordinates heavily across CCS and with internal clients. Works under general direction from Manager, CCS. Work performance is reviewed for effectiveness in meeting project goals and objectives and client satisfaction. Interaction is generally advisory and consultative in nature.

#### MINIMUM EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS

Bachelor's degree plus 5 years of experience in survey research and telephone data collections in positions of increasing management responsibility; or an equivalent combination of education, training and experience. Experience should include 2-3 years of telephone research production floor management and 2-3 years of external client service experience. Must understand accepted commercial research industry metrics for data collection quality and productivity.

#### PREFERED EXPERIENCE

Experience managing a commercial telephone research call center and handling federal government research projects. Knowledge of IVR operations. Experience with Blaise CATI and CASIS sample management systems.

Note: Entries listed under "Work Performed" and "Knowledge, Skills and Abilities Required" are essential functions of the position described.

This job description covers principal duties only and is not intended to include all the duties that may be assigned to the positions within this classification.

July 10, 2003

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

From: Feld, Karl

Sent: Thursday, September 18, 2003 11:06 AM

To: 'aapornet@asu.edu'

Subject: I Want To Hire Someone....

Hi everyone,

I have an opening coming up for a new hire. I thought I'd send this out to AAPORNet ask you to pass it on to anyone you know who might be interested. Resumes should go to Derek Schuchman at dschuchman@rti.org and reference "CCS Job". Thanks!

Karl G. Feld, Manager

Call Center Services

Survey Research Division

RTI Interntional

p: 919-248-4557

kfeld@rti.org

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Fri, 19 Sep 2003 13:42:57 -0400  
Reply-To: [JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM](mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <[JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM](mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Graphics  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I'm wondering if anyone has put together a handbook on news graphics to represent poll data? If so, would you be willing to share. I ask only because I have a client who continually has imaginative ideas of how poll data should be presented graphically. I keep saying, there are conventions and there is a reason why there are conventions. I'm reasonably persuasive, but I thought I might put together a handbook for future generations of graphics people I'm likely to encounter. Then it dawned on me that one or two of my peers might already have authored such a document.

To be more specific, my handbook would say things like: A pie chart starts at 12 o'clock and reads clockwise. Or, the "not sure" response is virtually never offered and so is not treated the same as an offered answer. Therefore, it is not rank-orded--it always goes at the end, whether in a list, a pie chart, or a bar graph. That kind of thing. JAS

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

visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Sat, 20 Sep 2003 17:51:23 -0400  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Subject: If you weight surveys, see this  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

I received the following from Mike McDonald. It may be of interest to those weighting surveys.

I thought you might like to know that last Thursday the Census Bureau released the 2000, 2001, and 2002 population estimates by sex-age-race (see: <[http://eire.census.gov/popest/estimates\\_dataset.php](http://eire.census.gov/popest/estimates_dataset.php)>[http://eire.census.gov/popest/estimates\\_dataset.php](http://eire.census.gov/popest/estimates_dataset.php)). Current age-sex-race estimates can be made through assumptions about aging, births, deaths, and migration numbers that are also available now. These are probably invaluable for survey researchers who would like to weight their polls,

Best,  
-Mike

---

Dr. Michael P. McDonald  
Assistant Professor  
Dept of Public and International Affairs  
George Mason University  
4400 University Drive - 3F4  
Fairfax, VA 22030-4444

Office: 703-993-4191  
Fax: 703-993-1399  
Efax: 561-431-3190  
[mmcdon@gmu.edu](mailto:mmcdon@gmu.edu)  
<http://elections.gmu.edu/>

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

212 496-2945  
212 496-0846 FAX

email: [mitofsky@mindspring.com](mailto: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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2003 13:40:05 -0400  
Reply-To: Cliff Zukin <[zukin@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU](mailto:zukin@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Cliff Zukin <[zukin@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU](mailto:zukin@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU)>  
Subject: cell phones  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I'm writing to start a discussion of a changing aspect of cell phone coverage. At present, cell phones are largely outside the sampling frame of RDD surveys. While this introduces non-coverage bias, particularly among the youngest age cohort, it has not thought to be severe, perhaps 2-3% or so if I remember discussions at last year's AAPOR conference correctly.

However, there is soon to be a regulatory change that will increase the challenge of finding and interviewing representative samples. By FCC rules, phone number policies will be changed by November 24 so that: a) companies will have to let cell phone owners will have the ability to keep their numbers when changing carriers, and b) cell phone owners will be able to transfer their numbers to land lines. This will muddy the waters about cell and land-line numbers having different exchanges, and may be something that needs to be accounted for in sampling frames.

I think many of us would welcome hearing from those in the industry who have been following developments and have new information to add.

Cliff Zukin

Professor of Public Policy

Director, Star-Ledger/Eagleton-Rutgers Poll

Rutgers University

[zukin@rci.rutgers.edu](mailto:zukin@rci.rutgers.edu) 732 932 9384 x247

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2003 13:35:53 -0500  
Reply-To: [slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu](mailto:slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Susan Carol Losh <[slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU](mailto:slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: cell phones  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain  
Content-transfer-encoding: binary  
Content-disposition: inline

Something I read recently noted that people could take their landline numbers and transfer those to a cell phone. If so, I don't know what the consequences are for RDD since it won't be possible to tell that a cell phone is being dialed.

Has anyone else also run across this one?

Susan

On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 13:40:05 -0400 Cliff Zukin wrote:

> I'm writing to start a discussion of a changing aspect of cell phone  
> coverage. At present, cell phones are largely outside the sampling  
> frame of  
> RDD surveys. While this introduces non-coverage bias, particularly among  
> the youngest age cohort, it has not thought to be severe, perhaps  
> 2-3% or so  
> if I remember discussions at last year's AAPOR conference correctly.  
>  
>  
>  
> However, there is soon to be a regulatory change that will increase the  
> challenge of finding and interviewing representative samples. By FCC  
> rules,  
> phone number policies will be changed by November 24 so that: a) companies  
> will have to let cell phone owners will have the ability to keep their  
> numbers when changing carriers, and b) cell phone owners will be able to  
> transfer their numbers to land lines. This will muddy the waters  
> about cell  
> and land-line numbers having different exchanges, and may be  
> something that  
> needs to be accounted for in sampling frames.  
>  
>  
>  
> I think many of us would welcome hearing from those in the industry  
> who have

> been following developments and have new information to add.  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> Cliff Zukin  
>  
> Professor of Public Policy  
>  
> Director, Star-Ledger/Eagleton-Rutgers Poll  
>  
> Rutgers University  
>  
> zukin@rci.rutgers.edu 732 932 9384 x247  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet

Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.  
American Statistical Association/NSF-SRS Research Fellow 2003-2004  
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>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2003 14:42:53 -0400  
Reply-To: Paul Braun <[pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM](mailto:pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Paul Braun <[pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM](mailto:pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Re: cell phones  
Comments: To: Cliff Zukin <[zukin@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU](mailto:zukin@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[002f01c38130\\$8f5f59f0\\$6401a8c0@ZUKINHOME](mailto:002f01c38130$8f5f59f0$6401a8c0@ZUKINHOME)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Cliff,

I spoke with Donna Gillen of CMOR on this a few months ago. CMOR.org has a link updating everyone on the new TCPA rules.

As I understand it, the restrictions on calling cell phones is limited to "automatic calling devices". I'm not sure whether this means predictive dialers, and/or CATI systems where the interviewer does not actually dial the number. The way it is written now, we might all have to go back to paper and pencil in order to not violate the rules. I don't know what else if anything is being done.

This is from CMOR:

Background on the TCPA:

In 1991, Congress enacted the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA). Under the law, Congress directed and authorized the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to promulgate Rules to implement the law; which it did in 1992.

As CMOR has previously reported, since late last year, the FCC has been reviewing TCPA Rules to determine if changes should be made to address issues that have emerged and grown in scope since the 1992 promulgation of its Rules. CMOR was involved in the review process, including the submission of formal comments and meetings with FCC Commissioners and staff regarding the impact of the Rules on survey research calls (For details see [http://cmor.org/industry\\_related.htm#submits](http://cmor.org/industry_related.htm#submits)).

As anticipated by CMOR after our latest round of FCC meetings, the FCC has left the restrictions on "automatic telephone dialing device" calls to cellular calls unchanged. However, as CMOR also noted, there are several ways survey industry members can comply with the cell phone restrictions. On a favorable note, the new national do-not-call registry provisions apply to sales-related calls only as does the a new provision to combat the issue of "dead air". Visit the CMOR website at [www.cmor.org](http://www.cmor.org) for our FAQ regarding the TCPA Rules and changes (password respect), which includes FCC rationale/statements concerning changes made (and not made). For additional details about the current TCPA Rules, please see the full July 2003 FCC Report and Order at [http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs\\_public/attachmatch/FCC-03-153A1.pdf](http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-03-153A1.pdf)

I hope this helps. If anyone else has new information, I would be obliged.

Regards to all,

Paul Braun

Braun Research  
Princeton NJ

=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Cliff Zukin

Sent: Monday, September 22, 2003 1:40 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: cell phones

I'm writing to start a discussion of a changing aspect of cell phone coverage. At present, cell phones are largely outside the sampling frame of RDD surveys. While this introduces non-coverage bias, particularly among the youngest age cohort, it has not thought to be severe, perhaps 2-3% or so if I remember discussions at last year's AAPOR conference correctly.

However, there is soon to be a regulatory change that will increase the challenge of finding and interviewing representative samples. By FCC rules, phone number policies will be changed by November 24 so that: a) companies will have to let cell phone owners will have the ability to keep their numbers when changing carriers, and b) cell phone owners will be able to transfer their numbers to land lines. This will muddy the waters about cell and land-line numbers having different exchanges, and may be something that needs to be accounted for in sampling frames.

I think many of us would welcome hearing from those in the industry who have been following developments and have new information to add.

Cliff Zukin

Professor of Public Policy

Director, Star-Ledger/Eagleton-Rutgers Poll

Rutgers University

zukin@rci.rutgers.edu 732 932 9384 x247

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text: signoff  
aapornet

-----

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2003 12:07:50 -0700  
Reply-To: Paolo Gardinali <[paolo@SURVEY.UCSB.EDU](mailto:paolo@SURVEY.UCSB.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Paolo Gardinali <[paolo@SURVEY.UCSB.EDU](mailto:paolo@SURVEY.UCSB.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: cell phones  
Comments: To: Susan Carol Losh <[slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU](mailto:slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[200309221835.h8MIZr612232@fire3.fsu.edu](mailto:200309221835.h8MIZr612232@fire3.fsu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Mon, 22 Sep 2003, Susan Carol Losh wrote:

> Something I read recently noted that people could take their landline  
> numbers and transfer those to a cell phone. If so, I don't know what the  
> consequences are for RDD since it won't be possible to tell that a cell  
> phone is being dialed.  
>  
> Has anyone else also run across this one?

Sure, Wired News had an article on it yesterday:

<http://www.wired.com/news/wireless/0,1382,60519,00.html>

Cheers,

--

Paolo A. Gardinali  
Associate Director  
UCSB Social Science Survey Center  
<http://www.survey.ucsb.edu>

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2003 15:54:31 -0400  
Reply-To: Charlotte Steeh <[dpocgs@LANGATE.GSU.EDU](mailto:dpocgs@LANGATE.GSU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Charlotte Steeh <[dpocgs@LANGATE.GSU.EDU](mailto:dpocgs@LANGATE.GSU.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: cell phones  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu), [zukin@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU](mailto:zukin@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-disposition: inline

For the last six to eight months I have been trying to alert survey =

researchers to this problem. Since I am completing a survey that uses a cellular number frame, I can see several consequences of the FCC portability rule change.

1. We will no longer be able to distinguish cellular numbers from landline numbers. I expect that at first this will not cause a big problem, but after November 24 it would be wise for most RDD surveys to include a preliminary question: "Have I reached a cellular telephone?" along with "Have I reached a household?" It would be up to each researcher to decide whether or not to continue the interview when the sample unit happens to be a cellular number. As more and more people take advantage of portability and increasing numbers of cellular telephones find their way into RDD samples, we will want to continue the cellular interviews and try to determine what differences exist between respondents contacted over a cellular telephone and respondents contacted through a landline. Ultimately we are going to have to develop procedures for combining a household sample (landline telephones) with an individual sample (cellular telephones). =20

2. One means of determining the status of a number will be eliminated. In my current work, we are using the information about provider obtained from the Telcordia file to determine whether a number is working or not. Although this has been a frustrating endeavor, it is beginning to pay off as providers make their websites and customer service representatives more knowledgeable and user friendly. After November 24 this source of information will be less reliable and become increasingly less reliable over time. Although our hit rate for working residential numbers has been approximately 45%, we suspect the actual rate is lower because such a large percentage of numbers fall in the indeterminate category--much larger than in a regular RDD survey.

3. Expect a gradual worsening of response rates. Refusals on cellular telephones are immediate and hostile. It also appears that refusal conversions are not as effective as in a pure RDD survey. The difficulty of identifying and eliminating nonworking numbers will also lead to lower response rates.

Until we have directories of cellular numbers that are fairly complete, we are going to have a difficult time after November 24 conducting telephone surveys of the general population.

Charlotte Steeh

>>> Cliff Zukin <zukin@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU> 09/22/03 01:40PM >>>  
I'm writing to start a discussion of a changing aspect of cell phone coverage. At present, cell phones are largely outside the sampling frame of RDD surveys. While this introduces non-coverage bias, particularly among the youngest age cohort, it has not thought to be severe, perhaps 2-3% or so if I remember discussions at last year's AAPOR conference correctly.

However, there is soon to be a regulatory change that will increase the

challenge of finding and interviewing representative samples. By FCC =  
rules,  
phone number policies will be changed by November 24 so that: a) companies  
will have to let cell phone owners will have the ability to keep their  
numbers when changing carriers, and b) cell phone owners will be able to  
transfer their numbers to land lines. This will muddy the waters about =  
cell  
and land-line numbers having different exchanges, and may be something =  
that  
needs to be accounted for in sampling frames.

I think many of us would welcome hearing from those in the industry who =  
have  
been following developments and have new information to add.

Cliff Zukin

Professor of Public Policy

Director, Star-Ledger/Eagleton-Rutgers Poll

Rutgers University

zukin@rci.rutgers.edu 732 932 9384 x247

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>=20  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2003 16:29:30 -0400  
Reply-To: Chris McCarty <[chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU](mailto:chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Chris McCarty <[chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU](mailto:chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU)>  
Subject: OMB Guidelines  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable



After a fairly extensive internet search, several unanswered calls to OMB and a lot of help and suggestions from members of the list, I have concluded that the OMB does not actually have a specific response rate level requirement. The closest thing to it are the guidelines for form 83 which say:

=20

"Describe methods to maximize response rates and to deal with issues of non-response. The accuracy and reliability of information collected must be shown to be adequate for intended uses. For collections based on sampling, a special justification must be provided for any collection that will not yield "reliable" data that can be generalized to the universe studied."

=20

This is of course very different from the 80% guideline that I have heard before. By the way, I have also seen references to 65% and 75%. I don't know where these numbers originated, but there appears to be no basis for them.

=20

Regards,

=20

Chris

=20

Chris McCarty, Survey Director

University of Florida Survey Research Center

Bureau of Economic and Business Research

PO Box 117145

University of Florida

Gainesville, FL 32611-7145

Phone: (352) 392-2908 x101

FAX: (352) 392-4739

=20

---

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

signoff aapornet

---

Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2003 15:33:13 -0500  
Reply-To: "Thomas F. Klobucar" <tklobucar@VERNONRESEARCH.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Thomas F. Klobucar" <tklobucar@VERNONRESEARCH.COM>  
Organization: Vernon Research Group  
Subject: Re: cell phones  
Comments: To: Charlotte Steeh <dpocgs@LANGATE.GSU.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <sf6f1b3b.071@langate.gsu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I have an executive contact in the industry, working on this very =  
issue,  
with whom I just spoke--she estimates that local landline portability =  
will  
be ready to go in November, as required, but that wireless to landline  
portability is more than one year away, government requirements  
notwithstanding. Further, moving such numbers will be very expensive =  
for  
the consumer, costing in the hundreds of dollars. Naturally, we need to  
anticipate these changes, but it remains to be seen if these carriers =  
can  
deliver on wireless to landline portability, despite their public  
pronouncements.

=20

Thomas F. Klobucar, Ph. D.

Director of Research

Vernon Research Group

1962 First Avenue NE

Cedar Rapids, IA 52402

Tel: (319) 364 7278 x109

Fax: (319) 364 7307=20

=20

=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Charlotte Steeh

Sent: Monday, September 22, 2003 14:55

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: cell phones

=20

For the last six to eight months I have been trying to alert survey researchers to this problem. Since I am completing a survey that uses a cellular number frame, I can see several consequences of the FCC = portability rule change.

=20

1. We will no longer be able to distinguish cellular numbers = from landline numbers. I expect that at first this will not cause a big = problem, but after November 24 it would be wise for most RDD surveys to include a preliminary question: "Have I reached a cellular telephone?" along with "Have I reached a household?" It would be up to each researcher to = decide whether or not to continue the interview when the sample unit happens to = be a cellular number. As more and more people take advantage of = portability and increasing numbers of cellular telephones find their way into RDD samples, we will want to continue the cellular interviews and try to determine what differences exist between respondents contacted over a cellular telephone and respondents contacted through a landline. = Ultimately we are going to have to develop procedures for combining a household = sample (landline telephones) with an individual sample (cellular telephones). =20

2. One means of determining the status of a number will be eliminated. In my current work, we are using the information about = provider obtained from the Telcordia file to determine whether a number is = working or not. Although this has been a frustrating endeavor, it is beginning to = pay off as providers make their websites and customer service = representatives more knowledgeable and user friendly. After November 24 this source of information will be less reliable and become increasing less reliable = over time. Although our hit rate for working residential numbers has been approximately 45%, we suspect the actual rate is lower because such a = large percentage of numbers fall in the indeterminate category--much larger = than in a regular RDD survey.

3. Expect a gradual worsening of response rates. Refusals on = cellular telephones are immediate and hostile. It also appears that refusal conversions are not as effective as in a pure RDD survey. The =

difficulty of identifying and eliminating nonworking numbers will also lead to lower response rates.

=20

Until we have directories of cellular numbers that are fairly complete, we are going to have a difficult time after November 24 conducting telephone surveys of the general population.

=20

Charlotte Steeh

=20

=20

>>> Cliff Zukin <zukin@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU> 09/22/03 01:40PM >>>

I'm writing to start a discussion of a changing aspect of cell phone

coverage. At present, cell phones are largely outside the sampling frame of

RDD surveys. While this introduces non-coverage bias, particularly among

the youngest age cohort, it has not thought to be severe, perhaps 2-3% or so

if I remember discussions at last year's AAPOR conference correctly.

=20

=20

=20

However, there is soon to be a regulatory change that will increase the

challenge of finding and interviewing representative samples. By FCC rules,

phone number policies will be changed by November 24 so that: a) companies

will have to let cell phone owners will have the ability to keep their

numbers when changing carriers, and b) cell phone owners will be able to

transfer their numbers to land lines. This will muddy the waters about =

cell

and land-line numbers having different exchanges, and may be something =  
that

needs to be accounted for in sampling frames.

=20

=20

=20

I think many of us would welcome hearing from those in the industry who =  
have

been following developments and have new information to add.

=20

=20

=20

=20

=20

Cliff Zukin

=20

Professor of Public Policy

=20

Director, Star-Ledger/Eagleton-Rutgers Poll

=20

Rutgers University

=20

zukin@rci.rutgers.edu 732 932 9384 x247

=20

=20

=20

=20

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>=20

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

signoff aapornet

=20  
-----

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

signoff aapornet  
-----

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

signoff aapornet  
=====

Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2003 18:05:48 -0400

Reply-To: Jane Sheppard <[jsheppard@CMOR.ORG](mailto:jsheppard@CMOR.ORG)>

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

From: Jane Sheppard <[jsheppard@CMOR.ORG](mailto:jsheppard@CMOR.ORG)>

Subject: Re: cell phones

Comments: To: "Thomas F. Klobucar" <[tklobucar@VERNONRESEARCH.COM](mailto:tklobucar@VERNONRESEARCH.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Additional Information From CMOR (questions - contact CMOR's Director of Government Affairs, Donna Gillin, at [dgillin@cmor.org](mailto:dgillin@cmor.org))

As Paul noted, in July of 2003, the FCC made public their official changes to the TCPA Rules. Although there are no language changes to the cell phone provisions, the FCC did note some clarifications to the Rules (see below). The TCPA Rules prohibit ANY call (including those for survey research purposes):

- made using an "automatic telephone dialing system"
- to cellular phones
- without the express consent of the called party
- where the called party is charged for the call

The TCPA Rules define "automatic telephone dialing system" as equipment that has the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be called using a random or sequential number generator and to dial such numbers. Although the FCC did not make any language or definition changes to "automatic telephone dialing system", they have now interpreted "automatic telephone dialing system" as including predictive dialers. In its July 2003 Report and Order,

the FCC acknowledged that "Most industry members that commented on the issue of autodialed calls argue that predictive dialers do not fall within the statutory definition of "automatic telephone dialing system," primarily because, they contend, predictive dialers do not dial numbers "randomly or sequentially." However, the FCC found that "a predictive dialer falls within the meaning and statutory definition of "automatic telephone dialing equipment" and the intent of Congress.

In addition, the FCC has further noted that its cell phone provisions encompass both voice calls and text calls to wireless numbers.

Many industry members are therefore curious if there are any exemptions in the "automatic telephone dialing device" cell restrictions and/or ways to comply with the Rules. The TCPA Rules allow for such calls to cellular calls, in cases of emergency or where there is express consent of the called party. In regard to what constitutes "express consent" - in its 1992 Report, the FCC acknowledged that "persons who knowingly release their phone numbers have in effect given their invitation or permission to be called at the number which they have given, absent instructions to the contrary... Hence, [callers] will not violate our rules by calling a number which was provided as one at which the called party wishes to be reached. However, if a caller's number is "captured" by a Caller ID or an ANI device without notice to the residential telephone subscriber, the caller cannot be considered to have given an invitation or permission to receive autodialer or prerecorded voice message calls."

In addition, as CMOR has previously noted, there are several ways industry members can comply with the cell phone restrictions:

- Place calls manually by telephone interviewers (instead of using any automatic telephone dialing system)
- Calls placed to cell phone users where the called party is not charged with the call
- Calls made with the express consent of the called party
- Removal of cell phone numbers from the sample (please note that in the July 2003 report, the FCC stated that methods exist to identify wireless numbers. In the 2003 Report and Order, they noted that, "information is available from a variety of sources to assist ... in determining which numbers are assigned to wireless carriers. For example, NeuStar as the North American Numbering Plan Administrator, the National Pooling Administrator, and the LNP Administrator makes information available that can assist ... in identifying numbers assigned to wireless carriers. Also, other commercial enterprises such as Telcordia, the owner-operator of the Local Exchange Routing Guide (LERG) maintain information that can assist ... in identifying numbers assigned to wireless carriers." In addition, in the July 2003 Report and Order, the FCC noted "that there are various solutions that will enable ... [identification of] wireless numbers in a pooling and number portability environment. We [the FCC] decline to mandate a specific solution, but rather rely on the [callers] to select solutions that best fit [their] needs." See FCC full report for further details -

[http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs\\_public/attachmatch/FCC-03-153A1.pdf](http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-03-153A1.pdf))

Jane Sheppard Miller  
Director Respondent Cooperation  
CMOR...Promoting & Advocating Survey Research  
2899 MacDuff Dr. N.W.  
North Canton, OH 44720  
Phone: 330-244-8616  
Fax: 330-244-8626  
Email: [jsheppard@cmor.org](mailto:jsheppard@cmor.org)  
Website: [www.cmor.org](http://www.cmor.org)

Available Soon! 2003 Respondent Cooperation & Industry Image Study Report  
Mark Your Calendar! Respondent Cooperation Workshop - March 2-3, 2004,  
Las Vegas Flamingo Hotel

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

From: "Thomas F. Klobucar" <[tklobucar@VERNONRESEARCH.COM](mailto:tklobucar@VERNONRESEARCH.COM)>  
To: <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2003 4:33 PM  
Subject: Re: cell phones

> I have an executive contact in the industry, working on this very issue,  
> with whom I just spoke--she estimates that local landline portability will  
> be ready to go in November, as required, but that wireless to landline  
> portability is more than one year away, government requirements  
> notwithstanding. Further, moving such numbers will be very expensive for  
> the consumer, costing in the hundreds of dollars. Naturally, we need to  
> anticipate these changes, but it remains to be seen if these carriers can  
> deliver on wireless to landline portability, despite their public  
> pronouncements.

>  
>  
>

> Thomas F. Klobucar, Ph. D.

>

> Director of Research

>

> Vernon Research Group

>

> 1962 First Avenue NE

>

> Cedar Rapids, IA 52402

>

> Tel: (319) 364 7278 x109

>

> Fax: (319) 364 7307

>

>

>

>

>

>

>



>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Charlotte Steeh  
> Sent: Monday, September 22, 2003 14:55  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: cell phones

>  
>  
>  
> For the last six to eight months I have been trying to alert survey  
> researchers to this problem. Since I am completing a survey that uses a  
> cellular number frame, I can see several consequences of the FCC  
portability  
> rule change.

>  
>  
>  
> 1. We will no longer be able to distinguish cellular numbers from  
> landline numbers. I expect that at first this will not cause a big  
problem,  
> but after November 24 it would be wise for most RDD surveys to include a  
> preliminary question: "Have I reached a cellular telephone?" along with  
> "Have I reached a household?" It would be up to each researcher to decide  
> whether or not to continue the interview when the sample unit happens to  
be  
> a cellular number. As more and more people take advantage of portability  
> and increasing numbers of cellular telephones find their way into RDD  
> samples, we will want to continue the cellular interviews and try to  
> determine what differences exist between respondents contacted over a  
> cellular telephone and respondents contacted through a landline.

Ultimately  
> we are going to have to develop procedures for combining a household  
sample  
> (landline telephones) with an individual sample (cellular telephones).

>  
> 2. One means of determining the status of a number will be  
> eliminated. In my current work, we are using the information about  
provider  
> obtained from the Telcordia file to determine whether a number is working  
or  
> not. Although this has been a frustrating endeavor, it is beginning to  
pay  
> off as providers make their websites and customer service representatives  
> more knowledgeable and user friendly. After November 24 this source of  
> information will be less reliable and become increasing less reliable over  
> time. Although our hit rate for working residential numbers has been  
> approximately 45%, we suspect the actual rate is lower because such a  
large  
> percentage of numbers fall in the indeterminate category--much larger than  
> in a regular RDD survey.

>  
> 3. Expect a gradual worsening of response rates. Refusals on  
cellular  
> telephones are immediate and hostile. It also appears that refusal

> conversions are not as effective as in a pure RDD survey. The difficulty of  
> identifying and eliminating nonworking numbers will also lead to lower  
> response rates.  
>  
>  
>  
> Until we have directories of cellular numbers that are fairly complete, we  
> are going to have a difficult time after November 24 conducting telephone  
> surveys of the general population.

> Charlotte Steeh

> >>> Cliff Zukin <zukin@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU> 09/22/03 01:40PM >>>

> I'm writing to start a discussion of a changing aspect of cell phone  
> coverage. At present, cell phones are largely outside the sampling frame  
> of  
> RDD surveys. While this introduces non-coverage bias, particularly among  
> the youngest age cohort, it has not thought to be severe, perhaps 2-3% or  
> so  
> if I remember discussions at last year's AAPOR conference correctly.

> However, there is soon to be a regulatory change that will increase the  
> challenge of finding and interviewing representative samples. By FCC  
> rules,  
> phone number policies will be changed by November 24 so that: a) companies  
> will have to let cell phone owners will have the ability to keep their  
> numbers when changing carriers, and b) cell phone owners will be able to  
> transfer their numbers to land lines. This will muddy the waters about  
> cell  
> and land-line numbers having different exchanges, and may be something



>  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>  
> signoff aapornet  
>  
>  
>  
> -----  
>  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>  
> signoff aapornet  
>  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
=====

Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2003 18:25:53 -0400  
Reply-To: Charlotte Steeh <[dpocgs@LANGATE.GSU.EDU](mailto:dpocgs@LANGATE.GSU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Charlotte Steeh <[dpocgs@LANGATE.GSU.EDU](mailto:dpocgs@LANGATE.GSU.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: cell phones  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu), [tklobucar@VERNONRESEARCH.COM](mailto:tklobucar@VERNONRESEARCH.COM)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-disposition: inline

For another point of view see:  
'Get Ready for a Wireless War: Carriers will likely spend heavily to keep =  
customers once number portability kicks in this November.'  
<http://money.cnn.com/2003/09/04/technology/techinvestor/lamonica/index.htm?cnn=3Dyes>

Charlotte

>>> "Thomas F. Klobucar" <[tklobucar@VERNONRESEARCH.COM](mailto:tklobucar@VERNONRESEARCH.COM)> 09/22/03 04:33PM =  
>>>

I have an executive contact in the industry, working on this very issue,  
with whom I just spoke--she estimates that local landline portability will  
be ready to go in November, as required, but that wireless to landline  
portability is more than one year away, government requirements  
notwithstanding. Further, moving such numbers will be very expensive for  
the consumer, costing in the hundreds of dollars. Naturally, we need to  
anticipate these changes, but it remains to be seen if these carriers can

deliver on wireless to landline portability, despite their public pronouncements.

=20

Thomas F. Klobucar, Ph. D.

Director of Research

Vernon Research Group

1962 First Avenue NE

Cedar Rapids, IA 52402

Tel: (319) 364 7278 x109

Fax: (319) 364 7307=20

=20

=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Charlotte Steeh

Sent: Monday, September 22, 2003 14:55

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu=20

Subject: Re: cell phones

=20

For the last six to eight months I have been trying to alert survey researchers to this problem. Since I am completing a survey that uses a cellular number frame, I can see several consequences of the FCC portability rule change.

=20

1. We will no longer be able to distinguish cellular numbers from landline numbers. I expect that at first this will not cause a big problem, but after November 24 it would be wise for most RDD surveys to include a preliminary question: "Have I reached a cellular telephone?" along with "Have I reached a household?" It would be up to each researcher to decide whether or not to continue the interview when the sample unit happens to be a cellular number. As more and more people take advantage of portability and increasing numbers of cellular telephones find their way into RDD samples, we will want to continue the cellular interviews and try to determine what differences exist between respondents contacted over a cellular telephone and respondents contacted through a landline. =  
Ultimately  
we are going to have to develop procedures for combining a household =

sample  
(landline telephones) with an individual sample (cellular telephones). =20

2. One means of determining the status of a number will be eliminated. In my current work, we are using the information about = provider obtained from the Telcordia file to determine whether a number is working = or not. Although this has been a frustrating endeavor, it is beginning to = pay off as providers make their websites and customer service representatives more knowledgeable and user friendly. After November 24 this source of information will be less reliable and become increasing less reliable over time. Although our hit rate for working residential numbers has been approximately 45%, we suspect the actual rate is lower because such a = large percentage of numbers fall in the indeterminate category--much larger than in a regular RDD survey.

3. Expect a gradual worsening of response rates. Refusals on = cellular telephones are immediate and hostile. It also appears that refusal conversions are not as effective as in a pure RDD survey. The difficulty = of identifying and eliminating nonworking numbers will also lead to lower response rates.

=20

Until we have directories of cellular numbers that are fairly complete, we are going to have a difficult time after November 24 conducting telephone surveys of the general population.

=20

Charlotte Steeh

=20

=20

>>> Cliff Zukin <zukin@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU> 09/22/03 01:40PM >>>

I'm writing to start a discussion of a changing aspect of cell phone

coverage. At present, cell phones are largely outside the sampling frame = of

RDD surveys. While this introduces non-coverage bias, particularly among

the youngest age cohort, it has not thought to be severe, perhaps 2-3% or = so

if I remember discussions at last year's AAPOR conference correctly.

=20

=20

=20

However, there is soon to be a regulatory change that will increase the challenge of finding and interviewing representative samples. By FCC rules, phone number policies will be changed by November 24 so that: a) companies will have to let cell phone owners will have the ability to keep their numbers when changing carriers, and b) cell phone owners will be able to transfer their numbers to land lines. This will muddy the waters about cell and land-line numbers having different exchanges, and may be something that needs to be accounted for in sampling frames.

=20

=20

=20

I think many of us would welcome hearing from those in the industry who have been following developments and have new information to add.

=20

=20

=20

=20

=20

Cliff Zukin

=20

Professor of Public Policy

=20

Director, Star-Ledger/Eagleton-Rutgers Poll

=20

Rutgers University

=20

zukin@rci.rutgers.edu 732 932 9384 x247

=20

=20

=20

=20

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>=20

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

signoff aapornet

=20

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>=20

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

signoff aapornet

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>=20

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

signoff aapornet

---

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

signoff aapornet

---

Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2003 21:30:12 -0400

Reply-To: [GRANTJURY@AOL.COM](mailto:GRANTJURY@AOL.COM)

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

From: Bernadette Grant <[GRANTJURY@AOL.COM](mailto:GRANTJURY@AOL.COM)>

Subject: Re: cell phones

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)



MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Has anyone considered the problem that when people are called on their cell phone that there is usually a cost for that call for the owner of the cell phone? I do not know if that includes long distance and or roaming charges. That ought to reduce the number of people willing to respond to a survey.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Mon, 22 Sep 2003 22:59:00 -0400  
Reply-To: dick halpern <[dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET](mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: dick halpern <[dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET](mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)>  
Subject: Re: cell phones  
Comments: To: [GRANTJURY@AOL.COM](mailto:GRANTJURY@AOL.COM)  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[111.284f1974.2ca0fc24@aol.com](mailto:111.284f1974.2ca0fc24@aol.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

When you answer your cell phone you pay for the call by the minute. No long distance charges or roaming. But considering the cost -- unless people have extensive calling plans -- most would freak out if a pollster called asking questions. That's why most of us keep our cell phone numbers closely guarded!

At 09:30 PM 9/22/2003 -0400, you wrote:

>Has anyone considered the problem that when people are called on their cell  
>phone that there is usually a cost for that call for the owner of the cell  
>phone? I do not know if that includes long distance and or roaming  
>charges. That  
>ought to reduce the number of people willing to respond to a survey.

>  
>  
>  
>  
>-----

>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>signoff aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
=====

Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 07:56:15 -0400  
Reply-To: "Lavrakas, Paul" <Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>  
Subject: Re: OMB Guidelines  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Let's give OBM the benefit of the doubt and credit them with the wisdom of recognizing that it's not response rates that primarily matter but whether or not there's likely to be any nonresponse bias...

I don't know that they in fact recognize this, but maybe they do...

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

From: Chris McCarty [mailto:chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU]  
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2003 4:30 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: OMB Guidelines

After a fairly extensive internet search, several unanswered calls to OMB and a lot of help and suggestions from members of the list, I have concluded that the OMB does not actually have a specific response rate level requirement. The closest thing to it are the guidelines for form 83 which say:

"Describe methods to maximize response rates and to deal with issues of non-response. The accuracy and reliability of information collected must be shown to be adequate for intended uses. For collections based on sampling, a special justification must be provided for any collection that will not yield "reliable" data that can be generalized to the universe studied."

This is of course very different from the 80% guideline that I have heard before. By the way, I have also seen references to 65% and 75%. I don't know where these numbers originated, but there appears to be no basis for them.

Regards,

Chris

Chris McCarty, Survey Director

University of Florida Survey Research Center

Bureau of Economic and Business Research

PO Box 117145

University of Florida

Gainesville, FL 32611-7145

Phone: (352) 392-2908 x101

FAX: (352) 392-4739

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

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

Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 09:33:36 -0400  
Reply-To: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@casro.org](mailto:dbowers@casro.org)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@CASRO.ORG](mailto:dbowers@CASRO.ORG)>  
Organization: CASRO  
Subject: Telephone Research  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

To add to the discussion on telephone research vs. telemarketing, I have =  
included a two recent emails CASRO sent its members regarding the legal =  
use of fax numbers, and updates on DNC and cell phone use. Diane =  
Bowers, CASRO

Implications of FCC Fax Regulations on Research  
Revisiting the Implied Exemption=20

--On July 3, 2003, the FCC adopted an amendment to its fax rules =  
promulgated under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, pursuant to =  
which all fax advertisers would have been required to obtain written =  
permission to send commercial faxes effective August 25, 2003. =  
Previously, the FCC had banned unsolicited commercial faxes, but allowed =  
such faxes to be sent to customers with whom the sender had an existing =  
business relationship. In new rules published last month, the FCC =

eliminated the existing business relationship exemption, thereby =  
requiring signed recipient consent prior to sending unsolicited =  
commercial faxes.=20

On August 18, however, based on numerous comments and motions from =  
various business and industry groups, including the American Society of =  
Association Executives (the "ASAE"), of which CASRO's President, Diane =  
Bowers, is a member, the FCC issued a stay of the new rules until =  
January 1, 2005.=20

Notwithstanding the FCC's delay in implementing the new rules, CASRO =  
believes that a number of critical issues exist with respect to the =  
operation of the current rules in connection with certain activities of =  
research organizations. CASRO further believes that the criticality of =  
these issues will increase when the new rules do become effective.=20

The FCC's regulations under the TCPA have always prohibited =  
"unsolicited facsimile advertisements," which are defined as "any =  
material advertising the commercial availability or quality of any =  
property, goods or services which is transmitted to any person without =  
that person's prior express invitation or permission." Up to now, the =  
FCC has permitted fax advertisers to assume that a recipient had granted =  
their express permission if the sender had an "established business =  
relationship" ("EBR") with the recipient.=20

The FCC's new amendments will, when effective, remove the EBR exemption, =  
thereby requiring anyone wishing to send a facsimile advertisement to =  
first obtain the express, written; signed permission of all individual =  
and business recipients. Accordingly, the rules will require =  
organizations such as trade and industry associations faxing their =  
members, businesses faxing their customers and universities faxing their =  
alumni, to obtain prior, signed opt-ins from all fax recipients. Many =  
of these organizations (including CASRO and the ASAE) are seeking =  
further interpretation of this change from the FCC.=20

With respect to fax contact by CASRO members to respondents, we have =  
historically asserted that the definition and use of the word =  
"commercial" in the FCC's language provides researchers with implicit =  
exemption from rules promulgated under the TCPA. We continue to believe =  
that pure research activities, e.g., transmitting questionnaires and =  
other contact with respondents that do not reference incentives, are not =  
within the purview of any of the rules established under the TCPA, =  
including the FCC's fax rules.=20

We are, however, re-examining whether the research industry should =  
continue to rely on this implicit exemption for fax-based activities =  
that are related to, but nonetheless, are not, pure research. While the =  
FCC's amendment to its fax rules does not change the definition of what =  
constitutes a commercial "advertisement", it may, when effective, =  
create more situations in which the issue of prior consent can arise and =  
in any event may signal more aggressive interpretation and enforcement =  
of the rule by the FCC.=20

One activity in which many research organizations engage that could be =

interpreted as an "advertisement" under the FCC's existing fax rules = would be panel recruitment, in which the research organization sends = unsolicited faxes offering money and/or other incentives as an = inducement to the recipient join one or more a research panels. For = example, in many professional panels, incentives may well be a central = aspect of the solicitation. CASRO is concerned that the FCC might deem = such incentive-based solicitation as falling outside of the implied = exemption for survey research and instead determine that the research = organization maintaining the panel is "advising the recipients of the = availability of property," (i.e., money or points redeemable for = prizes.) If the FCC were to take this position, then research = organizations would be prohibited from faxing incentive-based panel = recruitment solicitations unless, from now until December 31, 2004 they = had an EBR with each recipient and, after January 1, 2005, they obtained = the prior, signed consent of each recipient.=20

CASRO recognizes that this issue does not arise as a direct result of = the amendments to the FCC's rules. We are, however, concerned that = research organizations that fax incentive-based survey solicitations and = panel recruitment material may be at risk if they rely solely on the = implied exemption for survey research.=20

We are seeking further clarification from the FCC with respect to the = applicability of the implied exemption to incentive based solicitations = related to (but not constituting) actual research. At the present time, = researchers may wish to consider not including in fax requests any = incentive-based solicitation to join or remain in research panels. If, = however, you use a fax merely to update panel information, then such a = fax would not appear to be an advertisement or a commercial exchange.

The Federal Government: The Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA)

The Telemarketing Sales Rule (TSR)

=20

Intent of the Laws

Both the TCPA and the TSR are intended to regulate the calling of = consumers by telemarketers: those who are making unsolicited commercial = or sales-related calls. These laws were passed by legislators, the FCC, = and the FTC in response to abuses of the public's privacy and because of = misleading and fraudulent telemarketing cases.

=20

TCPA Provisions

The TCPA requires telemarketers to offer consumers the option of being = placed on a do-not-call list; it restricts telemarketers from calling = individuals whose names and numbers have been placed on a do-not-call = list; it regulates telemarketers' use of auto-dialers; and it restricts = the telemarketers' calls from between 8:00 AM and 9:00 PM. The benefit = of this law for researchers is that definitively differentiates =

telemarketing from research calls.

=20

## TCPA and Survey Research

Legitimate survey research calls are implicitly exempt from the TCPA. =  
In fact, during the rulemaking phase of writing this bill, the FCC =  
wrote: "We find that the exemption for non-commercial calls from the =  
prohibition on prerecorded messages to residences includes calls =  
conducting research, marketing surveys, political polling or similar =  
activities which do not involve solicitation as defined by our rules." =  
(emphasis my own)

=20

However, there are three specific issues involving the TCPA that apply =  
to survey research.

=20

Autodialer Calls: The TCPA prohibits autodialer calls to =  
emergency numbers.

=20

Cell Phone Calls: The TCPA prohibits autodialer calls to =  
cell phones without the prior consent of the party being called if that =  
party is charged for the call. This prohibition applies to all calls, =  
including those made for research. Penalties for willful or knowing =  
violations can be as high as \$1,500 per violation. It is important to =  
note that manual (non-autodialer) calls to cell phones are permitted, =  
even if the person is charged.

The FCC has acknowledged that it is difficult to determine whether a =  
number is for a cell phone and virtually impossible to determine whether =  
a cell phone user is being charged for an incoming call. And, as the =  
usage of cell phones increases and becomes a primary residential phone, =  
the rationale and implementation of this rule becomes more problematic. =  
As such, the FCC has received comments and suggestions for =  
clarification. CMOR has submitted comments suggesting that cell phone =  
subscribers be identified as residential telephone subscribers, that the =  
non-commercial call exemption include the use of autodialers, and/or =  
that the FCC require an ability for non-commercial callers to identify a =  
cellular phone number. The FCC is currently reviewing the public =  
Comments submitted regarding this rule.

=20

Do-Not-Call Lists: While non-commercial calls are exempted =  
under the TCPA and, therefore, research calls are implicitly exempted, =  
there are specific rules relating to the use of the TCPA Do-Not-Call =  
Lists that apply to survey researchers. In 2003 the FCC amended the =  
provision on the use of D-N-C list to state that the rule prohibits any =

person (not just a telemarketer) from using a do-not-call list for any = purpose other than deleting such numbers from their call lists or = sample. The Federal Register stated in January 2003 said the reason for = this amendment was "since consumers who sign up for a "do-not-call" list = are seeking to preserve their privacy, it would be an invasion of their = privacy to use any information that would identify those consumers = (e.g., names and telephone numbers) for any purpose other than to ensure = that those individuals do not receive unsolicited telemarketing calls." = Further, the FCC stated that it is important for all persons, not just = sellers and telemarketers, to use the "do-not-call" lists properly. = Therefore, the amended Rule extends the prohibition to "any person," in = order to prohibit all parties, including list brokers and other entities = that do not fall within the definitions of "seller" or "telemarketer." = The misuse of D-N-C lists is defined as a separate and distinct abusive = practice under the TCPA. Since nearly half the states have instituted = similar D-N-C lists, it is prudent for research entities to apply this = amended rule to all D-N-C lists that they may receive. That is, if a = research companies chooses to purchase or use a D-N-C list, they should = not manipulate, "flag," analyze or otherwise use the D-N-C lists for any = purpose other than to delete such names and numbers from their telephone = samples.

=20

#### TSR Provisions

The TSR requires telemarketers to state promptly (at the beginning of = the call) that they are selling something, what the product is and how = much it costs. With this provision, the law effectively prohibits = telemarketers from using fraudulent and misleading "openings" to = persuade consumers to listen to their sales pitch: it keeps the = telemarketer from getting his "foot in the door." The benefit of this = law for researchers is that it prohibits "sugging"-selling under the = guise of research. No longer can telemarketers say they are "conducting = a survey and just want to ask you a few questions," then proceed to sell = you something.

=20

#### TSR and Survey Research

Legitimate survey research calls are implicitly exempt from the = Telemarketing Sales Rule.

=20

However, there is one issue that potentially could impact survey = research telephone interviewing indirectly.

Do-Not-Call Lists: The FTC is planning to put into effect = in July 2003 a "national do-not-call registry," in which consumers may = register online to prohibit telemarketers from calling them. While this = national d-n-c list applies to telemarketing calls only, we anticipate = that there will be public confusion about who is exempt from the =

provisions of this law. It is important that survey research =  
interviewers be prepared for additional public complaints and questions =  
and to be prepared to respond appropriately. (See "Responding to =  
Questions, Complaints, and Legal Challenges" below.)

=20

## State Laws

=20

These federal laws are not pre-emptive of state laws. This means that =  
each state has the power to enact more restrictive telephone laws than =  
the TCPA and the TSR. At this point many states have modeled their laws =  
after the federal laws and survey research calls are exempt by =  
definition. At present, about half of the states have DNC list laws. =  
However, some states have proposed expanding the do-not-call list =  
requirements to cover all unsolicited calls. CMOR is working in this =  
area to ensure that proposed bills are amended to exempt survey research =  
calls. However, it is prudent to be aware of your each state's position =  
on do-not-call lists.

=20

## The Survey Research Industry's Position

=20

### We Support Differentiation between Survey Research and Telemarketing

The survey research industry has supported and applauded the work of the =  
FCC and the FTC in their efforts to regulate the calling practices of =  
telemarketers. Both government agencies have recognized that survey =  
research is a non-commercial activity, in which a =  
scientifically-selected sample of individuals is interviewed about their =  
opinions on a subject, issue, product or service. Further, the survey =  
research industry has demonstrated to legislators and government =  
regulators that we aggressively and consistently regulate ourselves =  
through mandatory professional standards and ethics, and, most =  
importantly, that we respect the individual's (our respondent's) =  
privacy, confidentiality, and decision NOT to participate in a survey. =  
Since public complaints about privacy intrusions and misleading =  
activities have related almost entirely to telemarketing, the survey =  
research industry has been able to support our position that the public =  
interest is not negatively impacted by survey research. In fact, the =  
analysis of public opinion via survey research has become an essential =  
method of improving the welfare of society, from influencing government =  
decision-makers to developing new consumer products and services.

=20

### We Respect Respondent Privacy and Confidentiality

Survey researchers, both in policy and practice, respect a respondent's =



decision not to participate in a survey, whether by telephone, mail, in person, or online. Survey researchers establish a "chain of trust" with the respondent which includes (1) respect; (2) "transparency"-a commitment (a) to inform the respondent appropriately about the purpose of the survey and the use of the respondent's information and opinions and (b) to not mislead the respondent in any way; (3) protection of the privacy of personal information; and (4) confidentiality of any respondent-identifiable information. Survey researchers believe that respondents are the "lifeblood"-the foundation-of the survey research profession. Specifically, our covenant with respondents requires us to ensure that respondents will participate willingly, that they are informed about the survey's intentions, that they are satisfied with the survey experience, and that they are willing to participate again.

=20

=20

## We Regulate Ourselves

Survey researchers adhere to a strict set of internal policies and procedures that ensure privacy and confidentiality. In addition, members of the Council of American Survey Research Organizations (at present, about 225 companies in the United States, Canada, and Mexico) must agree annually to follow the CASRO Code of Standards and Ethics for Survey Research (Attachment C). The CASRO Code specifically describes a research company's professional, ethical, and legal obligations and responsibilities to respondents, to clients, to subcontractors, and to the public in general. The CASRO Code, which was first written over twenty years ago, is reviewed annually and updated as appropriate. The CASRO Code has become the accepted standard for the industry as a whole, and is referred to by buyers, users, and teachers of survey research.

=20

CASRO has also created guidelines for business practices and survey research quality, as well as for various research disciplines. Finally, CASRO continues to improve the professional credentials of survey researchers through its business and project management curricula in CASRO University. These resources and publications, as well as a list of the members, are available on the CASRO website ([www.casro.org](http://www.casro.org)).=20

=20

## Responding to Questions, Complaints, and Legal Challenges

=20

## The Issue

National and local do-not-call (D-N-C) lists exist that relate to telemarketing, sales-related, or commercial calls. In these D-N-C list provisions individuals may add their names and numbers to a list to prevent and prohibit unsolicited calls from telemarketers. =

D-N-C lists exist at the state level (about half the states), the federal level (in the FCC's oversight of the TCPA; and the FTC's oversight of the TSR), and in the DMA's Telephone Preference Service.

While all these D-N-C list provisions currently target telemarketing, sales-related, or commercial calls and, therefore either explicitly or implicitly exempt survey research calls, nevertheless many people (including individuals, federal and state regulators, consumer groups, litigators, and clients) think that survey research calls are (or should be) covered by these D-N-C list requirements.

This confusion leads to:

--questions from respondents in telephone interviews

--questions from clients

--complaints from respondents

--legal challenges

=20

The survey research company must be prepared to respond to these questions, complaints, and legal challenges.

=20

Suggested Responses to Questions and Complaints=20

(1) A survey research call is not a commercial or telemarketing call

"We are not selling anything."

(Subject)." "We are only asking for your opinions on =

=20

(2) Survey research calls are exempt from these laws

"We are specifically not included in these laws because we don't mislead, we care about your privacy, and we try to talk to you when it's convenient for you."

"In fact, we support these laws to protect your privacy."

=20

(3) Survey researchers respect your privacy

"Your name/number and specific opinions will be =

kept confidential."

"Your answers will be combined with others and = statistically analyzed to determine the population's overall opinions."

"We respect your right not to be interviewed, if = you say no."

=20

optional: "We invite you to participate in our survey at your = convenience . . . you can call in to an 800-number, you can go online, = etc.

=20

optional: "We will add you to our internal D-N-C list if you do = not want to participate in our surveys."

=20

#### (4) Survey researchers regulate themselves

"Our company's privacy policy and information is = available on our website (Address) or by calling (Telephone Number)

"We belong to CASRO-the Council of American = Survey Research Organizations-and must follow the Code of Standards, = which protects your privacy and your confidentiality and prohibits any = abuse or harassment of our respondents. (CASRO website address)"

=20

#### Response to Legal Challenges

=20

(1) Consult with lawyer.

(2) Respond to the specific facts of the challenge, provide = documentation about when you called, who the interviewer was, the source = of the telephone number (if it was RDD, client-provided, etc.)

(3) Provide general background information about survey research.=20

#### Surveys and You

#### What is CASRO

#### CASRO Membership List

(4) Incorporate information apropos to your specific issue concerning = survey research's exemption from the TCPA or TSR laws, including D-N-C = list requirements=20

(5) Provide information about CASRO's protection of respondent privacy

CASRO Code of Standards and Ethics for Survey Research

CASRO Privacy Policy

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

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

Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 09:44:44 -0400

Reply-To: Nat Ehrlich <[nehrlich@UMICH.EDU](mailto:nehrlich@UMICH.EDU)>

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

From: Nat Ehrlich <[nehrlich@UMICH.EDU](mailto:nehrlich@UMICH.EDU)>

Subject: Re: cell phones

Comments: To: dick halpern <[dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET](mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

In-Reply-To: <[5.2.1.1.2.20030922225643.01bf30f8@mail.atl.bellsouth.net](mailto:5.2.1.1.2.20030922225643.01bf30f8@mail.atl.bellsouth.net)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

In addition to the cost, we should also be mindful of the location of the cell phone would-be respondent. Since a majority of survey work is conducted in the evening, the owner of the cell might be in a restaurant, or in an automobile, or in someone else's home -- or anywhere: camping out, in a theatre, hospital...all sorts of places where it would be unlikely that we would obtain a valid response.

Don't cell phones have unique three-digit prefixes that can be eliminated from the RDD sample?

Nat Ehrlich

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>]On Behalf Of dick halpern

Sent: Monday, September 22, 2003 10:59 PM

To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

Subject: Re: cell phones

When you answer your cell phone you pay for the call by the minute. No long distance charges or roaming. But considering the cost -- unless people have extensive calling plans -- most would freak out if a pollster called asking questions. That's why most of us keep our cell phone numbers closely guarded!

At 09:30 PM 9/22/2003 -0400, you wrote:

>Has anyone considered the problem that when people are called on their cell  
>phone that there is usually a cost for that call for the owner of the cell

>phone? I do not know if that includes long distance and or roaming  
>charges. That  
>ought to reduce the number of people willing to respond to a survey.  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>-----

>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>signoff aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 10:22:02 -0400  
Reply-To: Stephanie Berg <[stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET](mailto:stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Stephanie Berg <[stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET](mailto:stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET)>  
Subject: Re: cell phones  
Comments: To: Nat Ehrlich <[nehrlich@UMICH.EDU](mailto:nehrlich@UMICH.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

One last issue to be mindful of is that it will become (to some degree) harder to screen for a specific person in a household. For instance, if your sample frame consists of only female heads of household, the person who answers the phone may not be the female head of household. The female head of household may not be in the presence of the person on the cell phone. The number is pretty much unusable because an interviewer probably cannot just call back at a later time -- the phone number is for a specific person that is not the female head. The chances of screening for an appropriate householder are slim-to-none on a cell phone number.

=====  
Stephanie Berg  
Research Manager  
Network Solutions

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

From: Nat Ehrlich  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2003 9:44 AM  
Subject: Re: cell phones

In addition to the cost, we should also be mindful of the location of the

cell phone would-be respondent. Since a majority of survey work is conducted in the evening, the owner of the cell might be in a restaurant, or in an automobile, or in someone else's home -- or anywhere: camping out, in a theatre, hospital...all sorts of places where it would be unlikely that we would obtain a valid response. Don't cell phones have unique three-digit prefixes that can be eliminated from the RDD sample?

Nat Ehrlich

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of dick halpern  
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2003 10:59 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: cell phones

When you answer your cell phone you pay for the call by the minute. No long distance charges or roaming. But considering the cost -- unless people have extensive calling plans -- most would freak out if a pollster called asking questions. That's why most of us keep our cell phone numbers closely guarded!

At 09:30 PM 9/22/2003 -0400, you wrote:

>Has anyone considered the problem that when people are called on their cell phone that there is usually a cost for that call for the owner of the cell phone? I do not know if that includes long distance and or roaming charges. That ought to reduce the number of people willing to respond to a survey.  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>signoff aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

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

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

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

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

Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 11:23:18 -0400  
Reply-To: Charlotte Steeh <dpocgs@LANGATE.GSU.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Charlotte Steeh <dpocgs@LANGATE.GSU.EDU>  
Subject: Re: cell phones  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu, nehrlich@UMICH.EDU  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-disposition: inline

Yes, currently most (but not all) cellular numbers can be identified from =  
the Telcordia file. However, this will change when the portability rule =  
goes into effect and landline numbers are transferred to cellular phones =  
or vice versa.

There is an additional consequence for cold call RDD interviews after =  
November 24. Calling schedules will have to change. In my project we are =  
conducting an experiment to see if confining our calls to the weekends =  
when most plans allow many calls is more effective than using the week =  
night schedule that usually requires the called party to pay or use up =  
scarce anytime minutes. Of course, we recognize that the fact that the =  
called party pays is a huge obstacle to survey research using cellular =  
telephones. Again in my project we attempt to overcome this disadvantage =  
by offering a token of appreciation, but too many times we cannot even =  
communicate this fact before the person hangs up. =20

Charlotte Steeh=20

>>> Nat Ehrlich <nehrlich@UMICH.EDU> 09/23/03 09:44AM >>>

In addition to the cost, we should also be mindful of the location of the  
cell phone would-be respondent. Since a majority of survey work is =  
conducted

in the evening, the owner of the cell might be in a restaurant, or in an  
automobile, or in someone else's home -- or anywhere: camping out, in a  
theatre, hospital...all sorts of places where it would be unlikely that we  
would obtain a valid response.

Don't cell phones have unique three-digit prefixes that can be eliminated  
from the RDD sample?

Nat Ehrlich

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of dick halpern

Sent: Monday, September 22, 2003 10:59 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu=20  
Subject: Re: cell phones

When you answer your cell phone you pay for the call by the minute. No =  
long  
distance charges or roaming. But considering the cost -- unless people =  
have  
extensive calling plans -- most would freak out if a pollster called =  
asking  
questions. That's why most of us keep our cell phone numbers closely  
guarded!

At 09:30 PM 9/22/2003 -0400, you wrote:

>Has anyone considered the problem that when people are called on their =  
cell  
>phone that there is usually a cost for that call for the owner of the =  
cell  
>phone? I do not know if that includes long distance and or roaming  
>charges. That  
>ought to reduce the number of people willing to respond to a survey.  
>  
>  
>  
>

>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>=20  
>Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>signoff aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>=20  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>=20  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

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

---

Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 12:27:03 -0400  
Reply-To: [NPSchiavone@AOL.COM](mailto:NPSchiavone@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nicholas Schiavone <[NPSchiavone@AOL.COM](mailto:NPSchiavone@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: "OBM" (sic) set the tone. -- NPS Re: OMB Guidelines  
Comments: To: [Paul.Lavarakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM](mailto:Paul.Lavarakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM)  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit



Dear Paul,

I found your response to Chris McCarty and AAPORNET incomplete, condescending and troubling.

I do not understand your apparent lack of concern for the primacy that ought to be accorded the consideration of response rates as a measure of research quality.

Is this the position of Nielsen Media Research? If so, it would certainly go along way toward explaining the unimpressive response rates achieved by NMR meter panels and diary samples. Just how accurate and reliable are those TV ratings? No media or advertising client dare ask -- let alone the general public! (And please don't tell me that the implementation of weighting will reduce "bias" as evidenced in MSE calculations ad nauseam. Nielsen has no independent benchmarks for real bias reduction calculations.)

Is this position yours as a member of the ISR's External Advisory Committee (EAC) to the Program in Survey Methodology? Such a posture would hardly enrich a student's learning experience.

Instead of making OMB's methodological sophistication an object of speculation, we ought to reread Meeting 21st Century Demographic Data Needs - Implementing the American Community Survey: May 2002 / Report 2: Demonstrating Survey Quality by the U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU.

While research quality is a multidimensional construct, the value of aiming toward full cooperation (and the implications of not achieving it) ought not be marginalized by a facile observation about non-response bias.

Ironically, it appears your initial transposition set the tone for the balance of your missive: OBM.

As professionals, we need to treat basic concepts more carefully.

Respectfully,  
Nicholas P. Schiavone  
AAPOR Member

In a message dated 9/23/2003 7:56:39 AM Eastern Daylight Time, Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM writes:  
Let's give OBM the benefit of the doubt and credit them with the wisdom of recognizing that it's not response rates that primarily matter but whether or not there's likely to be any nonresponse bias...

I don't know that they in fact recognize this, but maybe they do...

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

From: Chris McCarty [mailto:chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU]

Sent: Monday, September 22, 2003 4:30 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: OMB Guidelines

After a fairly extensive internet search, several unanswered calls to OMB and a lot of help and suggestions from members of the list, I have concluded that the OMB does not actually have a specific response rate level requirement. The closest thing to it are the guidelines for form 83 which say:

"Describe methods to maximize response rates and to deal with issues of non-response. The accuracy and reliability of information collected must be shown to be adequate for intended uses. For collections based on sampling, a special justification must be provided for any collection that will not yield "reliable" data that can be generalized to the universe studied."

This is of course very different from the 80% guideline that I have heard before. By the way, I have also seen references to 65% and 75%. I don't know where these numbers originated, but there appears to be no basis for them.

Regards,

Chris

Chris McCarty, Survey Director

University of Florida Survey Research Center

Bureau of Economic and Business Research

PO Box 117145

University of Florida

Gainesville, FL 32611-7145

Phone: (352) 392-2908 x101

FAX: (352) 392-4739

This e-mail and any attachments thereto are intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify me by return e-mail and permanently delete the original and any copy of this e-mail message or attachment and any printout thereof. Thank you

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

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

-----  
Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 13:17:02 -0400

Reply-To: Linda Piekarski <[linda\\_piekarski@SURVEYSAMPLING.COM](mailto:linda_piekarski@SURVEYSAMPLING.COM)>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Linda Piekarski <linda\_piekarski@SURVEYSAMPLING.COM>  
Subject: Re: cell phones  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I am pleased that so many AAPORites are concerned about this important topic. As mentioned in a previous round of conversations, several of us have been actively involved for over a year, planning for the impacts of wireless technology on telephone sampling. Paul Lavrakas, Jim Lepkowski and I organized a Cell Phone Summit last February. The summit was followed by a Roundtable at AAPOR Nashville which played to a standing room only crowd. We are hoping to have a Roundtable and at least one paper session in Phoenix devoted to Cellular phone issues and to reconvene the Summit in 2004.

There are really two distinct issues: 1) the legal issues (TCPA) surrounding inadvertently calling a cellular phone using an autodialer and 2) when, why and how do we begin to incorporate cellular phone numbers in telephone samples.

The first issue has been covered pretty well by the responses from Diane Bowers and Jane Sheppard. This is not a totally new issue. Sampling firms regularly exclude from their frame those prefixes or 1000 banks dedicated to wireless services. However, cell phone numbers do occasionally appear in RDD sample primarily due to the prevalence of call-forwarding (from wireline to wireless). The new wrinkle is that TCPA now says that making such calls using an automatic telephone dialing system is illegal. With wireless/wireline portability in November, it will no longer be possible to identify as cellular those wireline telephone numbers (listed or unlisted) that have been ported to a wireless service.

Diane and Jane have documented the issues and how CASRO and CMOR are currently attempting to get a non-commercial exemption added to the TCPA. In the meantime, we risk violating TCPA by using our automated dialing equipment to call unidentified cellular phones "without prior express consent". Jane Sheppard's response points out that the FCC recognized that "people who knowingly release their telephone numbers have in effect given their invitation or permission to be called at the number they have given". This would cover calls made to directory-listed numbers ported to a wireless service after November 24, 2003 and those where individuals have call-forwarded calls from their landline phone to their cell phone. This would probably not cover a call to an unlisted number.

The missing tool is the "ability for non-commercial callers to identify a cellular phone number". Neustar informed the FCC that they would "provide a wireless number database service that would answer a query to determine if a telephone number belongs to a wireless customer". This service would be provided to "other NPAC users (such as telecommunications providers), who in turn would provide the service to telemarketers". Despite many telephone calls and days searching internet, I have not yet found a service provider (telecommunications or otherwise) that is preparing or prepared to offer such a service. If any of you know of one, I would love to hear from you.

The incorporation of cellular phones in telephone samples is, as the recent sets of comments illustrate, a much more complicated issue and, as mentioned above, one in which many of us are already deeply involved. If you or a colleague is interested in participating in a Roundtable or panel session devoted to Cellular Phones and Telephone Sampling at AAPOR 2004, please contact me directly. We are looking for presentations that will cover everything: household coverage, frame construction, sample design, weighting, dial protocols, interview scripts, and compensation. You name it, it needs to be discussed.

Linda Piekarski  
Vice President Database and Research  
Survey Sampling International  
linda\_piekarski@surveysampling.com  
203.255.4200

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

From: "Stephanie Berg" <stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET>  
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2003 10:22 AM  
Subject: Re: cell phones

> One last issue to be mindful of is that it will become (to some degree)  
> harder to screen for a specific person in a household. For instance, if  
> your  
> sample frame consists of only female heads of household, the person who  
> answers the phone may not be the female head of household. The female head  
> of household may not be in the presence of the person on the cell phone.  
> The  
> number is pretty much unusable because an interviewer probably cannot just  
> call back at a later time -- the phone number is for a specific person  
> that  
> is not the female head. The chances of screening for an appropriate  
> householder are slim-to-none on a cell phone number.

>  
> =====

> Stephanie Berg  
> Research Manager  
> Network Solutions

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

> From: Nat Ehrlich  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2003 9:44 AM  
> Subject: Re: cell phones

>  
>  
> In addition to the cost, we should also be mindful of the location of  
> the  
> cell phone would-be respondent. Since a majority of survey work is  
> conducted  
> in the evening, the owner of the cell might be in a restaurant, or in an

> automobile, or in someone else's home -- or anywhere: camping out, in a  
> theatre, hospital...all sorts of places where it would be unlikely that  
we  
> would obtain a valid response.  
> Don't cell phones have unique three-digit prefixes that can be  
eliminated  
> from the RDD sample?  
>  
> Nat Ehrlich  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of dick halpern  
> Sent: Monday, September 22, 2003 10:59 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: cell phones  
>  
>  
> When you answer your cell phone you pay for the call by the minute. No  
> long  
> distance charges or roaming. But considering the cost -- unless people  
> have  
> extensive calling plans -- most would freak out if a pollster called  
> asking  
> questions. That's why most of us keep our cell phone numbers closely  
> guarded!  
>  
> At 09:30 PM 9/22/2003 -0400, you wrote:  
> >Has anyone considered the problem that when people are called on their  
> cell  
> >phone that there is usually a cost for that call for the owner of the  
> cell  
> >phone? I do not know if that includes long distance and or roaming  
> >charges. That  
> >ought to reduce the number of people willing to respond to a survey.  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >-----  
> >Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> >Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> >signoff aapornet  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:

aapornet-request@asu.edu

>

> -----

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

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

>

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

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 13:22:06 -0400

Reply-To: "Lavrakas, Paul" <Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>

Subject: Re: "OBM" (sic) set the tone. -- NPS Re: OMB Guidelines

Comments: To: "NPSchiavone@AOL.COM" <NPSchiavone@AOL.COM>, "AAPORNET@asu.edu" <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Nick,

You posted your response to AAPORnet, so I will do so in turn with mine.

You don't know me, so please don't presume to judge whether I was condescending. I was not. Maybe some people who themselves are cynical and otherwise mean-spirited would read what I wrote and think I was making fun of OMB. I wasn't.

I simply noted that nonresponse error is what should be of concern to the discipline of survey research. This is so, because response rates often have been shown to be unrelated to nonresponse error. I have long articulated the point at AAPOR, going back to papers in the early 1990s that response rates are certainly incomplete, and often poor, measures of survey data quality. More importantly, by expending finite resources only to raise responses rate, survey researchers may well be harming the overall quality of their data compared to utilizing those resources to improve other aspects of the survey research enterprise (e.g., interviewer quality, questionnaire quality, etc.)

Regarding the work that Nielsen does, please feel free to call me (646-654-8378) to discuss your view that what is achieved is unimpressive. I believe just the opposite -- that is, that despite the levels of response rates that Nielsen achieves (nowadays in the 30s and 40s, depending on the research service) those rates are quite impressive.

Regarding my serving on an advisory committee for U-Michigan, I'm wondering why you know this about me or even care about this... But, assuming your statement about my views not enriching a student's education are an accurate reflection of your thinking, then once again I couldn't be more in disagreement with you.

Of course, you are entitled to say whatever you want. But I don't have to

agree with you.

PJL

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

From: Nicholas Schiavone [mailto:NPSchiavone@AOL.COM]

Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2003 12:27 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: "OBM" (sic) set the tone. -- NPS Re: OMB Guidelines

Dear Paul,

I found your response to Chris McCarty and AAPORNET incomplete, condescending and troubling.

I do not understand your apparent lack of concern for the primacy that ought to be accorded the consideration of response rates as a measure of research quality.

Is this the position of Nielsen Media Research? If so, it would certainly go along way toward explaining the unimpressive response rates achieved by NMR meter panels and diary samples. Just how accurate and reliable are those TV ratings? No media or advertising client dare ask -- let alone the general public! (And please don't tell me that the implementation of weighting will reduce "bias" as evidenced in MSE calculations ad nauseam. Nielsen has no independent benchmarks for real bias reduction calculations.)

Is this position yours as a member of the ISR's External Advisory Committee (EAC) to the Program in Survey Methodology? Such a posture would hardly enrich a student's learning experience.

Instead of making OMB's methodological sophistication an object of speculation, we ought to reread Meeting 21st Century Demographic Data Needs

-  
Implementing the American Community Survey: May 2002 / Report 2: Demonstrating Survey Quality by the U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU.

While research quality is a multidimensional construct, the value of aiming toward full cooperation (and the implications of not achieving it) ought not be marginalized by a facile observation about non-response bias.

Ironically, it appears your initial transposition set the tone for the balance of your missive: OBM.

As professionals, we need to treat basic concepts more carefully.

Respectfully,  
Nicholas P. Schiavone  
AAPOR Member

In a message dated 9/23/2003 7:56:39 AM Eastern Daylight Time,  
Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM writes:  
Let's give OBM the benefit of the doubt and credit them with the wisdom of  
recognizing that it's not response rates that primarily matter but whether  
or not there's likely to be any nonresponse bias...

I don't know that they in fact recognize this, but maybe they do...

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

From: Chris McCarty [mailto:chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU]  
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2003 4:30 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: OMB Guidelines

After a fairly extensive internet search, several unanswered calls to  
OMB and a lot of help and suggestions from members of the list, I have  
concluded that the OMB does not actually have a specific response rate  
level requirement. The closest thing to it are the guidelines for form  
83 which say:

"Describe methods to maximize response rates and to deal with issues of  
non-response. The accuracy and reliability of information collected  
must be shown to be adequate for intended uses. For collections based  
on sampling, a special justification must be provided for any collection  
that will not yield "reliable" data that can be generalized to the  
universe studied."

This is of course very different from the 80% guideline that I have  
heard before. By the way, I have also seen references to 65% and 75%.  
I don't know where these numbers originated, but there appears to be no  
basis for them.

Regards,

Chris  
Chris McCarty, Survey Director  
University of Florida Survey Research Center  
Bureau of Economic and Business Research  
PO Box 117145  
University of Florida  
Gainesville, FL 32611-7145  
Phone: (352) 392-2908 x101  
FAX: (352) 392-4739

This e-mail and any attachments thereto are intended  
only for use by the addressee(s) named herein  
and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information.



If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail,  
you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying  
of this e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited.  
If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify me  
by return e-mail and permanently delete the original  
and any copy of this e-mail message or attachment and any printout thereof.  
Thank you

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

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 13:59:44 -0400  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Subject: Re: "OBM" (sic) set the tone. -- NPS Re: OMB Guidelines  
Comments: To: [NPSchiavone@AOL.COM](mailto:NPSchiavone@AOL.COM), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[1a2.1a537665.2ca1ce57@aol.com](mailto:1a2.1a537665.2ca1ce57@aol.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

My problem with this post, other than its tone, is that response rates  
alone are not measures of quality unless one knows the survey and sample  
design. A high response rate is not automatically the Good Housekeeping  
Seal of Approval. One can artificially raise response rates. One way is to  
have non-random selection of respondents, especially from among those at home.

What I thought Paul meant was that the effect of response rates on survey  
validity was the important point. I would not automatically cede validity  
to a survey with a higher response rate. I would need to know more than  
just the response rate.  
warren mitofsky

At 12:27 PM 9/23/2003 -0400, Nicholas Schiavone wrote:

>Dear Paul,

>

>I found your response to Chris McCarty and AAPORNET incomplete, condescending  
>and troubling.

>

>I do not understand your apparent lack of concern for the primacy that ought  
>to be accorded the consideration of response rates as a measure of research  
>quality.

>

>Is this the position of Nielsen Media Research? If so, it would certainly go  
>along way toward explaining the unimpressive response rates achieved by NMR  
>meter panels and diary samples. Just how accurate and reliable are those TV  
>ratings? No media or advertising client dare ask -- let alone the general  
>public! (And please don't tell me that the implementation of weighting  
>will reduce

>"bias" as evidenced in MSE calculations ad nauseam. Nielsen has no  
>independent benchmarks for real bias reduction calculations.)  
>  
>Is this position yours as a member of the ISR's External Advisory Committee  
>(EAC) to the Program in Survey Methodology? Such a posture would hardly  
>enrich  
>a student's learning experience.  
>  
>Instead of making OMB's methodological sophistication an object of  
>speculation, we ought to reread Meeting 21st Century Demographic Data Needs -  
>Implementing the American Community Survey: May 2002 / Report 2:  
>Demonstrating Survey  
>Quality by the U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics  
>Administration, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU.  
>  
>While research quality is a multidimensional construct, the value of aiming  
>toward full cooperation (and the implications of not achieving it) ought  
>not be  
>marginalized by a facile observation about non-response bias.  
>  
>Ironically, it appears your initial transposition set the tone for the  
>balance of your missive: OBM.  
>  
>As professionals, we need to treat basic concepts more carefully.  
>  
>Respectfully,  
>Nicholas P. Schiavone  
>AAPOR Member  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>In a message dated 9/23/2003 7:56:39 AM Eastern Daylight Time,  
>Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM writes:  
>Let's give OBM the benefit of the doubt and credit them with the wisdom of  
>recognizing that it's not response rates that primarily matter but whether  
>or not there's likely to be any nonresponse bias...  
>  
>I don't know that they in fact recognize this, but maybe they do...  
>  
>-----Original Message-----  
>From: Chris McCarty [mailto:chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU]  
>Sent: Monday, September 22, 2003 4:30 PM  
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>Subject: OMB Guidelines  
>  
>After a fairly extensive internet search, several unanswered calls to  
>OMB and a lot of help and suggestions from members of the list, I have  
>concluded that the OMB does not actually have a specific response rate  
>level requirement. The closest thing to it are the guidelines for form  
>83 which say:  
>  
>"Describe methods to maximize response rates and to deal with issues of  
>non-response. The accuracy and reliability of information collected

>must be shown to be adequate for intended uses. For collections based  
>on sampling, a special justification must be provided for any collection  
>that will not yield "reliable" data that can be generalized to the  
>universe studied."

>  
>This is of course very different from the 80% guideline that I have  
>heard before. By the way, I have also seen references to 65% and 75%.  
>I don't know where these numbers originated, but there appears to be no  
>basis for them.

>  
>Regards,

>  
>Chris  
>Chris McCarty, Survey Director  
>University of Florida Survey Research Center  
>Bureau of Economic and Business Research  
>PO Box 117145  
>University of Florida  
>Gainesville, FL 32611-7145  
>Phone: (352) 392-2908 x101  
>FAX: (352) 392-4739

>  
>This e-mail and any attachments thereto are intended  
>only for use by the addressee(s) named herein  
>and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information.  
>If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail,  
>you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying  
>of this e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited.  
>If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify me  
>by return e-mail and permanently delete the original  
>and any copy of this e-mail message or attachment and any printout thereof.  
>Thank you

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

MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL  
1776 Broadway, Suite 1708  
New York, NY 10019

212 980-3031 Phone  
212 980-3107 Fax

[mitofsky@mindspring.com](mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com)  
[www.MitofskyInternational.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](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 14:27:34 -0400  
Reply-To: [NPSchiavone@AOL.COM](mailto:NPSchiavone@AOL.COM)

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nicholas Schiavone <NPSchiavone@AOL.COM>  
Subject: Appreciate Reply -- NPS Re: "OBM" (sic) set the tone. Re:  
OMB Guidelines  
Comments: To: Paul.Lavarakas@NielsenMedia.com  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

In a message dated 9/23/03 1:31:14 PM Eastern Daylight Time,  
Paul.Lavarakas@NielsenMedia.com writes:

> Of course, you are entitled to say whatever you want. But I don't have to  
> agree with you.  
>  
> PJL  
>

Dear Paul,

I appreciate your reply.

Though I agree we evidently disagree on some matters, there are limits to  
what ought to be said, especially in a public forum.

I posted my comments only because I was responding to comments made in public  
about matters of general concern (i.e., response rates and guidelines).

I trust even our limited exchange will encourage fellow AAPOR Members to  
reflect upon about the fundamental matter of cultivating research quality --  
an  
ever growing challenge that clearly matters to both of us.

Enjoy the balance of the day.

Thanks again.

Best regards,  
NPS

---

Nicholas P. Schiavone

---

This e-mail and any attachments thereto are intended  
only for use by the addressee(s) named herein  
and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information.  
If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail,  
you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying  
of this e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited.

If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify me by return e-mail and permanently delete the original and any copy of this e-mail message or attachment and any printout thereof. Thank you

---

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

---

Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 16:38:03 -0400  
Reply-To: [NPSchiavone@AOL.COM](mailto:NPSchiavone@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nicholas Schiavone <[NPSchiavone@AOL.COM](mailto:NPSchiavone@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Manners,  
Methodologies & Mistakes -- NPS Re: OMB Guidelines  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Comments: cc: [Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM](mailto:Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM), [mitofsky@mindspring.com](mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

In a message dated 9/23/2003 2:02:52 PM Eastern Daylight Time, [mitofsky@mindspring.com](mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com) writes:  
My problem with this post, other than its tone, is that response rates alone are not measures of quality unless one knows the survey and sample design.  
Dear AAPORNET Readers,

I regret my posting of 12:46:44 PM (Eastern Daylight Time) regarding the Paul Lavrakas posting of 7:56:39 AM.

Warren Mitofsky is right on both matters of methodology and, more importantly, manners.

Today's noontime e-mail was my first post on AAPORNET. While that may explain some things, it does not excuse the unintentionally ill-humored tone of my missive. The seeming informality of the medium is not an excuse for lack of civility, soiling the nest or extremism in defense of research quality. And those are certainly not preconditions for professional dialogue or progress.

If trial and error (and learning from one's errors) are great teachers, then I consider myself well-educated and appropriately chastened by today's events.

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Nicholas Schiavone

This e-mail and any attachments thereto are intended

only for use by the addressee(s) named herein  
and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information.  
If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail,  
you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying  
of this e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited.  
If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify me  
by return e-mail and permanently delete the original  
and any copy of this e-mail message or attachment and any printout thereof.  
Thank you

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

Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 16:59:00 -0400  
Reply-To: Chris McCarty <[chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU](mailto:chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Chris McCarty <[chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU](mailto:chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU)>  
Subject: Responses to OMB guideline question  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I want to thank everyone for their replies to my question. Since my second post I received several very helpful replies. It appears that the OMB does not actually have a set response rate level. This statement comes from someone at the OMB. However, in an OMB document titled "Implementing Guidance for OMB Review of Agency Information Collection" (June 2, 1999) there is an extensive discussion about response rates. This is the publication that most people cite as the source of the expectation. On page 127 the document says:

=20

"Some experiments conducted in household surveys compare incomplete samples at different stages of follow-up. This has been used to show that errors in statistics that are sensitive to the distribution (e.g., those such as significance tests that rely on measures of variance) are large at low response rates, but generally are not significant at 75% or above."=20

=20

This is apparently the most explicit reference to a fixed level. In reading the context of this discussion, the OMB is by no means saying that a response rate of 75% insures data quality, or that one lower than 75% insures biased results. The document is unclear about the survey mode. They do talk about the need to examine response rates, along with other factors, in evaluating data quality. =20

=20

My motivation for posting this question was that I had heard a lot about

the OMB guideline but never saw the actual text. I found it disturbing that a federal agency would set a level without regard for the mode or other contextual variables associated with a survey. Political polls typically get horrible response rates, but are often good predictors. The BRFSS struggles in many states to get a 40 percent response rate, yet is still used by epidemiologists. I guess I'm rebelling against what seem to be growing expectations in the field for higher and higher response rates when we all know they are going down.

=20

Regards,

=20

Chris

=20

Chris McCarty, Survey Director

University of Florida Survey Research Center

Bureau of Economic and Business Research

PO Box 117145

University of Florida

Gainesville, FL 32611-7145

Phone: (352) 392-2908 x101

FAX: (352) 392-4739

=20

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

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

=====

Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 17:29:44 -0400

Reply-To: Nat Ehrlich <[nehrlich@UMICH.EDU](mailto:nehrlich@UMICH.EDU)>

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

From: Nat Ehrlich <[nehrlich@UMICH.EDU](mailto:nehrlich@UMICH.EDU)>

Subject: Re: "OBM" (sic) set the tone. -- NPS Re: OMB Guidelines

Comments: To: [NPSchiavone@AOL.COM](mailto:NPSchiavone@AOL.COM), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

In-Reply-To: <[1a2.1a537665.2ca1ce57@aol.com](mailto:1a2.1a537665.2ca1ce57@aol.com)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Mr. Schiavone,

In my opinion, Lavrakas is right on target: response rate, by itself, is an indication of one thing: the level of effort expended in tracking down those who are not immediately willing to respond, or do not answer the first 30 calls, and 'converting' them.

I'm afraid that the elephant in the room is the assumption that nonrespondents will differ from respondents. A basic tenet of classical statistics is the acceptance, in the absence of contravening evidence, of the null hypothesis, i.e. that the difference between two observed groups [here, respondents and non-respondents] is non-significant. Even if non-respondents were limited to refusals, there is no a priori justification for the assumption of difference. Curtin's research [Curtin, Presser and Singer, THE EFFECTS OF RESPONSE RATE CHANGES ON THE INDEX OF CONSUMER SENTIMENT, Public Opinion Quarterly Volume 64:413-428] is the most complete, covering seventeen years of data collection for the survey of consumer attitudes. His reverse-engineering analysis, successively reducing the respondent population by discarding cases acquired after multiple call attempts and refusal conversion, demonstrates that there would be no change in response if response rates had been reduced from 70% to 25%. We need to integrate response rate with sampling error [which is a monotonic function of sample size] and the plurality of response; when 85% of the respondents endorse one response, with a sampling error of +/-3%, we can calculate the reversal likelihood given any response rate.

In addition, consider that the respondents who agree after repeated calls and intensive refusal conversion might themselves be a separate -- and significantly different in attitude -- group. I would never make that assumption, but someone else might.

Ultimately, we might have to agree to a 'coalition of the willing' as our respondent pool. Call each number once, and report only those who agree to take the survey on the first opportunity.

Nat Ehrlich

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nicholas Schiavone

Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2003 12:27 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: "OBM" (sic) set the tone. -- NPS Re: OMB Guidelines

Dear Paul,

I found your response to Chris McCarty and AAPORNET incomplete, condescending and troubling.

I do not understand your apparent lack of concern for the primacy that ought to be accorded the consideration of response rates as a measure of research quality.

Is this the position of Nielsen Media Research? If so, it would certainly go along way toward explaining the unimpressive response rates achieved by NMR



meter panels and diary samples. Just how accurate and reliable are those TV ratings? No media or advertising client dare ask -- let alone the general public! (And please don't tell me that the implementation of weighting will reduce "bias" as evidenced in MSE calculations ad nauseam. Nielsen has no independent benchmarks for real bias reduction calculations.)

Is this position yours as a member of the ISR's External Advisory Committee (EAC) to the Program in Survey Methodology? Such a posture would hardly enrich a student's learning experience.

Instead of making OMB's methodological sophistication an object of speculation, we ought to reread Meeting 21st Century Demographic Data Needs - Implementing the American Community Survey: May 2002 / Report 2: Demonstrating Survey Quality by the U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. CENSUS BUREAU.

While research quality is a multidimensional construct, the value of aiming toward full cooperation (and the implications of not achieving it) ought not be marginalized by a facile observation about non-response bias.

Ironically, it appears your initial transposition set the tone for the balance of your missive: OBM.

As professionals, we need to treat basic concepts more carefully.

Respectfully,  
Nicholas P. Schiavone  
AAPOR Member

In a message dated 9/23/2003 7:56:39 AM Eastern Daylight Time, Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM writes:  
Let's give OBM the benefit of the doubt and credit them with the wisdom of recognizing that it's not response rates that primarily matter but whether or not there's likely to be any nonresponse bias...

I don't know that they in fact recognize this, but maybe they do...

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

From: Chris McCarty [mailto:chrism@BEER.UFL.EDU]  
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2003 4:30 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: OMB Guidelines

After a fairly extensive internet search, several unanswered calls to OMB and a lot of help and suggestions from members of the list, I have concluded that the OMB does not actually have a specific response rate

level requirement. The closest thing to it are the guidelines for form 83 which say:

"Describe methods to maximize response rates and to deal with issues of non-response. The accuracy and reliability of information collected must be shown to be adequate for intended uses. For collections based on sampling, a special justification must be provided for any collection that will not yield "reliable" data that can be generalized to the universe studied."

This is of course very different from the 80% guideline that I have heard before. By the way, I have also seen references to 65% and 75%. I don't know where these numbers originated, but there appears to be no basis for them.

Regards,

Chris  
Chris McCarty, Survey Director  
University of Florida Survey Research Center  
Bureau of Economic and Business Research  
PO Box 117145  
University of Florida  
Gainesville, FL 32611-7145  
Phone: (352) 392-2908 x101  
FAX: (352) 392-4739

This e-mail and any attachments thereto are intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify me by return e-mail and permanently delete the original and any copy of this e-mail message or attachment and any printout thereof. Thank you

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

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 19:44:54 -0400  
Reply-To: Nat Ehrlich <[nehrlich@UMICH.EDU](mailto:nehrlich@UMICH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nat Ehrlich <[nehrlich@UMICH.EDU](mailto:nehrlich@UMICH.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: "OBM" (sic) set the tone. -- NPS Re: OMB Guidelines  
Comments: To: [beveridg@optonline.net](mailto:beveridg@optonline.net), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[KLEOLNOOPOCIGAODMGOHMEEAEPAA.beveridg@optonline.net](mailto:KLEOLNOOPOCIGAODMGOHMEEAEPAA.beveridg@optonline.net)>  
MIME-version: 1.0

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

The problem with the Literary Digest poll in 1936 was the sample frame of telephone users, which, in that depression era, limited the sample to the more affluent. Also, the issue in 1936 was a very simple one, Landon's conservatism vs. Roosevelt's liberalism, economically. A contemporary RDD frame is not comparable, in any way, to a 1936 telephone directory listing. Lest I be misinterpreted, let me state unequivocally that the 'coalition of the willing' sample was intended as a frivolous reductio ad absurdum; it is the only respondent set that can be designated as 'purely' willing and accessible. Any other respondents are in a compromised position. Ultimately, we must -- MUST -- decide whether to endorse the underlying assumption that nonrespondents are different from the respondents, without evidentiary proof, or not. The tenets of classical statistics [see R. A. Fischer, Principles of Statistics] are to assume that the null hypothesis until evidence is collected to refute it.

Nat Ehrlich

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

From: Andrew A Beveridge [mailto:beveridg@optonline.net]  
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2003 7:19 PM  
To: Nat Ehrlich; AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: RE: "OBM" (sic) set the tone. -- NPS Re: OMB Guidelines

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of Nat Ehrlich  
> Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2003 5:30 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: "OBM" (sic) set the tone. -- NPS Re: OMB Guidelines

>

>

> Mr. Schiavone,

> In my opinion, Lavrakas is right on target: response rate, by

> itself, is an

> indication of one thing: the level of effort expended in tracking

> down those

> who are not immediately willing to respond, or do not answer the first 30

> calls, and 'converting' them.

> I'm afraid that the elephant in the room is the assumption that

> nonrespondents will differ from respondents. A basic tenet of classical

> statistics is the acceptance, in the absence of contravening evidence, of

> the null hypothesis, i.e. that the difference between two observed groups

> [here, respondents and non-respondents] is non-significant. Even if

> non-respondents were limited to refusals, there is no a priori

> justification

> for the assumption of difference. Curtin's research [Curtin, Presser and

> Singer, THE EFFECTS OF RESPONSE RATE CHANGES ON THE INDEX OF CONSUMER

> SENTIMENT, Public Opinion Quarterly Volume 64:413-428] is the  
> most complete,  
> covering seventeen years of data collection for the survey of consumer  
> attitudes. His reverse-engineering analysis, successively reducing the  
> respondent population by discarding cases acquired after multiple call  
> attempts and refusal conversion, demonstrates that there would be  
> no change  
> in response if response rates had been reduced from 70% to 25%. We need to  
> integrate response rate with sampling error [which is a monotonic function  
> of sample size] and the plurality of response; when 85% of the respondents  
> endorse one response, with a sampling error of +/-3%, we can calculate the  
> reversal likelihood given any response rate.  
> In addition, consider that the respondents who agree after repeated calls  
> and intensive refusal conversion might themselves be a separate -- and  
> significantly different in attitude -- group. I would never make that  
> assumption, but someone else might.  
> Ultimately, we might have to agree to a 'coalition of the willing' as our  
> respondent pool. Call each number once, and report only those who agree to  
> take the survey on the first opportunity.  
>  
> Nat Ehrlich

Mitofsky is of course right about the Schivone comments up to a point.  
However, if one uses willing respondents, it seems to me that the next step  
is to go back to the discredited "Literary Digest" approach, and just use  
volunteers.

Didn't several people attack Shere Hite for just this sin? Not to mention  
Kinsey and others.

Andy Beveridge

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

-----  
Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 19:50:02 -0400  
Reply-To: [andy@troll.soc.qc.edu](mailto:andy@troll.soc.qc.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
Subject: "OBM" (sic) set the tone. -- NPS Re: OMB Guidelines  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[KLEOLNOOPOCIGAODMGOHOEEBEPAA.beveridg@optonline.net](mailto:KLEOLNOOPOCIGAODMGOHOEEBEPAA.beveridg@optonline.net)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Andrew A Beveridge [<mailto:beveridg@optonline.net>]  
> Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2003 7:50 PM  
> To: AAPORNET  
> Subject: FW: "OBM" (sic) set the tone. -- NPS Re: OMB Guidelines  
>  
>

>  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Andrew A Beveridge [mailto:beveridg@optonline.net]  
> Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2003 7:19 PM  
> To: Nat Ehrlich; AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: RE: "OBM" (sic) set the tone. -- NPS Re: OMB Guidelines

>> -----Original Message-----  
>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of Nat Ehrlich  
>> Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2003 5:30 PM  
>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>> Subject: Re: "OBM" (sic) set the tone. -- NPS Re: OMB Guidelines

>> Mr. Schiavone,  
>> In my opinion, Lavrakas is right on target: response rate, by  
>> itself, is an  
>> indication of one thing: the level of effort expended in tracking  
>> down those  
>> who are not immediately willing to respond, or do not answer  
> the first 30  
>> calls, and 'converting' them.  
>> I'm afraid that the elephant in the room is the assumption that  
>> nonrespondents will differ from respondents. A basic tenet of classical  
>> statistics is the acceptance, in the absence of contravening  
> evidence, of  
>> the null hypothesis, i.e. that the difference between two  
> observed groups  
>> [here, respondents and non-respondents] is non-significant. Even if  
>> non-respondents were limited to refusals, there is no a priori  
>> justification  
>> for the assumption of difference. Curtin's research [Curtin, Presser and  
>> Singer, THE EFFECTS OF RESPONSE RATE CHANGES ON THE INDEX OF CONSUMER  
>> SENTIMENT, Public Opinion Quarterly Volume 64:413-428] is the  
>> most complete,  
>> covering seventeen years of data collection for the survey of consumer  
>> attitudes. His reverse-engineering analysis, successively reducing the  
>> respondent population by discarding cases acquired after multiple call  
>> attempts and refusal conversion, demonstrates that there would be  
>> no change  
>> in response if response rates had been reduced from 70% to 25%.  
> We need to  
>> integrate response rate with sampling error [which is a  
> monotonic function  
>> of sample size] and the plurality of response; when 85% of the  
> respondents  
>> endorse one response, with a sampling error of +/-3%, we can  
> calculate the  
>> reversal likelihood given any response rate.  
>> In addition, consider that the respondents who agree after

> repeated calls  
>> and intensive refusal conversion might themselves be a separate -- and  
>> significantly different in attitude -- group. I would never make that  
>> assumption, but someone else might.  
>> Ultimately, we might have to agree to a 'coalition of the  
> willing' as our  
>> respondent pool. Call each number once, and report only those  
> who agree to  
>> take the survey on the first opportunity.  
>>  
>> Nat Ehrlich  
>  
> Mitofsky is of course right about the Schivone comments up to a  
> point. However, if one uses willing respondents, it seems to me  
> that the next step is to go back to the discredited "Literary  
> Digest" approach, and just use volunteers.  
>  
> Didn't several people attack Shere Hite for just this sin? Not  
> to mention Kinsey and others.  
>  
> Andy Beveridge

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2003 08:16:56 -0400  
Reply-To: "Lavrakas, Paul" <[Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM](mailto:Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <[Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM](mailto:Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Manners,  
Methodologies & Mistakes -- NPS Re: OMB Gui delines  
Comments: To: "NPSchiavone@AOL.COM" <[NPSchiavone@AOL.COM](mailto:NPSchiavone@AOL.COM)>,  
"aapornet@asu.edu" <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Nick,

I'll assume that we've put this behind us, but that we may take up the  
issues of response rates and possible nonresponse bias between ourselves  
off-line.

Thanks, PJL

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

From: Nicholas Schiavone [<mailto:NPSchiavone@AOL.COM>]  
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2003 4:38 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Manners, Methodologies & Mistakes -- NPS Re: OMB Guidelines

In a message dated 9/23/2003 2:02:52 PM Eastern Daylight Time,  
[mitofsky@mindspring.com](mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com) writes:

My problem with this post, other than its tone, is that response rates alone are not measures of quality unless one knows the survey and sample design.  
Dear AAPORNET Readers,

I regret my posting of 12:46:44 PM (Eastern Daylight Time) regarding the Paul Lavrakas posting of 7:56:39 AM.

Warren Mitofsky is right on both matters of methodology and, more importantly, manners.

Today's noontime e-mail was my first post on AAPORNET. While that may explain some things, it does not excuse the unintentionally ill-humored tone of my missive. The seeming informality of the medium is not an excuse for lack of civility, soiling the nest or extremism in defense of research quality. And those are certainly not preconditions for professional dialogue or progress.

If trial and error (and learning from one's errors) are great teachers, then I consider myself well-educated and appropriately chastened by today's events.

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Nicholas Schiavone

This e-mail and any attachments thereto are intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify me by return e-mail and permanently delete the original and any copy of this e-mail message or attachment and any printout thereof.  
Thank you

---

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

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2003 08:37:39 -0400  
Reply-To: Chris McCarty <[chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU](mailto:chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Chris McCarty <[chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU](mailto:chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU)>  
Subject: More on OMB guidelines  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

It looks like I spoke too soon. There was a 1979 memo from the Director of OMB to Heads of Executive Departments that said:

=20

"It is expected that data collections based on statistical methods will have a response rate of at least 75 percent. Proposed data collections having an expected response rate of less than 75 percent require a special justification....Proposed data collection activities having an expected response rate of less than 50 percent will be disapproved."

=20

Apparently this is the source of the fixed levels cited by several people. This text is not repeated in the Paperwork Reduction Act and so is not currently used by the OMB as a gauge of data quality. They have no set number that they use to determine data quality.

=20

chris

=20

Chris McCarty, Survey Director

University of Florida Survey Research Center

Bureau of Economic and Business Research

PO Box 117145

University of Florida

Gainesville, FL 32611-7145

Phone: (352) 392-2908 x101

FAX: (352) 392-4739

=20

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2003 07:59:48 -0500  
Reply-To: Cynthia Nelson <[cnelson@NIU.EDU](mailto:cnelson@NIU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>



From: Cynthia Nelson <cnelson@NIU.EDU>  
Subject: Re: More on OMB guidelines  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <2709A069CB844242A469ECC57C29D62104753C@kobe.bebr.ufl.edu>  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Well, as this is an excerpt, and I wasn't wanting to track down the memo myself, I must ask: Do they define how they calculate the response rate? As everyone on this list knows, without that specification this expectation doesn't have much meaning.

Cynthia Nelson  
Center for Governmental Studies  
Northern Illinois University  
DeKalb, IL 60115  
Voice 815.753.1918  
Fax 815.753.2305  
email cnelson@niu.edu

\*\*\*\*\* REPLY SEPARATOR \*\*\*\*\*

On 9/24/2003 at 8:37 AM Chris McCarty wrote:

>It looks like I spoke too soon. There was a 1979 memo from the Director  
>of OMB to Heads of Executive Departments that said:

>  
>  
>

>"It is expected that data collections based on statistical methods will  
>have a response rate of at least 75 percent. Proposed data collections  
>having an expected response rate of less than 75 percent require a  
>special justification....Proposed data collection activities having an  
>expected response rate of less than 50 percent will be disapproved."

>  
>  
>

>Apparently this is the source of the fixed levels cited by several  
>people. This text is not repeated in the Paperwork Reduction Act and so  
>is not currently used by the OMB as a gauge of data quality. They have  
>no set number that they use to determine data quality.

>  
>  
>

>chris

>  
>  
>

>Chris McCarty, Survey Director

>

>University of Florida Survey Research Center

>  
>Bureau of Economic and Business Research  
>  
>PO Box 117145  
>  
>University of Florida  
>  
>Gainesville, FL 32611-7145  
>  
>Phone: (352) 392-2908 x101  
>  
>FAX: (352) 392-4739  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>signoff aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2003 09:06:48 -0400  
Reply-To: Chris McCarty <[chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU](mailto:chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Chris McCarty <[chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU](mailto:chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: More on OMB guidelines  
Comments: To: Cynthia Nelson <[cnelson@NIU.EDU](mailto:cnelson@NIU.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

No, apparently they don't define how to calculate it. Also, I don't think it mentions a specific mode (mail, phone, face-to-face). I think these are among the reasons that OMB doesn't adhere to this as a guideline now.

chris

Chris McCarty, Survey Director  
University of Florida Survey Research Center  
Bureau of Economic and Business Research  
PO Box 117145  
University of Florida  
Gainesville, FL 32611-7145  
Phone: (352) 392-2908 x101  
FAX: (352) 392-4739

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

From: Cynthia Nelson [<mailto:cnelson@NIU.EDU>]=20

Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2003 8:00 AM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Re: More on OMB guidelines

Well, as this is an excerpt, and I wasn't wanting to track down the memo myself, I must ask: Do they define how they calculate the response rate? As everyone on this list knows, without that specification this expectation doesn't have much meaning.

Cynthia Nelson  
Center for Governmental Studies  
Northern Illinois University  
DeKalb, IL 60115  
Voice 815.753.1918  
Fax 815.753.2305  
email cnelson@niu.edu

\*\*\*\*\* REPLY SEPARATOR \*\*\*\*\*

On 9/24/2003 at 8:37 AM Chris McCarty wrote:

>It looks like I spoke too soon. There was a 1979 memo from the  
>Director  
>of OMB to Heads of Executive Departments that said:  
>  
>  
>  
>"It is expected that data collections based on statistical methods will  
>have a response rate of at least 75 percent. Proposed data collections  
>having an expected response rate of less than 75 percent require a  
>special justification....Proposed data collection activities having an  
>expected response rate of less than 50 percent will be disapproved."  
>  
>  
>  
>Apparently this is the source of the fixed levels cited by several  
>people. This text is not repeated in the Paperwork Reduction Act and  
>so  
>is not currently used by the OMB as a gauge of data quality. They have  
>no set number that they use to determine data quality.  
>  
>  
>  
>chris  
>  
>  
>  
>Chris McCarty, Survey Director  
>  
>University of Florida Survey Research Center

>  
>Bureau of Economic and Business Research  
>  
>PO Box 117145  
>  
>University of Florida  
>  
>Gainesville, FL 32611-7145  
>  
>Phone: (352) 392-2908 x101  
>  
>FAX: (352) 392-4739  
>  
>  
>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>signoff aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2003 09:29:07 -0500  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject: Positions Available  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Comments: cc: [achar001@umn.edu](mailto:achar001@umn.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The following three positions have just been added to the Jobs Listing =  
in the Member's Only Section of the AAPOR Home Page: [www.AAPOR.org](http://www.AAPOR.org) =20

## OPEN FACULTY POSITIONS

The University of Minnesota School of Journalism and Mass Communication =  
is pleased to invite applications and nominations for up to three (3) =  
new full-time, nine-month, tenure-track positions. Full descriptions of =  
the positions are at [www.sjmc.umn.edu](http://www.sjmc.umn.edu).

## Visual Journalism

We are seeking an outstanding colleague to extend departmental = curricular strengths in one or more of the following areas: electronic = journalism (television, radio and/or online), information graphics, = publication design and news editing. Research and scholarship may be in = areas such as communications law (constitutional or administrative), = media sociology, organizational and management studies, media ethics, = social and behavioral theory, media history, media effects, cultural = studies or media criticism. A research focus on new media is desired. = Rank: Assistant Professor.

## Strategic Communication

We are seeking an outstanding colleague extend departmental curricular = strengths in one or more of the following areas: creative strategy, = media analysis, campaign planning, public relations tactics, interactive = advertising, and campaign management. Research and scholarship in = strategic communications in communications law and regulation; = organizational and management studies; policy studies; social and = behavioral theory; audience measurement; economics; history; or = communication effects. Interest and capacity to contribute to teaching = and research related to new media is desired. Rank: Assistant Professor

## Journalism & Mass Communication=20

We are seeking an outstanding colleague to enhance departmental = curricular strengths in one or more of the following areas: electronic = journalism (television, radio and/or online), news editing or news = writing and reporting (general or specialized). Research and = scholarship may be in areas such as: communications law (constitutional = or administrative); media sociology; organizational, policy or = management studies; media ethics; social and behavioral theory; = journalism history; cultural studies or media criticism. Rank: = Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor

Applications will be reviewed beginning October 15, 2003, and will be = accepted until the position is filled.=20

Send applications to:

Chair, (Please specify which search you are apply for)=20  
School of Journalism and Mass Communication  
University of Minnesota  
111 Murphy Hall/206 Church Street S.E.  
Minneapolis, MN 55455-0418

The University of Minnesota is an equal opportunity educator and = employer. =20

Version B - Very Short (Listserv and Email) version.

The School of Journalism and Mass Communication in the College of = Liberal Arts at the University of Minnesota seeks to fill two tenure = track faculty positions and an open rank (tenured or tenure track) = faculty position. Candidates will hold the Ph.D., M.F.A. or other = appropriate terminal degree, and present a promising program of = scholarly research, a capacity to contribute to graduate and =

undergraduate teaching in visual journalism, strategic communication = and/or journalism and mass communication. Professional media experience = and an interest in new media are desired. The University of Minnesota is = an equal opportunity educator and employer. Visit [www.sjmc.umn.edu](http://www.sjmc.umn.edu) = <<http://www.sjmc.umn.edu>> for additional information.

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2003 11:53:09 -0400  
Reply-To: Stephanie Berg <[stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET](mailto:stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Stephanie Berg <[stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET](mailto:stephanie.berg@VERIZON.NET)>  
Subject: Courts Knock Down DNC List  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

[washingtonpost.com](http://www.washingtonpost.com)

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A57823-2003Sep24.html>  
Court Knocks Down 'Do Not Call' List

By Caroline E. Mayer  
Washington Post Staff Writer  
Wednesday, September 24, 2003; 11:40 AM

A U.S. District Court has knocked down the federal government's plan to curb unsolicited telemarketing calls through a national do-not-call list that was scheduled to start next week.

More than 50 million phone numbers have been posted to the anti-telemarketing registry; as of October 1, telemarketers were supposed to stop calling those numbers.

Judge Lee R. West in Oklahoma City issued a decision late Monday saying the Federal Trade Commission lacked authority to develop the list.

Although Congress gave the agency funding to run the list, it did not give the FTC specific authority to implement the list, West said. An administrative agency's power to regulate in the public interest must "always be grounded in a valid grant of authority from Congress," West said.

FTC spokeswoman Cathy MacFarlane said the agency was reviewing the court's ruling.

Telemarketing experts said the do-not-call list may not be able to go forward unless the agency wins on appeal or Congress specifically gives the agency authority to implement it.

The lawsuit challenging the do-not-call list was filed by the Direct Marketing Association, which represents many companies that telemarket. The association said in a statement that it was grateful for the judge's decision, but acknowledged "the wishes of millions of U.S. consumers who have expressed their preference not to receive telephone-marketing solicitatons." DMA said it would work with the FTC to evaluate the implications of the court decision.

© 2003 The Washington Post Company

---

Stephanie Berg  
Research Manager  
Network Solutions

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2003 12:05:51 -0400  
Reply-To: dick halpern <[dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET](mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: dick halpern <[dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET](mailto:dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET)>  
Subject: BREAKING NEWS: 'Do not call' list blocked  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Many people are beginning to turn on their answering machines and caller ID --and if the caller is not easily identifiable, they'll just hang up.

---

MSNBC Breaking News

---

A U.S. court in Oklahoma has blocked the national "do not call" list that would allow consumers to stop most unwanted telephone sales calls, the Direct Marketing Association said on Wednesday.

---

For more details: <http://www.msnbc.com>

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2003 09:18:31 -0700  
Reply-To: Fred Solop <[Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU](mailto:Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Fred Solop <[Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU](mailto:Fred.Solop@NAU.EDU)>

Subject: Court Blocks 'Do Not Call' List  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Breaking News: Do Not Call List Blocked

<http://www.msnbc.com/news/971221.asp>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2003 11:29:52 -0500  
Reply-To: Robert Godfrey <[rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU](mailto:rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Robert Godfrey <[rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU](mailto:rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU)>  
Subject: VerifiedVoting.org  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <p05210603bb7a9b38b232@[66.188.93.60]>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

VerifiedVoting.org was initiated by David L. Dill early in July of 2003. The web site grew out of his concern for the integrity of the election process. The mission of the website is threefold:

- \* To inform the public of the problems with relying on electronic voting machines to record and count our votes, without the backup of a voter-verifiable audit trail.

- \* To point to reasonable solutions that are within reach.

- \* To provide a list of actions voters can take, and to encourage them to act on their own behalf to ensure that all their votes count accurately in future elections.

David L. Dill is a Professor of Computer Science and, by courtesy, Electrical Engineering at Stanford University. He has been on the faculty at Stanford since 1987. He has an S.B. in Electrical Engineering and Computer Science from Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1979), and an M.S and Ph.D. from Carnegie-Mellon University (1982 and 1987).

His primary research interests relate to the theory and application of formal verification techniques to system designs, including hardware, protocols, and software. He has also done research in asynchronous circuit verification and synthesis, and in verification methods for hard real-time systems. He was the Chair of the Computer-Aided Verification Conference held at Stanford University in 1994. From July 1995 to September 1996, he was Chief Scientist at 0-In Design Automation.

Prof. Dill's Ph.D. thesis, "Trace Theory for Automatic Hierarchical Verification of Speed Independent Circuits" was named as a Distinguished



Dissertation by ACM , and published as such by M.I.T. Press in 1988. He was the recipient of an Presidential Young Investigator award from the National Science Foundation in 1988, and a Young Investigator award from the Office of Naval Research in 1991. He has received Best Paper awards at International Conference on Computer Design in 1991 and the Design Automation Conference in 1993 and 1998. He was named a Fellow of the IEEE in 2001 for his contributions to verification of circuits and systems.

Prof. David L. Dill Department of Computer Science Gates Building 3A  
Stanford, CA 94305-9030 Phone: (650) 725-3642 Fax: (650) 725-6949 Email:  
dill@cs.stanford.edu

Professor Dill's work has inspired many volunteers to add their time and talents to his in this effort to ensure the integrity of elections. VerifiedVoting.org is the result. We welcome your input and assistance.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2003 12:34:47 -0500  
Reply-To: Linda Owens <[lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU](mailto:lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Linda Owens <[lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU](mailto:lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU)>  
Subject: literature on restricted access buildings?  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-disposition: inline

Hello Everyone,  
Does anyone know of any literature focusing on conducting face to face =  
surveys in urban areas? I'm particularly interested in learning how =  
survey organizations have addressed the problems of restricted access =  
buildings.  
thank you=20

Linda Owens, Ph.D.  
Assistant Director  
University of Illinois Survey Research Lab  
505 E. Green St. Ste 3  
Champaign, IL 61820  
Phone: 217-333-4422  
Fax: 217-244-4408  
Email: [lindao@srl.uic.edu](mailto:lindao@srl.uic.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2003 14:47:37 -0400

Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>  
Subject: Wash Times - Suspicious numbers  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The Washington Times  
Inside Politics

By Greg Pierce  
<http://www.washtimes.com/national/inpolitics.htm>

### Suspicious numbers

"The press has been trumpeting a new CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll showing Wesley Clark beating President Bush, 49 percent to 46 percent," James Taranto writes in his Best of the Web Today column at [www.OpinionJournal.com](http://www.OpinionJournal.com).

"But a look at the poll results makes us suspicious. For one thing, it is a survey of '1,003 National Adults' - not registered voters or likely voters. Casting a net this wide tends to oversample Democratic voters, and sure enough, 480, or just under 48 percent, of those who answered the poll describe themselves as Democrats or 'Democrat-leaners.' That's just a percentage point less than the 49 percent Clark gets," Mr. Taranto said.

"What's more, only 52 percent of those polled have an opinion of Clark (39 percent favorable, 13 percent unfavorable), so this is almost the equivalent of a poll pitting Bush against an 'unnamed Democrat.' Will Clark wear well when Americans - or, for that matter, Democrats - get to know him?"

. Greg Pierce can be reached at 202/636-3285 or [gpierce@washingtontimes.com](mailto:gpierce@washingtontimes.com).

-----  
Mark David Richards

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

=====

Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2003 15:55:13 -0400  
Reply-To: John Gorman <[jgorman@OPINIONDYNAMICS.COM](mailto:jgorman@OPINIONDYNAMICS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: John Gorman <[jgorman@OPINIONDYNAMICS.COM](mailto:jgorman@OPINIONDYNAMICS.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Wash Times - Suspicious numbers  
Comments: To: [mark@bisconti.com](mailto:mark@bisconti.com), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The objection raised by the Times is not supported by the full press =  
release (below) which shows clear breakdowns among registered voters. =  
Whether Wesley Clark is a "generic Democrat" or an actual candidate is =  
irrelevant to the numbers at this point.

CNN/USA TODAY/GALLUP POLL

SEPTEMBER WAVE 1

-- FINAL TOPLINE --

Timberline: 139797

R: 515

Princeton Job #: 03-09-043

Jeff Jones, David Moore

September 19-21, 2003

Results are based on telephone interviews with -1,003-National Adults, =  
aged 18+, conducted September 19-21, 2003. For results based on the =  
total sample of National Adults, one can say with 95% confidence that =  
the margin of sampling error is =B13 percentage points.

For results based on the -519-national adults in the Form A half-sample =  
and -484-national adults in the Form B half-sample, the maximum margins =  
of sampling error are =B15 percentage points.

For results based on the sample of -877-adults who are registered to =  
vote, the maximum margin of sampling error is =B14 percentage points.

For results based on the sample of -480-Democrats and Democratic =  
leaners, the maximum margin of sampling error is =B15 percentage points.

For results based on the sample of -423-Democrats and Democratic leaners =  
who are registered to vote, the maximum margin of sampling error is =B15 =  
percentage points.

In addition to sampling error, question wording and practical =  
difficulties in conducting surveys can introduce error or bias into the =  
findings of public opinion polls.

ALL RESULTS FOR RELEASE ON MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 22 AT 4 PM

=20  
 First,=20

1. Do you approve or disapprove of the way George W. Bush is handling =  
 his job as president?

|                   | Approve | Dis-approve | No opinion | No opinion        | Approve | Dis- |
|-------------------|---------|-------------|------------|-------------------|---------|------|
|                   | approve | No opinion  |            |                   | approve | Dis- |
| 2003              |         |             |            |                   |         |      |
| 2003 Sep 19-21    | 50      | 47          | 3          | 2002 Nov 8-10     | 68      | 27   |
| 5                 |         |             |            | 2002 Oct 31-Nov 3 | 63      | 29   |
| 8                 |         |             |            |                   |         |      |
| 2003 Sep 8-10     | 52      | 43          | 5          | 2002 Oct 21-22    | 67      | 28   |
| 5                 |         |             |            |                   |         |      |
| 2003 Aug 25-26    | 59      | 37          | 4          | 2002 Oct 14-17    | 62      | 31   |
| 7                 |         |             |            |                   |         |      |
| 2003 Aug 4-6      | 60      | 36          | 4          | 2002 Oct 3-6      | 67      | 28   |
| 5                 |         |             |            |                   |         |      |
| 2003 Jul 25-27    | 58      | 38          | 4          | 2002 Sep 23-26    | 68      | 26   |
| 6                 |         |             |            |                   |         |      |
| 2003 Jul 18-20    | 59      | 38          | 3          | 2002 Sep 20-22    | 66      | 30   |
| 4                 |         |             |            |                   |         |      |
| 2003 Jul 7-9      | 62      | 34          | 4          | 2002 Sep 13-16    | 70      | 26   |
| 4                 |         |             |            |                   |         |      |
| 2003 Jun 27-29    | 61      | 36          | 3          | 2002 Sep 5-8      | 66      | 30   |
| 4                 |         |             |            |                   |         |      |
| 2003 Jun 12-15    | 63      | 33          | 4          | 2002 Sep 2-4      | 66      | 29   |
| 5                 |         |             |            |                   |         |      |
| 2003 Jun 9-10     | 62      | 34          | 4          | 2002 Aug 19-21    | 65      | 28   |
| 7                 |         |             |            |                   |         |      |
| 2003 May 30-Jun 1 | 64      | 32          | 4          | 2002 Aug 5-8      | 68      |      |
| 26                | 6       |             |            |                   |         |      |
| 2003 May 19-21    | 66      | 30          | 4          | 2002 Jul 29-31    | 71      | 23   |
| 6                 |         |             |            |                   |         |      |
| 2003 May 5-7      | 69      | 28          | 3          | 2002 Jul 26-28    | 69      | 26   |
| 5                 |         |             |            |                   |         |      |
| 2003 Apr 22-23    | 70      | 26          | 4          | 2002 Jul 22-24    | 69      | 24   |
| 7                 |         |             |            |                   |         |      |
| 2003 Apr 14-16    | 71      | 24          | 5          | 2002 Jul 9-11     | 73      | 21   |
| 6                 |         |             |            |                   |         |      |
| 2003 Apr 7-9      | 69      | 26          | 5          | 2002 Jul 5-8      | 76      | 18   |
| 6                 |         |             |            |                   |         |      |
| 2003 Apr 5-6      | 70      | 27          | 3          | 2002 Jun 28-30    | 76      | 19   |
| 5                 |         |             |            |                   |         |      |
| 2003 Mar 29-30    | 71      | 26          | 3          | 2002 Jun 21-23    | 73      | 21   |
| 6                 |         |             |            |                   |         |      |
| 2003 Mar 24-25    | 69      | 27          | 4          | 2002 Jun 17-19    | 74      | 20   |
| 6                 |         |             |            |                   |         |      |
| 2003 Mar 22-23    | 71      | 25          | 4          | 2002 Jun 7-8      | 74      | 18   |
| 8                 |         |             |            |                   |         |      |

|                           |                      |
|---------------------------|----------------------|
| 2003 Mar 14-15 58 38 4    | 2002 Jun 3-6 70 23   |
| 7                         |                      |
| 2003 Mar 3-5 57 37 6      | 2002 May 28-29 77 17 |
| 6                         |                      |
| 2003 Feb 24-26 57 37 6    | 2002 May 20-22 76 17 |
| 7                         |                      |
| 2003 Feb 17-19 58 37 5    | 2002 May 6-9 76 19   |
| 5                         |                      |
| 2003 Feb 7-9 61 34 5      | 2002 Apr 29-May 1 77 |
| 20 3                      |                      |
| 2003 Feb 3-6 59 35 6      | 2002 Apr 22-24 77 17 |
| 6                         |                      |
| 2003 Jan 31-Feb 2 61 35 4 | 2002 Apr 8-11 75     |
| 20 5                      |                      |
| 2003 Jan 23-25 60 36 4    | 2002 Apr 5-7 76 19   |
| 5                         |                      |
| 2003 Jan 20-22 58 36 6    | 2002 Mar 22-24 79 17 |
| 4                         |                      |
| 2003 Jan 13-16 61 34 5    | 2002 Mar 18-20 79 16 |
| 5                         |                      |
| 2003 Jan 10-12 58 37 5    | 2002 Mar 8-9 80 14   |
| 6                         |                      |
| 2003 Jan 3-5 63 32 5      | 2002 Mar 4-7 77 18   |
| 5                         |                      |
| 2002                      | 2002 Mar 1-3 81 14 5 |
| 2002 Dec 19-22 61 32 7    | 2002 Feb 8-10 82 14  |
| 4                         |                      |
| 2002 Dec 16-17 63 33 4    | 2002 Feb 4-6 82 14   |
| 4                         |                      |
| 2002 Dec 9-10 63 32 5     | 2002 Jan 25-27 84 13 |
| 3                         |                      |
| 2002 Dec 5-8 64 29 7      | 2002 Jan 11-14 83 13 |
| 4                         |                      |
| 2002 Nov 22-24 65 28 7    | 2002 Jan 7-9 84 12   |
| 4                         |                      |
| 2002 Nov 11-14 66 26 8    | =09                  |

=20

Q.1 (BUSH JOB APPROVAL) CONTINUED

|                   | Approve | Dis-approve | No opinion |
|-------------------|---------|-------------|------------|
|                   | =09     |             |            |
| 2001              | =09     |             |            |
| 2001 Dec 14-16 86 | 11      | 3           |            |
| 2001 Dec 6-9 86   | 10      | 4           |            |
| 2001 Nov 26-27 87 | 8       | 5           |            |
| 2001 Nov 8-11 87  | 9       | 4           |            |
| 2001 Nov 2-4 87   | 9       | 4           |            |
| 2001 Oct 19-21 88 | 9       | 3           |            |
| 2001 Oct 11-14 89 | 8       | 3           |            |
| 2001 Oct 5-6 87   | 10      | 3           |            |
| 2001 Sep 21-22 90 | 6       | 4           |            |
| 2001 Sep 14-15 86 | 10      | 4           |            |
| 2001 Sep 7-10 51  | 39      | 10          |            |

|                   |    |    |    |    |
|-------------------|----|----|----|----|
| 2001 Aug 24-26    | 55 | 36 | 9  |    |
| 2001 Aug 16-19    | 57 | 34 | 9  |    |
| 2001 Aug 10-12    | 57 | 35 | 8  |    |
| 2001 Aug 3-5      | 55 | 35 | 10 |    |
| 2001 Jul 19-22    | 56 | 33 | 11 |    |
| 2001 Jul 10-11    | 57 | 35 | 8  |    |
| 2001 Jun 28-Jul 1 |    | 52 | 34 | 14 |
| 2001 Jun 11-17    | 55 | 33 | 12 |    |
| 2001 Jun 8-10     | 55 | 35 | 10 |    |
| 2001 May 18-20    | 56 | 36 | 8  |    |
| 2001 May 10-14    | 56 | 31 | 13 |    |
| 2001 May 7-9      | 53 | 33 | 14 |    |
| 2001 Apr 20-22    | 62 | 29 | 9  |    |
| 2001 Apr 6-8      | 59 | 30 | 11 |    |
| 2001 Mar 26-28    | 53 | 29 | 18 |    |
| 2001 Mar 9-11     | 58 | 29 | 13 |    |
| 2001 Mar 5-7      | 63 | 22 | 15 |    |
| 2001 Feb 19-21    | 62 | 21 | 17 |    |
| 2001 Feb 9-11     | 57 | 25 | 18 |    |
| 2001 Feb 1-4      | 57 | 25 |    | 18 |

2. Do you [approve/disapprove] strongly or only moderately?

=09

|                | Strongly approve | Moderately approve | Moderately disapprove | No opinion |   |
|----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|------------|---|
| 2003 Sep 19-21 | 30               | 20                 | 15                    | 32         | 3 |
| 2001 Oct 5-6   | 60               | 27                 | 5                     | 5          | 3 |

=20  
Now turning to something else,

D7. PARTY IDENTIFICATION - FOR SCREENING PURPOSES ONLY  
D8. PARTY IDENTIFICATION - FOR SCREENING PURPOSES ONLY

3. Next, I'm going to read a list of people who may be running in the Democratic primary for president in the next election. After I read all the names, please tell me which of those candidates you would be most likely to support for the Democratic nomination for President in the year 2004. [ROTATED: Massachusetts Senator, John Kerry, Connecticut Senator, Joe Lieberman, North Carolina Senator, John Edwards, Missouri Congressman, Dick Gephardt, Florida Senator, Bob Graham, Former Vermont Governor, Howard Dean, the Reverend Al Sharpton, Ohio Congressman, Dennis Kucinich, Former Illinois Senator, Carol Moseley Braun, Retired General, Wesley Clark]

BASED ON -480-DEMOCRATS OR DEMOCRATIC LEANERS

BASED ON -457-DEMOCRATS OR DEMOCRATIC LEANERS WHO ARE REGISTERED TO VOTE

Clark Dean Kerry Lieb-erman Gep-hardt Sharp-ton  
 Ed-wards Gra-ham Braun =  
 Kuc-inich None/ other/ no opin.

=09

ALL DEMOCRATS/DEMOCRATIC LEANERS

|                   |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
|-------------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|
| 2003 Sep 19-21    | 21 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 9  | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| 3 2 17            |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
| 2003 Sep 8-10     | 9  | 13 | 11 | 12 | 15 | 3 | 5 | 5 |
| 5 2 20            |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
| 2003 Aug 25-26    | 2  | 11 | 9  | 23 | 13 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 4 1 22            |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
| 2003 Aug 4-6      | -- | 14 | 12 | 17 | 14 | 4 | 6 | 5 |
| 5 2 21            |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
| 2003 Jul 25-27    | -- | 10 | 16 | 20 | 14 | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| 6 2 16            |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
| 2003 Jun 12-18    | -- | 6  | 13 | 20 | 15 | 7 | 7 | 6 |
| 6 1 19            |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
| 2003 May 31-Jun 1 | -- | 5  | 16 | 21 | 14 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 4 3 3 20          |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
| 2003 Apr 22-23    | -- | 6  | 17 | 23 | 15 | 3 | 9 | 5 |
| 4 3 15            |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |

=09

DEMOCRATS/DEMOCRATIC LEANERS WHO ARE REGISTERED TO VOTE

|                   |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
|-------------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|
| 2003 Sep 19-21    | 22 | 13 | 11 | 10 | 11 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 3 2 16            |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
| 2003 Sep 8-10     | 10 | 14 | 12 | 13 | 16 | 2 | 5 | 5 |
| 4 2 17            |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
| 2003 Aug 25-26    | 2  | 12 | 10 | 23 | 13 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| 5 1 21            |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
| 2003 Aug 4-6      | -- | 15 | 12 | 18 | 15 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| 5 2 19            |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
| 2003 Jul 25-27    | -- | 11 | 15 | 21 | 16 | 5 | 6 | 4 |
| 6 2 14            |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
| 2003 Jun 12-18    | -- | 7  | 13 | 21 | 17 | 6 | 6 | 7 |
| 5 1 17            |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
| 2003 May 31-Jun 1 | -- | 5  | 17 | 20 | 14 | 7 | 7 | 6 |
| 4 4 2 21          |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |
| 2003 Apr 22-23    | -- | 6  | 18 | 22 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 5 |
| 4 3 15            |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |

=20

4. Who would be your second choice?

COMBINED RESPONSES (Q.3-4); Percentages total more than 100% due to = multiple responses

Clark Dean Kerry Lieb-erman Gep-hardt Sharp-ton  
 Ed-wards Gra-ham Braun =

Kuc-inich None/ other/ no opin.

=09  
ALL DEMOCRATS/DEMOCRATIC LEANERS  
2003 Sep 19-21 29 22 23 24 21 8 7 7  
8 4 15

=09  
DEMOCRATS/DEMOCRATIC LEANERS WHO ARE REGISTERED TO VOTE  
2003 Sep 19-21 29 24 23 22 23 7 7 7  
8 4 15

5. How closely have you been following the news about the candidates =  
running for the Democratic nomination for president-very closely, =  
somewhat closely, not too closely, or not at all?

BASED ON -480-DEMOCRATS OR DEMOCRATIC LEANERS

|  | Very closely | Somewhat closely | Not too closely | Not at all | Noopinion |
|--|--------------|------------------|-----------------|------------|-----------|
|  |              |                  |                 |            |           |
|  |              |                  |                 |            |           |
|  |              |                  |                 |            |           |
|  |              |                  |                 |            |           |
|  |              |                  |                 |            |           |

=20  
Next, we'd like you to think about the general election for President to =  
be held next year, that is in November 2004.

Q.6/6A-10/10A ROTATED

6. If retired General Wesley Clark were the Democratic Party's candidate =  
and George W. Bush were the Republican Party's candidate, who would you =  
be more likely to vote for - [ROTATED: Wesley Clark, the Democrat (or) =  
George W. Bush, the Republican]?

6A. As of today, do you lean more toward - [ROTATED: Clark, the Democrat =  
(or) Bush, the Republican]?

|  | Clark | Bush | Neither (vol.) | Other (vol.) | Noopinion |
|--|-------|------|----------------|--------------|-----------|
|  |       |      |                |              |           |
|  |       |      |                |              |           |
|  |       |      |                |              |           |
|  |       |      |                |              |           |
|  |       |      |                |              |           |

7. If former Vermont Governor Howard Dean were the Democratic Party's =  
candidate and George W. Bush were the Republican Party's candidate, who =  
would you be more likely to vote for - [ROTATED: Howard Dean, the =  
Democrat (or) George W. Bush, the Republican]?



7A. As of today, do you lean more toward - [ROTATED: Dean, the Democrat = (or) Bush, the Republican]?

|                   | Dean | Bush | Neither (vol.) | Other (vol.) | Noopinion |
|-------------------|------|------|----------------|--------------|-----------|
|                   |      |      |                |              | =09       |
| NATIONAL ADULTS   |      |      |                |              | =09       |
| 2003 Sep 19-21    | 45   | 49   | 3              | 1            | 2         |
|                   |      |      |                |              | =09       |
| REGISTERED VOTERS |      |      |                |              | =09       |
| 2003 Sep 19-21    | 46   | 49   | 2              | 1            | 2         |

8. If Missouri Congressman Dick Gephardt were the Democratic Party's = candidate and George W. Bush were the Republican Party's candidate, who = would you be more likely to vote for - [ROTATED: Dick Gephardt, the = Democrat (or) George W. Bush, the Republican]?

8A. As of today, do you lean more toward - [ROTATED: Gephardt, the = Democrat (or) Bush, the Republican]?

|                   | Gephardt | Bush | Neither (vol.) | Other (vol.) | Noopinion |
|-------------------|----------|------|----------------|--------------|-----------|
|                   |          |      |                |              | =09       |
| NATIONAL ADULTS   |          |      |                |              | =09       |
| 2003 Sep 19-21    | 45       | 49   | 3              | 1            | 2         |
|                   |          |      |                |              | =09       |
| REGISTERED VOTERS |          |      |                |              | =09       |
| 2003 Sep 19-21    | 46       | 48   | 3              | 1            | 2         |

=20

9. If Massachusetts Senator John Kerry were the Democratic Party's = candidate and George W. Bush were the Republican Party's candidate, who = would you be more likely to vote for - [ROTATED: John Kerry, the = Democrat (or) George W. Bush, the Republican]?

9A. As of today, do you lean more toward - [ROTATED: Kerry, the Democrat = (or) Bush, the Republican]?

|                   | Kerry | Bush | Neither (vol.) | Other (vol.) | Noopinion |
|-------------------|-------|------|----------------|--------------|-----------|
|                   |       |      |                |              | =09       |
| NATIONAL ADULTS   |       |      |                |              | =09       |
| 2003 Sep 19-21    | 47    | 48   | 2              | 1            | 2         |
|                   |       |      |                |              | =09       |
| REGISTERED VOTERS |       |      |                |              | =09       |
| 2003 Sep 19-21    | 48    | 47   | 2              | 1            | 2         |

10. If Connecticut Senator Joe Lieberman were the Democratic Party's = candidate and George W. Bush were the Republican Party's candidate, who = would you be more likely to vote for - [ROTATED: Joe Lieberman, the = Democrat (or) George W. Bush, the Republican]?

10A. As of today, do you lean more toward - [ROTATED: Lieberman, the = Democrat (or) Bush, the Republican]?

|  | Lieberman | Bush | Neither (vol.) | Other (vol.) | Noopinion |
|--|-----------|------|----------------|--------------|-----------|
|  |           |      |                |              | =09       |

NATIONAL ADULTS =09  
 2003 Sep 19-21 46 49 3 \* 2  
 =09

REGISTERED VOTERS =09  
 2003 Sep 19-21 47 48 3 \* 2  
 =20

11. Next, we'd like to get your overall opinion of some people in the news. As I read each name, please say if you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of these people -- or if you have never heard of them. First, ... How about... [RANDOM ORDER]

A. Dick Cheney

|                   | Favorable | Unfavorable | Never heard of | No opinion |
|-------------------|-----------|-------------|----------------|------------|
| 2003 Sep 19-21    | 54        | 36          | 3              | 7          |
| 2003 Jun 27-29 ^  | 54        | 34          | 3              | 9          |
| 2003 Jan 31-Feb 2 | 61        | 28          | 2              | 9          |
| 2002 Sep 23-26    | 65        | 24          | 4              | 7          |
| 2002 Jul 26-28    | 57        | 30          | 3              | 10         |
| 2002 Jan 11-14    | 67        | 20          | 3              | 10         |
| 2001 Apr 20-22    | 64        | 22          | 3              | 11         |
| 2001 Mar 5-7      | 63        | 18          | 5              | 14         |
| 2001 Jan 15-16    | 61        | 23          | 5              | 11         |
| 2000 Dec 15-17    | 61        | 23          | 6              | 10         |
| 2000 Dec 2-4      | 58        | 23          | 8              | 11         |
| 2000 Nov 13-15    | 51        | 22          | 9              | 18         |
| 2000 Nov 13-15    | 53        | 22          | 8              | 17         |
| 2000 Sep 15-17    | 46        | 24          | 8              | 22         |
| 2000 Aug 18-19    | 54        | 21          | 5              | 20         |
| 2000 Aug 4-5      | 48        | 21          | 9              | 22         |
| 2000 Jul 25-26    | 51        | 14          | 12             | 23         |
| 1994 Mar 28-30 ^  | 49        | 21          | 16             | 14         |

^ Asked of a half sample

? Based on 466 Republicans; Asked: "Former Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney."

B. Wesley Clark

|                | Favorable | Unfavorable | Never heard of | No opinion |
|----------------|-----------|-------------|----------------|------------|
| 2003 Sep 19-21 | 39        | 13          | 26             | 22         |

=20

Q.11 (FAVORABLES) CONTINUED

C. Hillary Rodham Clinton

|                | Favor-able | Unfavor-able | No opinion | Favor-able     |
|----------------|------------|--------------|------------|----------------|
| 2003           |            |              |            |                |
| 2003 Sep 19-21 | 54         | 40           | 6          |                |
|                |            |              |            | 1998           |
|                |            |              |            | =09            |
|                |            |              |            | 1998 Feb 13-15 |
|                |            |              |            | 60             |
|                |            |              |            | 36             |

|                  |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
|------------------|----|----|---|--|-------------------|----|----|---|--|
| 4                |    |    |   |  | 1998 Jan 30-Feb 1 | 64 | 34 |   |  |
| 2                |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 2003 Jun 27-29 ? | 52 | 44 | 4 |  | 1998 Jan 28 ^     | 61 |    |   |  |
| 34 5             |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 2003 Jun 9-10    | 53 | 43 | 4 |  | 1998 Jan 24-25    | 61 | 33 |   |  |
| 6                |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 2003 Mar 14-15   | 45 | 46 | 9 |  | 1997 =09          |    |    |   |  |
| 2002             |    |    |   |  | 1998 Jan 23-24    | 60 | 35 | 5 |  |
| 2002 Dec 16-17   | 48 | 46 | 6 |  | 1997 Dec 18-21    | 56 | 38 |   |  |
| 6                |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 2002 Sep 23-26   | 47 | 44 | 9 |  | 1997 Oct 27-29    | 61 | 34 |   |  |
| 5                |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 2001             |    |    |   |  | 1997 Jun 26-29    | 51 | 42 | 7 |  |
| 2001 Aug 3-5     | 51 | 44 | 5 |  | 1997 Feb 24-26    | 51 | 42 |   |  |
| 6                |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 2001 Mar 5-7     | 44 | 53 | 3 |  | 1997 Jan 31-Feb 2 | 55 |    |   |  |
| 39 6             |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 2001 Feb 19-21   | 49 | 44 | 7 |  | 1997 Jan 10-13    | 56 | 37 |   |  |
| 7                |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 2001 Feb 1-4     | 52 | 43 | 5 |  | 1996 =09          |    |    |   |  |
| 2000             |    |    |   |  | 1996 Oct 26-29 ?  | 49 | 43 |   |  |
| 8                |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 2000 Nov 13-15   | 56 | 39 | 5 |  | 1996 Aug 28-29 ?  | 51 |    |   |  |
| 41 8             |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 2000 Oct 25-28   | 52 | 43 | 5 |  | 1996 Aug 16-18 ?  | 47 |    |   |  |
| 48 5             |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 2000 Aug 4-5     | 45 | 50 | 5 |  | 1996 Aug 5-7 ?    | 48 | 45 |   |  |
| 7                |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 2000 Feb 4-6     | 55 | 39 | 6 |  | 1996 Jun 18-19    | 46 | 47 |   |  |
| 6                |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 1999             |    |    |   |  | 1996 Mar 15-17    | 47 | 48 | 5 |  |
| 1999 Dec 9-12    | 48 | 48 | 4 |  | 1996 Jan 12-15    | 43 | 51 |   |  |
| 6                |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 1999 Sep 23-26   | 56 | 40 | 4 |  | 1995 =09          |    |    |   |  |
| 1999 Aug 3-4     | 56 | 41 | 3 |  | 1995 Jul 7-9      | 50 | 44 |   |  |
| 6                |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 1999 Jul 22-25   | 62 | 35 | 3 |  | 1995 Mar 17-19    | 49 | 44 |   |  |
| 7                |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 1999 Jun 25-27   | 56 | 42 | 2 |  | 1995 Jan 16-18    | 50 | 44 |   |  |
| 6                |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 1999 Mar 5-7     | 65 | 31 | 4 |  | 1994 =09          |    |    |   |  |
| 1999 Feb 19-21   | 65 | 30 | 5 |  | 1994 Nov 28-29    | 50 | 44 |   |  |
| 6                |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 1999 Feb 4-8     | 66 | 31 | 3 |  | 1994 Sep 6-7      | 48 | 47 |   |  |
| 5                |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 1998             |    |    |   |  | 1994 Jul 15-17    | 48 | 46 | 6 |  |
| 1998 Dec 28-29   | 67 | 29 | 4 |  | 1994 Apr 22-24    | 56 | 40 |   |  |
| 4                |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 1998 Oct 9-12 ?  | 63 | 33 | 4 |  | 1994 Mar 25-27    | 52 | 42 |   |  |
| 6                |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 1998 Sep 14-15   | 61 | 33 | 6 |  | 1994 Mar 7-8      | 55 | 40 |   |  |
| 5                |    |    |   |  |                   |    |    |   |  |
| 1998 Aug 21-23   | 61 | 33 | 6 |  | 1994 Jan 15-17    | 57 | 36 |   |  |

|    |                |    |    |    |                |    |    |
|----|----------------|----|----|----|----------------|----|----|
| 7  | 1998 Aug 20 ^  | 60 | 30 | 10 | 1993 =09       |    |    |
|    | 1998 Aug 18 ^  | 64 | 29 | 7  | 1993 Nov 2-4   | 58 | 34 |
| 8  | 1998 Aug 10-12 | 60 | 36 | 4  | 1993 Sep 24-26 | 62 | 27 |
| 11 | 1998 Aug 7-8   | 60 | 35 | 5  | 1993 Aug 8-10  | 57 | 33 |
| 10 |                |    |    |    |                |    |    |

- ^ Based on a one night poll.
  - ? Based on likely voters.
  - ? Based on registered voters.
  - ? Asked of a half sample.
- 2002-March 2003 WORDING: New York Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton.

=20  
Q.11 (FAVORABLES) CONTINUED

D. Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld

|                | Favorable | Unfavorable | Never heard of | No opinion |
|----------------|-----------|-------------|----------------|------------|
|                | =09       |             |                |            |
| 2003 Sep 19-21 | 53        | 33          | 6              | 8          |
|                | =09       |             |                |            |
| 2003 Feb 7-9   | 58        | 20          | 10             | 12         |
| 2002 Sep 23-26 | 61        | 19          | 10             | 10         |
| 2002 Jul 26-28 | 67        | 15          | 9              | 9          |

E. Attorney General John Ashcroft

|                   | Favorable | Unfavorable | Never heard of | No opinion |
|-------------------|-----------|-------------|----------------|------------|
|                   | =09       |             |                |            |
| 2003 Sep 19-21    | 49        | 31          | 9              | 11         |
|                   | =09       |             |                |            |
| 2003 Jan 31-Feb 2 | 58        | 24          | 6              | 12         |
| 2001 Feb 1-4      | 38        | 31          | 13             | 18         |
| 2001 Jan 15-16 ^  | 34        | 28          | 17             | 21         |
|                   | =09       |             |                |            |

^ WORDING: Attorney General nominee John Ashcroft

Turning to another topic,

12. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree that George W. Bush has = the personality and leadership qualities a president should have.=20

|                | Agree | Disagree | No opinion |
|----------------|-------|----------|------------|
|                | =09   |          |            |
| 2003 Sep 19-21 | 59    | 40       | 1          |
|                | =09   |          |            |
| 2003 Jun 27-29 | 64    | 35       | 1          |
| 2002 Jan 25-27 | 79    | 19       | 2          |
| 2001 Aug 10-12 | 57    | 41       | 2          |
| 2001 Jun 8-10  | 54    | 42       | 4          |

2000 Aug 18-19 64 32 4  
 2000 Aug 11-12 65 28 7  
 2000 Aug 4-5 70 26 4  
 2000 Jul 25-26 62 32 6  
 2000 Apr 7-9 61 30 9  
 2000 Jan 17-19 65 28 7  
 =09

2000 WORDING: Please tell me whether you agree or disagree that [ROTATE: =  
 Al Gore/George Bush] has the personality and leadership qualities a =  
 president should have. How about...?

13. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with George W. Bush on =  
 the issues that matter most to you.

|                | Agree | Disagree | No opinion |
|----------------|-------|----------|------------|
| 2003 Sep 19-21 | 46    | 51       | 3          |
| 2003 Jun 27-29 | 53    | 46       | 1          |
| 2002 Jan 25-27 | 71    | 25       | 4          |
| 2001 Aug 10-12 | 52    | 42       | 6          |
| 2001 Jun 8-10  | 49    | 47       | 4          |

=09  
=20

17. Now I am going to read a list of some of the issues that will =  
 probably be discussed in next year's presidential election campaigns. =  
 As I read each one, please tell me how important the candidates' =  
 positions on that issue will be in influencing your vote for president =  
 -- extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not =  
 important. How about -- [RANDOM ORDER]?  
 =09

|                                       | Extremely important | Very important | Somewhat important | Not important | No opinion |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------|------------|
| 2003 Sep 19-21(sorted by "extremely") |                     |                |                    |               |            |
| The economy                           | 49                  | 42             | 9                  | *             | *          |
| Terrorism                             | 49                  | 38             | 11                 | 2             | *          |
| Creating American jobs ^              | 46                  | 45             | 8                  | 1             | *          |
| Protecting American jobs ^            | 46                  | 44             | 9                  | 1             | *          |
| The situation in Iraq                 | 46                  | 36             | 14                 | 4             | *          |
| Education                             | 45                  | 43             | 11                 | 1             | *          |
| Health Care                           | 43                  | 42             | 13                 | 2             | *          |
| The federal budget deficit            | 39                  | 35             | 23                 | 2             | 1          |
| Social Security                       | 36                  | 43             | 18                 | 3             | *          |
| Taxes                                 | 36                  | 41             | 20                 | 2             | 1          |
| Medicare                              | 36                  | 40             | 21                 | 3             | *          |
| Foreign Affairs                       | 31                  | 40             | 25                 | 3             | 1          |
| The environment                       | 30                  | 40             | 27                 | 3             | *          |
| Energy                                | 27                  | 44             | 26                 | 2             | 1          |
| Policies toward gays and lesbians     | 12                  | 16             | 31                 | 39            | 2          |

=09

^ Asked of a half sample. Protecting Americans jobs asked of 519 =  
 national adults in form A; Creating Americans jobs asked of 484 national =  
 adults in form B.

=20

Now, we'd like to ask you some questions about Iraq. First,

18. All in all, do you think the situation in Iraq was worth going to war over, or not?

|                    | Worth going to war | Not worth going to war | No opinion |
|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------|
| 2003 Sep 19-21     | 50                 | 48                     | 2          |
| 2003 Sep 8-10      | 58                 | 40                     | 2          |
| 2003 Aug 25-26     | 63                 | 35                     | 2          |
| 2003 Jul 25-27     | 63                 | 34                     | 3          |
| 2003 Jul 18-20     | 63                 | 35                     | 2          |
| 2003 Jun 27-29     | 56                 | 42                     | 2          |
| 2003 Apr 14-16 ^   | 73                 | 23                     | 4          |
| 2003 Apr 9 ^ ?     | 76                 | 19                     | 5          |
| 2003 Apr 7-8 ^     | 67                 | 30                     | 3          |
| 2003 Mar 24-25 ^ ? | 68                 | 29                     | 3          |
| 2003 Jan 3-5 ^ ?   | 53                 | 42                     | 5          |

^ WORDING: All in all, do you think the current situation in Iraq is worth going to war over, or not?

? Polls conducted entirely in one day, such as this one, are subject to additional error or bias not found in polls conducted over several days.  
? Asked of a half sample.

TRENDS FOR COMPARISON:

|                     | Worth going to war | Not worth going to war | No opinion |
|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------|
| 1998 Feb 20-22      | 57                 | 36                     | 7          |
| PERSIAN GULF WAR    |                    |                        |            |
| 1991 Jan 30-Feb 2 ^ | 71                 | 24                     | 5          |
| 1991 Jan 11-13 ?    | 46                 | 44                     | 10         |
| 1991 Jan 3-6 ?      | 47                 | 44                     | 9          |
| 1990 Dec 13-16 ?    | 49                 | 44                     | 7          |
| 1990 Dec 6-9 ?      | 47                 | 45                     | 8          |
| 1990 Nov 29-Dec 2 ? | 51                 | 41                     | 8          |
| 1990 Nov 15-18 ?    | 46                 | 45                     | 9          |
| 1990 Sep 27-30 ?    | 49                 | 41                     | 10         |
| 1990 Aug 30-Sep 2 ? | 45                 | 44                     | 11         |
| 1990 Aug 23-26 ?    | 49                 | 41                     | 10         |

^ All in all, do you think the situation in the Middle East involving Iraq and Kuwait is worth going to war over, or not?

? All in all, is the current situation in the Mideast worth going to war over, or not?

=20  
 19. Based on what you have heard or read about the events in Iraq over the past few weeks, do you think that for all intents and purposes, the war with Iraq is over, or not?

|                    | Yes, over | No, not | No opinion |
|--------------------|-----------|---------|------------|
| 2003 Sep 19-21     | 10        | 89      | 1          |
| 2003 May 5-7 ^ ?   | 41        | 58      | 1          |
| 2003 Apr 22-23 ^ ? | 36        | 63      | 1          |
| 2003 Apr 14-16     | 31        | 67      | 2          |
| 2003 Apr 9 ?       | 15        | 84      | 1          |

^ Asked of a half sample.  
 ? WORDING: Based on what you have heard or read about the events in Iraq

over the past few weeks, do you think that for all intents and purposes, the war with Iraq is over, or not?  
 ? WORDING: Based on what you have heard or read about the events in Baghdad today, do you think that for all intents and purposes, the war with Iraq is over, or not? (Polls conducted entirely in one day, such as this one, are subject to additional error or bias not found in polls conducted over several days.)

20. Do you think Saddam Hussein was personally involved in the September 11th terrorist attacks, or not?

|                  | Yes, was involved | No, was not | No opinion |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------|------------|
| 2003 Sep 19-21   | 43                | 50          | 7          |
| 2003 Mar 14-15 ^ | 51                | 41          | 8          |
| 2002 Aug 19-21 ^ | 53                | 34          | 13         |

^ Asked of a half sample.

21. Just your best guess, do you think Saddam Hussein is - [ROTATED: alive and personally directing the attacks against U.S. soldiers in Iraq, alive, but basically powerless to direct attacks against U.S. soldiers in Iraq, or do you think he is dead]?

|                | Alive, directing attacks | Alive, powerless | Dead | No opinion |
|----------------|--------------------------|------------------|------|------------|
| 2003 Sep 19-21 | 47                       | 42               | 7    | 4          |

=20  
 On another topic,

25. Which of these statements do you think best describes North Korea's military and weapons capabilities - [ROTATED: it is a crisis for the United States, it is a major problem but is not a crisis, it is a minor problem, (or) it is not a problem for the United States at all]?

Crisis Major problem Minor problem Not a problem at all  
No opinion

=09  
2003 Sep 19-21 22 59 14 4 1  
=09  
2003 Jan 3-5 14 60 19 5 2

Q.43-44 SPLIT SAMPLED

43. If the sponsors of a political debate announced they would give the questions in advance to all the candidates, would you consider this to be a valid debate or not? =20

BASED ON -519-NATIONAL ADULTS IN FORM A

Yes, valid No, not valid No opinion  
=09

2003 Sep 19-21 43 55 2

44. Which type of debate would you prefer to see candidates for political office engage in-[ROTATED: a debate where the candidates were not given the questions in advance (or) a debate where all the candidates were given the questions in advance by the debate sponsors]?

BASED ON -484-NATIONAL ADULTS IN FORM B

Not given questions Given questions Both (vol.) Neither (vol.)

=  
No opinion

=09  
2003 Sep 19-21 80 17 1 1 1

=20  
Next, =20

45. Are you currently paying more attention to - [ROTATED: news about the 2004 presidential election in which 10 Democrats are competing to oppose George W. Bush (or) news about the California recall election in which Arnold Schwarzenegger and others are competing to replace the state's governor]?

2004 presidential election California recall election  
Neither (vol.) =  
No opinion

=09  
2003 Sep 19-21 37 44 17 2



46. Some Democrats have charged that recent events such as the impeachment of Bill Clinton, the recall election in California, and the Florida recount following the 2000 presidential election are part of a Republican strategy to attempt to overturn the results of elections which don't go their way. Do you believe these charges to be true or not true?

|                | True | Not true | No opinion |
|----------------|------|----------|------------|
|                | =09  |          |            |
| 2003 Sep 19-21 | 38   | 58       | 4          |

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

From: Mark David Richards [mailto:mark@BISCONTI.COM]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2003 2:48 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Wash Times - Suspicious numbers

The Washington Times  
Inside Politics

By Greg Pierce  
<http://www.washtimes.com/national/inpolitics.htm>

Suspicious numbers

"The press has been trumpeting a new CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll showing Wesley Clark beating President Bush, 49 percent to 46 percent," James Taranto writes in his Best of the Web Today column at [www.OpinionJournal.com](http://www.OpinionJournal.com).

"But a look at the poll results makes us suspicious. For one thing, it is a survey of '1,003 National Adults' - not registered voters or likely voters. Casting a net this wide tends to oversample Democratic voters, and sure enough, 480, or just under 48 percent, of those who answered the poll describe themselves as Democrats or 'Democrat-leaners.' That's just a percentage point less than the 49 percent Clark gets," Mr. Taranto said.

"What's more, only 52 percent of those polled have an opinion of Clark (39 percent favorable, 13 percent unfavorable), so this is almost the equivalent of a poll pitting Bush against an 'unnamed Democrat.' Will Clark wear well when Americans - or, for that matter, Democrats - get to know him?"

. Greg Pierce can be reached at 202/636-3285 or [gpierce@washingtontimes.com](mailto:gpierce@washingtontimes.com).

-----  
Mark David Richards

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2003 16:34:02 -0400  
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Organization: Rider University  
Subject: Re: Wash Times - Suspicious numbers  
Comments: To: [mark@BISCONTI.COM](mailto:mark@BISCONTI.COM)  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Actually, this commentary raises an interesting question behind its obvious reasons for critiquing the poll. Do any of the polls at this point survey "registered voters" or "likely voters"? How does one define a registered, or especially a likely, voter 14 months or so before an election? Also, if what Pierce is saying is correct, what about the polls of a nationwide sample of adults that gave Bush such high approval ratings about four months ago. Should those be discounted also?

Frank Rusciano

Mark David Richards wrote:

- > The Washington Times
- > Inside Politics
- >
- > By Greg Pierce
- > <http://www.washtimes.com/national/inpolitics.htm>
- >
- > Suspicious numbers
- >
- > "The press has been trumpeting a new CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll
- > showing Wesley Clark beating President Bush, 49 percent to 46 percent,"
- > James Taranto writes in his Best of the Web Today column at
- > [www.OpinionJournal.com](http://www.OpinionJournal.com).
- >
- > "But a look at the poll results makes us suspicious. For one thing,
- > it is a survey of '1,003 National Adults' - not registered voters or
- > likely voters. Casting a net this wide tends to oversample Democratic
- > voters, and sure enough, 480, or just under 48 percent, of those who
- > answered the poll describe themselves as Democrats or
- > 'Democrat-leaners.' That's just a percentage point less than the 49
- > percent Clark gets," Mr. Taranto said.

>  
> "What's more, only 52 percent of those polled have an opinion of  
> Clark (39 percent favorable, 13 percent unfavorable), so this is almost  
> the equivalent of a poll pitting Bush against an 'unnamed Democrat.'  
> Will Clark wear well when Americans - or, for that matter, Democrats -  
> get to know him?"

>  
> . Greg Pierce can be reached at 202/636-3285 or  
> gpierce@washingtontimes.com.

> -----  
> Mark David Richards

>  
> -----

> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2003 13:54:13 -0700  
Reply-To: "Doherty, Joseph" <[Doherty@MAIL.LAW.UCLA.EDU](mailto:Doherty@MAIL.LAW.UCLA.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Doherty, Joseph" <[Doherty@MAIL.LAW.UCLA.EDU](mailto:Doherty@MAIL.LAW.UCLA.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Wash Times - Suspicious numbers  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

These poll numbers sound good to me. Both the 2000 and 2002 NES indicate that Dems and Dem Leaners comprise 49% of the electorate (43% Rep and Rep leaners).

-----Original Message-----  
From: Mark David Richards [<mailto:mark@BISCONTI.COM>]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2003 10:48 AM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Wash Times - Suspicious numbers

The Washington Times  
Inside Politics

By Greg Pierce  
<http://www.washtimes.com/national/inpolitics.htm>

Suspicious numbers

"The press has been trumpeting a new CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll showing Wesley Clark beating President Bush, 49 percent to 46 percent," James Taranto writes in his Best of the Web Today column at

www.OpinionJournal.com.

"But a look at the poll results makes us suspicious. For one thing, it is a survey of '1,003 National Adults' - not registered voters or likely voters. Casting a net this wide tends to oversample Democratic voters, and sure enough, 48, or just under 48 percent, of those who answered the poll describe themselves as Democrats or 'Democrat-leaners.' That's just a percentage point less than the 49 percent Clark gets," Mr. Taranto said.

"What's more, only 52 percent of those polled have an opinion of Clark (39 percent favorable, 13 percent unfavorable), so this is almost the equivalent of a poll pitting Bush against an 'unnamed Democrat.' Will Clark wear well when Americans - or, for that matter, Democrats - get to know him?"

. Greg Pierce can be reached at 202/636-3285 or  
gpierce@washingtontimes.com.

---

Mark David Richards

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text: signoff aapornet

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2003 17:01:22 -0400  
Reply-To: Phillip Downs <[pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM](mailto:pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Phillip Downs <[pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM](mailto:pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM)>  
Subject: Reporting Tense  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

We have always written survey results in the past tense because: 1) all data we report represent what we have found rather than what we are finding, and 2) using present tense (in my opinion) invariably leads to stilted sentences for some findings. I must admit I spend more time writing my own reports than I do reading others' reports. Am I out in left field with respect to tense? Interested in what you think. 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

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2003 17:52:23 -0400  
Reply-To: Nat Ehrlich <[nehrlich@UMICH.EDU](mailto:nehrlich@UMICH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nat Ehrlich <[nehrlich@UMICH.EDU](mailto:nehrlich@UMICH.EDU)>  
Subject: updated info for directory  
Comments: To: AAPOR <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>, [-info@goAMP.com](mailto:-info@goAMP.com)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Company name: Michigan State University Institute for Public Policy and  
Social Research

Michigan State University College of Social Science  
321 Berkey Hall  
East Lansing, MI 48824-1111

Work Phone: (517) 355-6672  
Home Phone: (734) 223-1019  
Fax: (517) 432-1544  
Email: [nehrlich@umich.edu](mailto:nehrlich@umich.edu)  
Nat Ehrlich

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2003 17:31:51 -0700  
Reply-To: Jennifer Franz <[jdfranz@earthlink.net](mailto:jdfranz@earthlink.net)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jennifer Franz <[jdfranz@JDFRANZ.COM](mailto:jdfranz@JDFRANZ.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Reporting Tense  
Comments: To: Phillip Downs <[pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM](mailto:pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM)>  
Comments: cc: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Phillip -

I too use the past tense, except in drawing conclusions. Respondents "said"  
something in the past. We infer from that in the present. I, too, write a  
lot of reports - and edit still more.

Jennifer

Jennifer D. Franz, Ph.D.  
President  
JD Franz Research, Inc.  
(916) 440-8777 Voice  
(916) 440-8787 Fax

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

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

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2003 2:01 PM

Subject: Reporting Tense

> We have always written survey results in the past tense because: 1) all  
> data  
> we report represent what we have found rather than what we are finding,  
> and  
> 2) using present tense (in my opinion) invariably leads to stilted  
> sentences  
> for some findings. I must admit I spend more time writing my own reports  
> than I do reading others' reports. Am I out in left field with respect to  
> tense? Interested in what you think. 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

>

> -----

> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet

>

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

signoff aapornet

---

Date: Wed, 24 Sep 2003 23:13:47 -0400

Reply-To: [NPSchiavone@AOL.COM](mailto:NPSchiavone@AOL.COM)

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

From: Nicholas Schiavone <[NPSchiavone@AOL.COM](mailto:NPSchiavone@AOL.COM)>

Subject: Finally, Emerson... Re: Manners,

Methodologies & Mistakes/ Re: OMB Gui delines

Comments: To: [Paul.Lavarakas@NielsenMedia.com](mailto:Paul.Lavarakas@NielsenMedia.com), [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

In a message dated 9/24/2003 8:17:10 AM Eastern Daylight Time,  
Paul.Lavrakas@NielsenMedia.com writes:  
Nick,

I'll assume that we've put this behind us, but that we may take up the  
issues of response rates and possible nonresponse bias between ourselves  
off-line.

Thanks, PJL

Paul,

I will happily share your assumption.

Certain words of Ralph Waldo Emerson have had particular resonance for me  
over the past 24 hours. Please permit me to share them with you and the  
witnesses to our exchange:

Finish each day and be done with it. You have done what you could;  
some blunders and absurdities have crept in; forget them as soon as you can.  
Tomorrow is a new day; you shall begin it serenely  
and with too high a spirit to be encumbered with your old nonsense.

Thank you.

Regards,  
NPS

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

=====

Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2003 00:06:31 -0400  
Reply-To: [andy@troll.soc.qc.edu](mailto:andy@troll.soc.qc.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
Subject: FW: [public-news-alert] \*\*\*REVISION #2 -- DISREGARD PREVIOUS\*\*\*  
CENSUS BUREAU NEWS --FACTS FOR FEATURES -- DIALING FOR DOLLARS  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Interesting and coincidental that this was released the day of the Don't  
Call List decision.

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

From: [public-news-alert-admin@lists.census.gov](mailto:public-news-alert-admin@lists.census.gov)  
[<mailto:public-news-alert-admin@lists.census.gov>]On Behalf Of  
[donna.e.tillery@census.gov](mailto:donna.e.tillery@census.gov)  
Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2003 5:15 PM

To: Census-Bureau-Alert@lists.census.gov;  
Public-News-Alert@lists.census.gov; newsdesk@usnewswire.com  
Subject: [public-news-alert] \*\*\*REVISION #2 -- DISREGARD PREVIOUS\*\*\*  
CENSUS BUREAU NEWS --FACTS FOR FEATURES -- DIALING FOR DOLLARS

CB03-FF.14SE

September 24 , 2003

\*REVISION 2 --DISREGARD PREVIOUS\*

i Special Edition i

Dialing for Dollars

Telemarketing

3,169

The number of telemarketing establishments in the United States in 1997.

<[http://www.census.gov/epcd/ec97/US\\_56.HTM](http://www.census.gov/epcd/ec97/US_56.HTM)>

5,250

The number of collection agencies in the United States in 1997.

Collection agencies are another source of pesky, dinnertime calls to people's homes.

<[http://www.census.gov/epcd/ec97/US\\_56.HTM](http://www.census.gov/epcd/ec97/US_56.HTM)>

\$8.2 billion

Sales by telemarketing firms, as reported in the 1997 Economic Census, the most current data available (data from the 2002 Economic Census currently are being processed.)

<[http://www.census.gov/epcd/ec97/US\\_56.HTM](http://www.census.gov/epcd/ec97/US_56.HTM)>

236,000

The number of people employed by the telemarketing industry in 1997.

<[http://www.census.gov/epcd/ec97/US\\_56.HTM](http://www.census.gov/epcd/ec97/US_56.HTM)>

\$3.5 billion

The annual payroll for employees in the telemarketing industry in 1997.

<[http://www.census.gov/epcd/ec97/US\\_56.HTM](http://www.census.gov/epcd/ec97/US_56.HTM)>

112 million

The number of residential telephone access lines in the United States in 2001.

<<http://www.census.gov/statab/www/>>, 2003 edition, Table 1149 (unpublished).

Phone Service

103 million

The number of the nation's households (98 percent) with telephone service in 2000. They consisted of 69 million homeowners and 34 million renters.

<<http://factfinder.census.gov>>, Census 2000 Summary File 3, Table H43.

99 percent

The proportion of all owner-occupied housing units that had telephone service in 2000.



<<http://factfinder.census.gov>>, Census 2000 Summary File 3, Table QT-H9.

540 billion

The number of interstate long-distance call minutes clocked by carriers in 2001.

<<http://www.census.gov/statab/www/>>, 2003 edition, Table 1149 (unpublished).

515 billion

The number of local calls originated in the United States in 2001.

<<http://www.census.gov/statab/www/>>, 2003 edition, Table 1149 (unpublished).

98 billion

The number of toll calls originated in the United States in 2001.

<<http://www.census.gov/statab/www/>>, 2003 edition, Table 1149 (unpublished).

\$914

The average annual expenditure by consumers on telephones in 2001. Blacks (\$1,024) spent much more than the average, while Hispanics (\$917) spent about the average. One-person consumer units spent \$620, while those with five or more people spent \$1,194.

<<http://www.census.gov/statab/www/>>, 2003 edition, Tables 678, 679 (unpublished).

1920

The first available census data on telephones, which showed 35 percent of households had access to a telephone, either in their homes or outside the residence (at work or in the home of a neighbor or relative, for example). The percentage didn't pass 50 percent until after World War II. The 1980 census was the first time the question on phones specified, "Do you have a telephone in your living quarters?"

<<http://www.census.gov/statab/www/>>, 1999 edition, Table 1440.

The following is a list of observances typically covered by the Census Bureau's Facts for Features series, which can be found at

<<http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/factsheets.html>>:

|                                             |                |
|---------------------------------------------|----------------|
| African American History Month (February)   | Back to School |
| (August)                                    |                |
| Valentine's Day (Feb. 14)                   | Labor Day      |
| (Sept. 1)                                   |                |
| Women's History Month (March)               | Grandparents   |
| Day (Sept. 14)                              |                |
| St. Patrick's Day (March 17)                | Hispanic       |
| Heritage Month (Sept. 15-Oct. 15)           |                |
| Asian Pacific American Heritage Month (May) | Halloween      |
| (Oct. 31)                                   |                |
| Older Americans Month (May)                 | American       |
| Indian/Alaska Native                        |                |
| Heritage                                    |                |



> Jennifer D. Franz, Ph.D.  
> President  
> JD Franz Research, Inc.  
> (916) 440-8777 Voice  
> (916) 440-8787 Fax  
> ----- Original Message -----  
> From: "Phillip Downs" <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>  
> To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
> Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2003 2:01 PM  
> Subject: Reporting Tense

>  
>> We have always written survey results in the past tense because: 1) all  
> data  
>> we report represent what we have found rather than what we are finding,  
> and  
>> 2) using present tense (in my opinion) invariably leads to stilted  
> sentences  
>> for some findings. I must admit I spend more time writing my own reports  
>> than I do reading others' reports. Am I out in left field with respect to  
>> tense? Interested in what you think. 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

>>  
>> -----  
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>> signoff aapornet

>>  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2003 10:45:22 -0400  
Reply-To: Sid Groeneman <[sid.grc@VERIZON.NET](mailto:sid.grc@VERIZON.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Sid Groeneman <[sid.grc@VERIZON.NET](mailto:sid.grc@VERIZON.NET)>  
Subject: Re: Reporting Tense  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[3F72F935.E4C78CCD@marketsharescorp.com](mailto:3F72F935.E4C78CCD@marketsharescorp.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0

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

My practice has been to use the past tense in the "detailed findings" section of the report because it often sounds more natural and the present tense in the Executive Summary to make the results come across as fresh (unless the survey is not reasonably current).

Sid

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

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nick Panagakis  
Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2003 10:19 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Reporting Tense

My preference has been present tense if the report is being written within a couple or a few days after interviewing is completed. "Say" is more appropriate and, I think, more compelling to the reader.

Nick.

Jennifer Franz wrote:

>  
> Phillip -  
>  
> I too use the past tense, except in drawing conclusions. Respondents "said"  
> something in the past. We infer from that in the present. I, too,  
> write a  
> lot of reports - and edit still more.  
>  
> Jennifer  
>  
> Jennifer D. Franz, Ph.D.  
> President  
> JD Franz Research, Inc.  
> (916) 440-8777 Voice  
> (916) 440-8787 Fax  
> ----- Original Message -----  
> From: "Phillip Downs" <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>  
> To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
> Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2003 2:01 PM  
> Subject: Reporting Tense  
>  
>> We have always written survey results in the past tense because: 1)  
all

> data  
>> we report represent what we have found rather than what we are  
finding,  
> and  
>> 2) using present tense (in my opinion) invariably leads to stilted  
> sentences  
>> for some findings. I must admit I spend more time writing my own  
reports  
>> than I do reading others' reports. Am I out in left field with  
respect to  
>> tense? Interested in what you think. 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

>>

>> -----

>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>> signoff aapornet

>>

>

> -----

> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2003 11:01:34 -0400  
Reply-To: Harry Wilson <[wilson@ROANOKE.EDU](mailto:wilson@ROANOKE.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Harry Wilson <[wilson@ROANOKE.EDU](mailto:wilson@ROANOKE.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Wash Times - Suspicious numbers  
Comments: To: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I agree that the issue of the "correct" population for pre-election polls  
conducted this far in advance of any election is open to at least some

debate. While I would be tempted to survey only registered voters, that would obviously exclude anyone who would register before the deadline.

Is that a greater problem than including many respondents who obviously won't vote? I assume that asking an intent to vote question this early would yield results that are likely to be invalid.

Returning to a recent and recurring thread--if we do separate breakdowns for general population, those registered to vote, likely voters, etc., then how do we advise journalists which set of numbers to report (assuming that time/space considerations won't permit reporting and explaining all breakdowns)?

The question of Presidential approval is more easily (I think) answered. That is almost always measured in general population surveys, so if we are consistent in that approach, then we are at least comparing apples to apples.

Beyond that, let me state the obvious. Opinion regarding Gen. Clark, positive or negative, is likely to be very transient because he is a largely unknown commodity. On the one hand, I understand why he must be included. On the other hand, I question what good is served by providing data that are likely to be so volatile. What do we or the public learn from this?

Harry Wilson

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

From: "Frank Rusciano" <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2003 4:34 PM

Subject: Re: Wash Times - Suspicious numbers

> Actually, this commentary raises an interesting question behind its obvious  
> reasons for critiquing the poll. Do any of the polls at this point survey  
> "registered voters" or "likely voters"? How does one define a registered,  
> or especially a likely, voter 14 months or so before an election? Also, if  
> what Pierce is saying is correct, what about the polls of a nationwide  
> sample of adults that gave Bush such high approval ratings about four  
> months ago. Should those be discounted also?  
>  
> Frank Rusciano  
>  
> Mark David Richards wrote:  
>  
>> The Washington Times  
>> Inside Politics

>>  
>> By Greg Pierce  
>> <http://www.washtimes.com/national/inpolitics.htm>  
>>  
>> Suspicious numbers  
>>  
>> "The press has been trumpeting a new CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll  
>> showing Wesley Clark beating President Bush, 49 percent to 46 percent,"  
>> James Taranto writes in his Best of the Web Today column at  
>> [www.OpinionJournal.com](http://www.OpinionJournal.com).  
>>  
>> "But a look at the poll results makes us suspicious. For one thing,  
>> it is a survey of '1,003 National Adults' - not registered voters or  
>> likely voters. Casting a net this wide tends to oversample Democratic  
>> voters, and sure enough, 480, or just under 48 percent, of those who  
>> answered the poll describe themselves as Democrats or  
>> 'Democrat-leaning.' That's just a percentage point less than the 49  
>> percent Clark gets," Mr. Taranto said.  
>>  
>> "What's more, only 52 percent of those polled have an opinion of  
>> Clark (39 percent favorable, 13 percent unfavorable), so this is almost  
>> the equivalent of a poll pitting Bush against an 'unnamed Democrat.'  
>> Will Clark wear well when Americans - or, for that matter, Democrats -  
>> get to know him?"  
>>  
>> . Greg Pierce can be reached at 202/636-3285 or  
>> [gpierce@washingtontimes.com](mailto:gpierce@washingtontimes.com).

>> -----  
>> Mark David Richards  
>>  
>> -----

>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>> signoff aapornet  
>

> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet  
>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
=====

Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2003 11:45:40 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Wash Times - Suspicious numbers  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <005a01c38375\$e9c59c00\$a9986fc7@WilsonHarry>

MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I would argue that at this stage of the campaign all the numbers are likely to be quite volatile. In fact, public opinion is by its very nature subject to rapid change which is why it is important to stress the snapshot nature of much of our findings.

We are looking at a national race where about a month ago 2/3s of the population could not name a single Democratic challenger.

If I was advising a reporter (now there's an unlikely occurrence) as to which numbers to report or writing a press release on a horse race I would probably stress the registered voters at this point.

A quick review of the actual Gallup press release at <http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr030924.asp> makes it look as if they agree with me (Whew!) The oft quoted numbers of 49% and 46% appear to be among registered voters. They also note in that press release that it is their first presidential match-up of the season, that Clark is not particularly well-known and that much can change between now and the first votes and caucuses.

--

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 Harry Wilson

> Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2003 11:02 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Wash Times - Suspicious numbers

>

> I agree that the issue of the "correct" population for pre-election polls

> conducted this far in advance of any election is open to at least some

> debate. While I would be tempted to survey only registered voters, that

> would obviously exclude anyone who would register before the deadline.

>

> Is that a greater problem than including many respondents who obviously

> won't vote? I assume that asking an intent to vote question this early

> would yield results that are likely to be invalid.

>

> Returning to a recent and recurring thread--if we do separate



breakdowns

> for  
> general population, those registered to vote, likely voters, etc.,  
then  
> how  
> do we advise journalists which set of numbers to report (assuming that  
> time/space considerations won't permit reporting and explaining all  
> breakdowns)?

>  
> The question of Presidential approval is more easily (I think)  
answered.

> That is almost always measured in general population surveys, so if we  
are

> consistent in that approach, then we are at least comparing apples to  
> apples.

>  
> Beyond that, let me state the obvious. Opinion regarding Gen. Clark,  
> positive or negative, is likely to be very transient because he is a  
> largely  
> unknown commodity. On the one hand, I understand why he must be  
included.

> On the other hand, I question what good is served by providing data  
that

> are  
> likely to be so volatile. What do we or the public learn from this?

>  
>  
> Harry Wilson

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> ----- Original Message -----  
> From: "Frank Rusciano" <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>  
> To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
> Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2003 4:34 PM  
> Subject: Re: Wash Times - Suspicious numbers

>  
>  
>> Actually, this commentary raises an interesting question behind its  
> obvious

>> reasons for critiquing the poll. Do any of the polls at this point  
> survey

>> "registered voters" or "likely voters"? How does one define a  
> registered,  
>> or especially a likely, voter 14 months or so before an election?

Also,  
> if  
>> what Pierce is saying is correct, what about the polls of a  
nationwide

>> sample of adults that gave Bush such high approval ratings about  
four

>> months ago. Should those be discounted also?  
>>

>> Frank Rusciano  
>>  
>> Mark David Richards wrote:  
>>  
>>> The Washington Times  
>>> Inside Politics  
>>>  
>>> By Greg Pierce  
>>> <http://www.washtimes.com/national/inpolitics.htm>  
>>>  
>>> Suspicious numbers  
>>>  
>>> "The press has been trumpeting a new CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll  
>>> showing Wesley Clark beating President Bush, 49 percent to 46  
> percent,"  
>>> James Taranto writes in his Best of the Web Today column at  
>>> [www.OpinionJournal.com](http://www.OpinionJournal.com).  
>>>  
>>> "But a look at the poll results makes us suspicious. For one  
> thing,  
>>> it is a survey of '1,003 National Adults' - not registered voters  
> or  
>>> likely voters. Casting a net this wide tends to oversample  
Democratic  
>>> voters, and sure enough, 480, or just under 48 percent, of those  
> who  
>>> answered the poll describe themselves as Democrats or  
>>> 'Democrat-leaners.' That's just a percentage point less than the  
> 49  
>>> percent Clark gets," Mr. Taranto said.  
>>>  
>>> "What's more, only 52 percent of those polled have an opinion  
> of  
>>> Clark (39 percent favorable, 13 percent unfavorable), so this is  
> almost  
>>> the equivalent of a poll pitting Bush against an 'unnamed  
Democrat.'  
>>> Will Clark wear well when Americans - or, for that matter,  
Democrats -  
>>> get to know him?"  
>>>  
>>> . Greg Pierce can be reached at 202/636-3285 or  
>>> [gpierce@washingtontimes.com](mailto:gpierce@washingtontimes.com).  
>>>  
>>> -----  
>>> Mark David Richards  
>>>  
>>> -----  
>>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>> signoff aapornet  
>>  
>> -----  
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>> signoff aapornet  
>>  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2003 11:39:42 -0400  
Reply-To: [JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM](mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <[JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM](mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Reporting Tense  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

We report in the present tense to indicate that opinions typically are reflective of an on-going state of mind. JAS

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

visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2003 11:52:01 -0500  
Reply-To: "Steen, Bob" <[steenb@FLEISHMAN.COM](mailto:steenb@FLEISHMAN.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Steen, Bob" <[steenb@FLEISHMAN.COM](mailto:steenb@FLEISHMAN.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Reporting Tense  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1

In executive summaries, I subtly use tense to imply my confidence in the results. I use present tense for results in which I have the greatest confidence and feel are generally applicable (reflect an on-going state

of mind). For findings which I want to treat with less confidence, I revert to the past tense referring to the survey results. I attempt to keep the same tense within a given paragraph. In Action Implications, I try to use the imperative tense as the lead for each point, backed up with present tense justification.

My biggest grammatical hassle is the distinction between passive and active voice. While the active voice is to be preferred in much writing, I get tired of "respondents say" or "people believe." In many cases the object of their attitudes are the focus of the narrative, not who said it.

Bob Steen  
Vice President  
Fleishman-Hillard Knowledge Solutions  
200 North Broadway  
St. Louis, MO 63102

314-982-1752

steenb@fleishman.com  
Fax: 314-982-9105

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

From: J. Ann Selzer [mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM]  
Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2003 10:40 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Reporting Tense

We report in the present tense to indicate that opinions typically are reflective of an on-going state of mind. JAS

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

visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text: signoff  
aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2003 12:56:26 -0500  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: Re: Reporting Tense  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

You bring up another style issue: "respondents say".

I believe that in virtually all cases "people say" ", "voters say" ",  
whomever, is preferable to "respondents say".

A sample of respondents, ostensibly, represents a population. What they  
say (or said) is descriptive of the entire \*population\* and is not  
limited to the sample.

Also, active voice is the better writing style for phone questionnaires.

Nick

"Steen, Bob" wrote:

>  
> In executive summaries, I subtly use tense to imply my confidence in the  
> results. I use present tense for results in which I have the greatest  
> confidence and feel are generally applicable (reflect an on-going state  
> of mind). For findings which I want to treat with less confidence, I  
> revert to the past tense referring to the survey results. I attempt to  
> keep the same tense within a given paragraph. In Action Implications, I  
> try to use the imperative tense as the lead for each point, backed up  
> with present tense justification.

>  
> My biggest grammatical hassle is the distinction between passive and  
> active voice. While the active voice is to be preferred in much writing,  
> I get tired of "respondents say" or "people believe." In many cases the  
> object of their attitudes are the focus of the narrative, not who said  
> it.

>  
> Bob Steen  
> Vice President  
> Fleishman-Hillard Knowledge Solutions  
> 200 North Broadway  
> St. Louis, MO 63102  
>  
> 314-982-1752  
>  
> steenb@fleishman.com  
> Fax: 314-982-9105  
>

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

> From: J. Ann Selzer [mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM]  
> Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2003 10:40 AM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: Reporting Tense  
>  
> We report in the present tense to indicate that opinions typically are  
> reflective of an on-going state of mind. 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>  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text: signoff  
> aapornet  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2003 14:50:45 -0400  
Reply-To: [nancybelden@brspoll.com](mailto:nancybelden@brspoll.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nancy Belden <[nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM](mailto:nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM)>  
Subject: DO NOT CALL PRESS -- URGENT REQUEST FOR HELP  
Comments: To: "AAPORNet (E-mail)" <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
Comments: cc: "Susan B. Oliver (E-mail)" <[susan.b.oliver@verizon.net](mailto:susan.b.oliver@verizon.net)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear AAPOR members:

Attached you will find a press release about the DNC registry, as well as the Council's statement in support of it. We had planned to release our statement for October 1 -- the date the registry was to kick in -- but obviously events overtook us. So we have scurried around to amend the idea from "AAPOR applauds the establishment" to "AAPOR urges Congress to get things back on track."

Many of you have expressed an interest in this, and we would like to ask you

to take it upon yourself to push our story in your local media market. Feel free to use these materials to:

send the press release to local reporters, editors, producers,  
make telephone calls to them,  
get yourself on the air and in print,  
send reporters to our press person Susan Oliver (see the release,  
703-796-0777),  
whatever --

making the point that survey researchers believe a DNC registry is a great idea (see fuller rationale in the statement). The time is now to try to get our message out in follow up stories.

And please let us know of any successes you have. If you have questions about overlap, please call Susan (703-796-0777). Thank you! Nancy

Nancy Belden

AAPOR Vice President/Pres. Elect

Belden Russonello & Stewart  
1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036

202.822.6090

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2003 15:30:33 -0400  
Reply-To: [nancybelden@brspoll.com](mailto:nancybelden@brspoll.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nancy Belden <[nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM](mailto:nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM)>  
Subject: DNC attachments  
Comments: To: "AAPORNet (E-mail)" <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Sorry folks that my earlier email was incomplete. AAPORnet doesn't support attachments, so the press release and statement are copied in below:

Nancy Belden  
Belden Russonello & Stewart  
1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036

202.822.6090

PRESS RELEASE

Editors Note: Nationally known polling experts such as Andy Kohut of the The Pew Research Center for People and the Press, AAPOR President Betsy Martin, and Bob Blendon of Harvard University are available for interviews.

Contact: Susan Oliver, 703-796-0777.

Contact: Susan Oliver 703-796-0777  
For Immediate Release

susan.b.oliver@verizon.net

## RESEARCH COMMUNITY URGES REINSTATEMENT OF “DO NOT CALL” LIST

### Decrease in Telemarketing Will Lead to More Informed Research

September 25, 2003 – Washington, D.C. – The American Association for Public Opinion Research ([www.AAPOR.org](http://www.AAPOR.org)) today decried a federal judge’s decision to halt implementation of the new national Do Not Call registry.

“We hope this ruling will be overturned right away,” said Betsy Martin, President of AAPOR. “The registry will be a benefit for the American people and a valuable reform that will promote more active participation in important survey research.”

The Do Not Call registry, which was planned for implementation on October 1, would allow people to become part of a national listing of those who do not want to receive unsolicited telemarketing phone calls. Telemarketers would not be allowed to call anyone who has asked to be in the registry, but legitimate survey research calls to all households would continue to be legal.

“The vast majority of unsolicited calls that people receive at home are from telemarketers, not pollsters,” said Betsy Martin, president of AAPOR, the nation’s primary professional organization of public opinion researchers. “Yet, the public’s frustration over telemarketing and the frequent confusion with research calls threaten our ability to conduct high quality surveys,” she added. “Excessive telemarketing phone calls make it difficult for survey researchers to report on important trends in American life.”

Troubling researchers is a recent Harris Interactive survey showing that at least 42 percent of the public is unaware of the distinction between calls allowed under the proposed registry and those that are exempt. According to the Federal Trade Commission Web site, a call intended for the sole purpose of conducting a survey would be allowed.

Martin said, “Our democracy relies on an informed public, and much of that information comes from surveys. Society needs survey research to enable government, the news media, business, and social service organizations to understand the experiences, views, and needs of the nation in critical areas of health, the economy, security, politics and much more.”



Telephone interviews allow researchers to conduct surveys about unemployment and jobs, health insurance coverage, childhood immunization, war, elections, products and many other areas critical to the American people.

Founded in 1947, AAPOR is an organization of over 1,800 professionals from government agencies, colleges and universities, non-profit organizations, the media and commercial polling firms who are engaged or interested in public opinion and survey research.

# # #

## AAPOR STATEMENT OF SUPPORT FOR The National Do Not Call Registry

Thursday, September 25, 2003

The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) urges Congress to take action to enact the National Do Not Call (DNC) Registry, and urges its members and the public at large who wish to reduce the number of unsolicited telemarketing calls they receive to join the Registry.

Why does AAPOR support the DNC Registry?

AAPOR supports the DNC Registry for the following reasons:

- a.. The vast majority of unsolicited calls people receive at home are from telemarketers. Surveys make up only a very small fraction of such calls.
- b.. The generally negative reaction elicited by such telemarketing calls affects the ability of the survey profession to conduct high quality telephone surveys of the American public.
- c.. Legitimate surveys are exempt from the DNC Registry. Callers purporting to take a survey, but also offering to sell goods or services must comply with the Registry.

The fact that over 40 million telephone numbers have been registered with the DNC Registry is evidence of the public's frustration with the number of telemarketing calls they receive and with the persistence of the callers. AAPOR's view is that in their efforts to avoid telemarketing calls, consumers are hanging up or screening out all unsolicited calls, including legitimate survey requests. By signing up on the DNC Registry, the public would be able to dramatically reduce the number of unsolicited calls they receive. If so, the requests made by survey researchers will receive a more sympathetic hearing.

Are Surveys Exempt from the Do Not Call Registry?

Yes. To quote from the Federal Trade Commissions website: “If the call is really for the sole purpose of conducting a survey, it is not covered. Only telemarketing calls are covered – that is, calls that solicit sales of goods or services. Callers purporting to take a survey, but also offering to sell goods or services, must comply with the National Do Not Call Registry.”

What is the difference between a survey call and a telemarketing call?

How can one tell a legitimate survey from a sales call? What questions should one ask the caller to determine whether this is a survey (exempt from the DNC Registry) or a sales call (which may be in violation of the Registry)? The goal of most telephone surveys is to seek information about people’s opinions and behavior. These could be on any number of topics, ranging from the cost of health care, to the President’s job performance, to breakfast cereal. The goal of a telemarketing call is to sell something.

Here are some of the ways to tell the difference:

- a.. A survey interviewer will never ask for money or a commitment to purchase any product or service.
- b.. Survey interviewers should explain where they are calling from, and should provide on request a way for you to verify their legitimacy, whether this is a toll-free number for you to call, a website or a mailing address.
- c.. Surveys are voluntary, and while survey interviewers may try to convince you of the importance of your participation in the survey, they should not coerce you to do the surveys. Even if you agree to do the survey, you may choose not to answer any of the individual questions.
- d.. Survey interviewers should offer to call back at a time more convenient to you. Many survey calls are made at dinner time, as this is the best time to reach people at home. But interviewers should always be willing to call back when it suits you.

All AAPOR members are required to adhere to a code of professional ethics and practices. The cooperation of the public is essential to the conduct of surveys, and AAPOR members respect respondents and value their contributions to knowledge of our society. For more information on AAPOR, visit [www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org).

Why should one participate in surveys?

Surveys play an important role in a democratic society. Government agencies routinely conduct or sponsor surveys to collect information of vital importance to the smooth operation of government, ranging from unemployment statistics, to consumer prices, to crime and health issues affecting the American public. Academic and not-for-profit organizations conduct surveys to improve our understanding of how society works, and to explore issues of importance to social scientists. Media organizations conduct surveys to elicit the public’s views on a wide range of contemporary issues of interest to policy-makers and the public alike. Market researchers use surveys for a similarly wide range of purposes, ranging from lifestyle and attitude measurement to reactions to new products, pricing, promotion, and so on. The survey profession covers a wide range of topics and issues, and the information is widely used at all levels of society.

What is AAPOR?

The American Association for Public Opinion Research is the primary professional association representing public opinion researchers, and has a strong interest in protecting and strengthening the credibility of survey research. Founded in 1947, AAPOR is an organization of over 1,800 professionals from government agencies, colleges and universities, non-profit organizations, and commercial polling firms who are engaged or interested in public opinion and survey research.

American Association for Public Opinion Research  
P. O. Box 14263  
Lenexa, KS 66285-4263  
(913) 310-0118  
FAX: (913) 599-5340  
E-mail: AAPOR-info@goAMP.com

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
=====

Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2003 16:27:42 -0400  
Reply-To: [lmcgill@PRINCETON.EDU](mailto:lmcgill@PRINCETON.EDU)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Lawrence McGill <[lmcgill@PRINCETON.EDU](mailto:lmcgill@PRINCETON.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: DNC attachments  
Comments: To: [nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM](mailto:nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM)  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

It appears that events may have overtaken us once again. The AP reports that...

"The House approved legislation Thursday [today] aimed at ensuring the national "do-not-call" list goes into effect as scheduled next week so consumers can block many unwanted telemarketing sales pitches.

The House voted 412-8 after less than hour of debate. Lawmakers from both parties uniformly blasted a decision by U.S. District Judge Lee R. West, who ruled Tuesday that the Federal Trade Commission lacked authority to create and operate the registry."

Larry McGill

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

From: Nancy Belden <[nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM](mailto:nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM)>

Date: Thursday, September 25, 2003 3:30 pm  
Subject: DNC attachments

> Sorry folks that my earlier email was incomplete. AAPORnet  
> doesn't support  
> attachments, so the press release and statement are copied in below:  
> Nancy Belden  
> Belden Russonello & Stewart  
> 1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700  
> Washington, DC 20036  
>  
> 202.822.6090  
>  
>

> PRESS RELEASE  
>

> Editors Note: Nationally known polling experts such as Andy Kohut  
> of the  
> The Pew Research Center for People and the Press, AAPOR President  
> BetsyMartin, and Bob Blendon of Harvard University are available  
> for interviews.  
>

> Contact: Susan Oliver, 703-796-0777.  
>

> Contact: Susan Oliver 703-796-0777

> For Immediate Release  
>

> susan.b.oliver@verizon.net  
>

> RESEARCH COMMUNITY URGES REINSTATEMENT OF 'DO NOT CALL'; LIST  
>

> Decrease in Telemarketing Will Lead to More Informed Research  
>

> September 25, 2003 ; Washington, D.C. ; The American Association  
> for Public

> Opinion Research (www.AAPOR.org) today decried a federal judge's

> decision to

> halt implementation of the new national Do Not Call registry.  
>

> 'We hope this ruling will be overturned right away,' said Betsy

> Martin, President of AAPOR. 'The registry will be a benefit for

> the American people

> and a valuable reform that will promote more active participation in

> important survey research.'  
>

> The Do Not Call registry, which was planned for implementation on

> October 1, would allow people to become part of a national listing

> of those who do

> not want to receive unsolicited telemarketing phone calls.

> Telemarketers would not be allowed to call anyone who has asked to

> be in the registry, but

> legitimate survey research calls to all households would continue

> to be

> legal.

>  
>  
> &#147;The vast majority of unsolicited calls that people receive at  
> home are from  
> telemarketers, not pollsters,&#148; said Betsy Martin, president of  
> AAPOR, the  
> nation&#146;s primary professional organization of public opinion  
> researchers.&#147;Yet, the public&#146;s frustration over telemarketing and  
> the frequent confusion  
> with research calls threaten our ability to conduct high quality  
> surveys,&#148;she added. &#147;Excessive telemarketing phone calls make it  
> difficult for  
> survey researchers to report on important trends in American life.&#148;  
>  
> Troubling researchers is a recent Harris Interactive survey  
> showing that at  
> least 42 percent of the public is unaware of the distinction  
> between calls  
> allowed under the proposed registry and those that are exempt.  
> According to the Federal Trade Commission Web site, a call intended  
> for the sole  
> purpose of conducting a survey would be allowed.  
>  
> Martin said, &#147;Our democracy relies on an informed public, and  
> much of that  
> information comes from surveys. Society needs survey research to  
> enable government, the news media, business, and social service  
> organizations to  
> understand the experiences, views, and needs of the nation in  
> critical areas  
> of health, the economy, security, politics and much more.&#148;  
>  
>  
> Telephone interviews allow researchers to conduct surveys about  
> unemployment and jobs, health insurance coverage, childhood  
> immunization, war, elections,  
> products and many other areas critical to the American people.  
>  
> Founded in 1947, AAPOR is an organization of over 1,800  
> professionals from  
> government agencies, colleges and universities, non-profit  
> organizations, the media and commercial polling firms who are  
> engaged or interested in  
> public opinion and survey research.  
>  
> # # #  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

>  
> AAPOR STATEMENT OF SUPPORT FOR The National Do Not Call Registry

>  
>  
> Thursday, September 25, 2003

>  
>  
>  
> The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)  
> urges Congress  
> to take action to enact the National Do Not Call (DNC) Registry,  
> and urges  
> its members and the public at large who wish to reduce the number of  
> unsolicited telemarketing calls they receive to join the Registry.

>  
> Why does AAPOR support the DNC Registry?

>  
> AAPOR supports the DNC Registry for the following reasons:

>  
> a.. The vast majority of unsolicited calls people receive at  
> home are from  
> telemarketers. Surveys make up only a very small fraction of such  
> calls. b.. The generally negative reaction elicited by such  
> telemarketing calls  
> affects the ability of the survey profession to conduct high quality  
> telephone surveys of the American public.  
> c.. Legitimate surveys are exempt from the DNC Registry. Callers  
> purporting to take a survey, but also offering to sell goods or  
> services must comply with the Registry.

>  
> The fact that over 40 million telephone numbers have been  
> registered with  
> the DNC Registry is evidence of the public's frustration with the  
> number of  
> telemarketing calls they receive and with the persistence of the  
> callers. AAPOR's view is that in their efforts to avoid  
> telemarketing calls,  
> consumers are hanging up or screening out all unsolicited calls,  
> including legitimate survey requests. By signing up on the DNC  
> Registry, the public  
> would be able to dramatically reduce the number of unsolicited  
> calls they  
> receive. If so, the requests made by survey researchers will  
> receive a more  
> sympathetic hearing.

> Are Surveys Exempt from the Do Not Call Registry?

>  
> Yes. To quote from the Federal Trade Commissions website: "If  
> the call is  
> really for the sole purpose of conducting a survey, it is not  
> covered. Only  
> telemarketing calls are covered"; that is, calls that solicit  
> sales of goods  
> or services. Callers purporting to take a survey, but also

- > offering to sell
- > goods or services, must comply with the National Do Not Call Registry.
- > What is the difference between a survey call and a telemarketing call?
- > How can one tell a legitimate survey from a sales call? What questions should one ask the caller to determine whether this is a survey (exempt from the DNC Registry) or a sales call (which may be in violation of the Registry)? The goal of most telephone surveys is to seek information about people's opinions and behavior. These could be on any number of topics, ranging from the cost of health care, to the President's job performance, to breakfast cereal. The goal of a telemarketing call is to sell something.
- > Here are some of the ways to tell the difference:
- >
- > a.. A survey interviewer will never ask for money or a commitment to purchase any product or service.
- > b.. Survey interviewers should explain where they are calling from, and should provide on request a way for you to verify their legitimacy, whether this is a toll-free number for you to call, a website or a mailing address.
- > c.. Surveys are voluntary, and while survey interviewers may try to convince you of the importance of your participation in the survey, they should not coerce you to do the surveys. Even if you agree to do the survey, you may choose not to answer any of the individual questions.
- > d.. Survey interviewers should offer to call back at a time more convenient to you. Many survey calls are made at dinner time, as this is the best time to reach people at home. But interviewers should always be willing to call back when it suits you.
- > All AAPOR members are required to adhere to a code of professional ethics and practices. The cooperation of the public is essential to the conduct of surveys, and AAPOR members respect respondents and value their contribution to knowledge of our society. For more information on AAPOR, visit [www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org).
- >
- > Why should one participate in surveys?
- >
- > Surveys play an important role in a democratic society.
- > Government agencies routinely conduct or sponsor surveys to collect information of vital importance to the smooth operation of government, ranging from unemployment statistics, to consumer prices, to crime and health issues affecting the

> American public. Academic and not-for-profit organizations  
> conduct surveys  
> to improve our understanding of how society works, and to explore  
> issues of  
> importance to social scientists. Media organizations conduct  
> surveys to  
> elicit the public's views on a wide range of contemporary issues  
> of interest  
> to policy-makers and the public alike. Market researchers use  
> surveys for a  
> similarly wide range of purposes, ranging from lifestyle and attitude  
> measurement to reactions to new products, pricing, promotion, and  
> so on.  
> The survey profession covers a wide range of topics and issues,  
> and the  
> information is widely used at all levels of society.

>

> What is AAPOR?

>

> The American Association for Public Opinion Research is the primary  
> professional association representing public opinion researchers,  
> and has a  
> strong interest in protecting and strengthening the credibility of  
> surveyresearch. Founded in 1947, AAPOR is an organization of over  
> 1,800professionals from government agencies, colleges and  
> universities,non-profit organizations, and commercial polling  
> firms who are engaged or  
> interested in public opinion and survey research.

>

> American Association for Public Opinion Research

> P. O. Box 14263

> Lenexa, KS 66285-4263

> (913) 310-0118

> FAX: (913) 599-5340

> E-mail: AAPOR-info@goAMP.com

>

>

>

>

> -----

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

> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

> signoff aapornet

>

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2003 16:47:53 -0400

Reply-To: [nancybelden@brspoll.com](mailto:nancybelden@brspoll.com)

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

From: Nancy Belden <[nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM](mailto:nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM)>

Subject: Re: DNC attachments



Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Comments: cc: "Susan B. Oliver (E-mail)" <susan.b.oliver@verizon.net>  
In-Reply-To: <1a60b571a5f943.1a5f9431a60b57@Princeton.EDU>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The original intent of our press relations around the DNC registry was and remains getting out our message: that survey research is exempt and that we think the registry is a great thing.

Thus -- It is great news that Congress has already acted to get the registry to go forward AND we can all continue to try to be a part of the media as it goes into effect (October 1 or whenever) -- exactly what we had planned before the judge's ruling threw us a curve this week.

Let's celebrate and keep up the drum beat.

Nancy Belden  
Belden Russonello & Stewart  
1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036

202.822.6090

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

From: lmcgill@Princeton.EDU [mailto:lmcgill@Princeton.EDU]  
Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2003 4:28 PM  
To: nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM  
Cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: DNC attachments

It appears that events may have overtaken us once again. The AP reports that...

"The House approved legislation Thursday [today] aimed at ensuring the national "do-not-call" list goes into effect as scheduled next week so consumers can block many unwanted telemarketing sales pitches.

The House voted 412-8 after less than hour of debate. Lawmakers from both parties uniformly blasted a decision by U.S. District Judge Lee R. West, who ruled Tuesday that the Federal Trade Commission lacked authority to create and operate the registry."

Larry McGill

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

From: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>  
Date: Thursday, September 25, 2003 3:30 pm  
Subject: DNC attachments

> Sorry folks that my earlier email was incomplete. AAPORnet  
> doesn't support  
> attachments, so the press release and statement are copied in below:  
> Nancy Belden  
> Belden Russonello & Stewart  
> 1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700  
> Washington, DC 20036

>  
> 202.822.6090

>  
>  
> PRESS RELEASE

>  
> Editors Note: Nationally known polling experts such as Andy Kohut  
> of the  
> The Pew Research Center for People and the Press, AAPOR President  
> BetsyMartin, and Bob Blendon of Harvard University are available  
> for interviews.

>  
> Contact: Susan Oliver, 703-796-0777.

>  
> Contact: Susan Oliver 703-796-0777

> For Immediate Release

>  
> susan.b.oliver@verizon.net

>  
> RESEARCH COMMUNITY URGES REINSTATEMENT OF 'DO NOT CALL' LIST

>  
> Decrease in Telemarketing Will Lead to More Informed Research

>  
> September 25, 2003; Washington, D.C.; The American Association  
> for Public

> Opinion Research (www.AAPOR.org) today decried a federal judge's  
> decision to  
> halt implementation of the new national Do Not Call registry.

>  
> 'We hope this ruling will be overturned right away,' said Betsy  
> Martin, President of AAPOR. 'The registry will be a benefit for  
> the American people  
> and a valuable reform that will promote more active participation in  
> important survey research.'

>  
> The Do Not Call registry, which was planned for implementation on  
> October 1, would allow people to become part of a national listing  
> of those who do  
> not want to receive unsolicited telemarketing phone calls.

> Telemarketers would not be allowed to call anyone who has asked to  
> be in the registry, but  
> legitimate survey research calls to all households would continue  
> to be  
> legal.

>  
>

> &#147;The vast majority of unsolicited calls that people receive at  
> home are from  
> telemarketers, not pollsters,&#148; said Betsy Martin, president of  
> AAPOR, the  
> nation&#146;s primary professional organization of public opinion  
> researchers.&#147;Yet, the public&#146;s frustration over telemarketing  
> and  
> the frequent confusion  
> with research calls threaten our ability to conduct high quality  
> surveys,&#148;she added. &#147;Excessive telemarketing phone calls make  
> it  
> difficult for  
> survey researchers to report on important trends in American life.&#148;  
>  
> Troubling researchers is a recent Harris Interactive survey  
> showing that at  
> least 42 percent of the public is unaware of the distinction  
> between calls  
> allowed under the proposed registry and those that are exempt.  
> According to the Federal Trade Commission Web site, a call intended  
> for the sole  
> purpose of conducting a survey would be allowed.  
>  
> Martin said, &#147;Our democracy relies on an informed public, and  
> much of that  
> information comes from surveys. Society needs survey research to  
> enable government, the news media, business, and social service  
> organizations to  
> understand the experiences, views, and needs of the nation in  
> critical areas  
> of health, the economy, security, politics and much more.&#148;  
>  
>  
> Telephone interviews allow researchers to conduct surveys about  
> unemployment and jobs, health insurance coverage, childhood  
> immunization, war, elections,  
> products and many other areas critical to the American people.  
>  
> Founded in 1947, AAPOR is an organization of over 1,800  
> professionals from  
> government agencies, colleges and universities, non-profit  
> organizations, the media and commercial polling firms who are  
> engaged or interested in  
> public opinion and survey research.  
>  
> # # #  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

>  
> AAPOR STATEMENT OF SUPPORT FOR The National Do Not Call Registry

>  
>  
> Thursday, September 25, 2003

>  
>  
>  
> The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)  
> urges Congress  
> to take action to enact the National Do Not Call (DNC) Registry,  
> and urges  
> its members and the public at large who wish to reduce the number of  
> unsolicited telemarketing calls they receive to join the Registry.

>  
> Why does AAPOR support the DNC Registry?

>  
> AAPOR supports the DNC Registry for the following reasons:

>  
> a.. The vast majority of unsolicited calls people receive at  
> home are from  
> telemarketers. Surveys make up only a very small fraction of such  
> calls. b.. The generally negative reaction elicited by such  
> telemarketing calls  
> affects the ability of the survey profession to conduct high quality  
> telephone surveys of the American public.  
> c.. Legitimate surveys are exempt from the DNC Registry. Callers  
> purporting to take a survey, but also offering to sell goods or  
> services must comply with the Registry.

>  
> The fact that over 40 million telephone numbers have been  
> registered with  
> the DNC Registry is evidence of the public's frustration with the  
> number of  
> telemarketing calls they receive and with the persistence of the  
> callers. AAPOR's view is that in their efforts to avoid  
> telemarketing calls,  
> consumers are hanging up or screening out all unsolicited calls,  
> including legitimate survey requests. By signing up on the DNC  
> Registry, the public  
> would be able to dramatically reduce the number of unsolicited  
> calls they  
> receive. If so, the requests made by survey researchers will  
> receive a more  
> sympathetic hearing.

> Are Surveys Exempt from the Do Not Call Registry?

>  
> Yes. To quote from the Federal Trade Commissions website: "If  
> the call is  
> really for the sole purpose of conducting a survey, it is not  
> covered. Only  
> telemarketing calls are covered"; that is, calls that solicit  
> sales of goods  
> or services. Callers purporting to take a survey, but also

- > offering to sell
- > goods or services, must comply with the National Do Not Call Registry.
- > What is the difference between a survey call and a telemarketing call?
- > How can one tell a legitimate survey from a sales call? What questions should one ask the caller to determine whether this is a survey (exempt from the DNC Registry) or a sales call (which may be in violation of the Registry)? The goal of most telephone surveys is to seek information about people's opinions and behavior. These could be on any number of topics, ranging from the cost of health care, to the President's job performance, to breakfast cereal. The goal of a telemarketing call is to sell something.
- > Here are some of the ways to tell the difference:
- > a.. A survey interviewer will never ask for money or a commitment to purchase any product or service.
- > b.. Survey interviewers should explain where they are calling from, and should provide on request a way for you to verify their legitimacy, whether this is a toll-free number for you to call, a website or a mailing address.
- > c.. Surveys are voluntary, and while survey interviewers may try to convince you of the importance of your participation in the survey, they should not coerce you to do the surveys. Even if you agree to do the survey, you may choose not to answer any of the individual questions.
- > d.. Survey interviewers should offer to call back at a time more convenient to you. Many survey calls are made at dinner time, as this is the best time to reach people at home. But interviewers should always be willing to call back when it suits you.
- > All AAPOR members are required to adhere to a code of professional ethics and practices. The cooperation of the public is essential to the conduct of surveys, and AAPOR members respect respondents and value their contribution to knowledge of our society. For more information on AAPOR, visit [www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org).
- > Why should one participate in surveys?
- > Surveys play an important role in a democratic society.
- > Government agencies routinely conduct or sponsor surveys to collect information of vital importance to the smooth operation of government, ranging from unemployment statistics, to consumer prices, to crime and health issues affecting the

> American public. Academic and not-for-profit organizations  
> conduct surveys  
> to improve our understanding of how society works, and to explore  
> issues of  
> importance to social scientists. Media organizations conduct  
> surveys to  
> elicit the public's views on a wide range of contemporary issues  
> of interest  
> to policy-makers and the public alike. Market researchers use  
> surveys for a  
> similarly wide range of purposes, ranging from lifestyle and attitude  
> measurement to reactions to new products, pricing, promotion, and  
> so on.  
> The survey profession covers a wide range of topics and issues,  
> and the  
> information is widely used at all levels of society.

>

> What is AAPOR?

>

> The American Association for Public Opinion Research is the primary  
> professional association representing public opinion researchers,  
> and has a  
> strong interest in protecting and strengthening the credibility of  
> surveyresearch. Founded in 1947, AAPOR is an organization of over  
> 1,800professionals from government agencies, colleges and  
> universities,non-profit organizations, and commercial polling  
> firms who are engaged or  
> interested in public opinion and survey research.

>

> American Association for Public Opinion Research  
> P. O. Box 14263  
> Lenexa, KS 66285-4263  
> (913) 310-0118  
> FAX: (913) 599-5340  
> E-mail: AAPOR-info@goAMP.com

>

>

>

> -----

> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet

>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2003 20:01:16 -0400  
Reply-To: Mike McLaen <[mike.mclaen@TNS-I.COM](mailto:mike.mclaen@TNS-I.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike McLaen <[mike.mclaen@TNS-I.COM](mailto:mike.mclaen@TNS-I.COM)>  
Subject: and, then....

Comments: To: "lmcgill@PRINCETON.EDU" <lmcgill@PRINCETON.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

## Second Judge Knocks Down Do Not Call List

DENVER (Reuters) - A second federal judge on Thursday blocked the popular "do not call" program that would declare 50 million telephone numbers off limits for telemarketers, saying it violated constitutional protections for free speech.

News of the judge's decision came less than an hour after Congress overrode another legal hurdle to the Federal Trade Commission-run list thrown up by a federal judge in Oklahoma City early this week.

The latest legal ruling could prove more difficult to overcome as it cannot be remedied in Congress and must be decided in the courts.

U.S. District Judge Edward Nottingham in Denver said, "The Federal Trade Commission has chosen to entangle itself too much in the consumers' decision by manipulating consumer choice and favoring speech by charitable (organizations) over commercial speech."

The FTC's list would prevent telemarketers from calling the phone numbers of those who did not want to hear from them. It would not apply to political or charitable calls.

FTC officials have said in the past that blocking those calls could risk infringing free speech.

The Denver decision came shortly after Congress bolstered the FTC's authority to run the program, answering the Oklahoma City judge's objection.

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

From: Lawrence McGill [mailto:lmcgill@PRINCETON.EDU]  
Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2003 4:28 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: DNC attachments

It appears that events may have overtaken us once again. The AP reports that...

"The House approved legislation Thursday [today] aimed at ensuring the national "do-not-call" list goes into effect as scheduled next week so consumers can block many unwanted telemarketing sales pitches.

The House voted 412-8 after less than hour of debate. Lawmakers from both parties uniformly blasted a decision by U.S. District Judge Lee R. West, who ruled Tuesday that the Federal Trade Commission lacked authority to create and operate the registry."

Larry McGill

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

From: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>

Date: Thursday, September 25, 2003 3:30 pm

Subject: DNC attachments

> Sorry folks that my earlier email was incomplete. AAPORnet  
> doesn't support  
> attachments, so the press release and statement are copied in below:  
> Nancy Belden  
> Belden Russonello & Stewart  
> 1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700  
> Washington, DC 20036  
>  
> 202.822.6090  
>  
>  
> PRESS RELEASE  
>  
> Editors Note: Nationally known polling experts such as Andy Kohut  
> of the  
> The Pew Research Center for People and the Press, AAPOR President  
> BetsyMartin, and Bob Blendon of Harvard University are available  
> for interviews.  
>  
> Contact: Susan Oliver, 703-796-0777.  
>  
> Contact: Susan Oliver 703-796-0777  
> For Immediate Release  
>  
> susan.b.oliver@verizon.net  
>  
> RESEARCH COMMUNITY URGES REINSTATEMENT OF 'DO NOT CALL' LIST  
>  
> Decrease in Telemarketing Will Lead to More Informed Research  
>  
> September 25, 2003; Washington, D.C.; The American Association  
> for Public  
> Opinion Research (www.AAPOR.org) today decried a federal judge's  
> decision to  
> halt implementation of the new national Do Not Call registry.  
>  
> 'We hope this ruling will be overturned right away,' said Betsy  
> Martin, President of AAPOR. 'The registry will be a benefit for  
> the American people  
> and a valuable reform that will promote more active participation in  
> important survey research.'  
>  
> The Do Not Call registry, which was planned for implementation on  
> October 1, would allow people to become part of a national listing  
> of those who do



> not want to receive unsolicited telemarketing phone calls.  
> Telemarketers would not be allowed to call anyone who has asked to  
> be in the registry, but  
> legitimate survey research calls to all households would continue  
> to be  
> legal.  
>  
>  
> ¶;The vast majority of unsolicited calls that people receive at  
> home are from  
> telemarketers, not pollsters,¶; said Betsy Martin, president of  
> AAPOR, the  
> nation's primary professional organization of public opinion  
> researchers.¶;Yet, the public's frustration over telemarketing  
> and  
> the frequent confusion  
> with research calls threaten our ability to conduct high quality  
> surveys,¶;she added. ¶;Excessive telemarketing phone calls make  
> it  
> difficult for  
> survey researchers to report on important trends in American life.¶;  
>  
> Troubling researchers is a recent Harris Interactive survey  
> showing that at  
> least 42 percent of the public is unaware of the distinction  
> between calls  
> allowed under the proposed registry and those that are exempt.  
> According to the Federal Trade Commission Web site, a call intended  
> for the sole  
> purpose of conducting a survey would be allowed.  
>  
> Martin said, ¶;Our democracy relies on an informed public, and  
> much of that  
> information comes from surveys. Society needs survey research to  
> enable government, the news media, business, and social service  
> organizations to  
> understand the experiences, views, and needs of the nation in  
> critical areas  
> of health, the economy, security, politics and much more.¶;  
>  
>  
> Telephone interviews allow researchers to conduct surveys about  
> unemployment and jobs, health insurance coverage, childhood  
> immunization, war, elections,  
> products and many other areas critical to the American people.  
>  
> Founded in 1947, AAPOR is an organization of over 1,800  
> professionals from  
> government agencies, colleges and universities, non-profit  
> organizations, the media and commercial polling firms who are  
> engaged or interested in  
> public opinion and survey research.  
>  
> # # #



>

> Yes. To quote from the Federal Trade Commissions website: ‘If the call is really for the sole purpose of conducting a survey, it is not covered. Only telemarketing calls are covered; that is, calls that solicit sales of goods or services. Callers purporting to take a survey, but also offering to sell goods or services, must comply with the National Do Not Call Registry.’

> What is the difference between a survey call and a telemarketing call?

> How can one tell a legitimate survey from a sales call? What questions should one ask the caller to determine whether this is a survey (exempt from the DNC Registry) or a sales call (which may be in violation of the Registry)? The goal of most telephone surveys is to seek information about people’s opinions and behavior. These could be on any number of topics, ranging from the cost of health care, to the President’s job performance, to breakfast cereal. The goal of a telemarketing call is to sell something.

> Here are some of the ways to tell the difference:

>

> a.. A survey interviewer will never ask for money or a commitment to purchase any product or service.

> b.. Survey interviewers should explain where they are calling from, and should provide on request a way for you to verify their legitimacy, whether this is a toll-free number for you to call, a website or a mailing address.

> c.. Surveys are voluntary, and while survey interviewers may try to convince you of the importance of your participation in the survey, they should not coerce you to do the surveys. Even if you agree to do the survey, you may choose not to answer any of the individual questions.

> d.. Survey interviewers should offer to call back at a time more convenient to you. Many survey calls are made at dinner time, as this is the best time to reach people at home. But interviewers should always be willing to call back when it suits you.

> All AAPOR members are required to adhere to a code of professional ethics and practices. The cooperation of the public is essential to the conduct of surveys, and AAPOR members respect respondents and value their contribution to knowledge of our society. For more information on AAPOR, visit [www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org).

>

- > Why should one participate in surveys?
- >
- > Surveys play an important role in a democratic society.
- > Government agencies
- > routinely conduct or sponsor surveys to collect information of vital
- > importance to the smooth operation of government, ranging from
- > unemployment statistics, to consumer prices, to crime and health
- > issues affecting the
- > American public. Academic and not-for-profit organizations
- > conduct surveys
- > to improve our understanding of how society works, and to explore
- > issues of
- > importance to social scientists. Media organizations conduct
- > surveys to
- > elicit the public's views on a wide range of contemporary issues
- > of interest
- > to policy-makers and the public alike. Market researchers use
- > surveys for a
- > similarly wide range of purposes, ranging from lifestyle and attitude
- > measurement to reactions to new products, pricing, promotion, and
- > so on.
- > The survey profession covers a wide range of topics and issues,
- > and the
- > information is widely used at all levels of society.

- >
- > What is AAPOR?
- >
- > The American Association for Public Opinion Research is the primary
- > professional association representing public opinion researchers,
- > and has a
- > strong interest in protecting and strengthening the credibility of
- > survey research. Founded in 1947, AAPOR is an organization of over
- > 1,800 professionals from government agencies, colleges and
- > universities, non-profit organizations, and commercial polling
- > firms who are engaged or
- > interested in public opinion and survey research.

- >
- > American Association for Public Opinion Research
- > P. O. Box 14263
- > Lenexa, KS 66285-4263
- > (913) 310-0118
- > FAX: (913) 599-5340
- > E-mail: AAPOR-info@goAMP.com

- >
- >
- >
- > -----
- > Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
- > Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:
- > signoff aapornet
- >

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
=====

Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2003 11:07:05 -0400  
Reply-To: [mark@bisconti.com](mailto:mark@bisconti.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mark David Richards <[mark@BISCONTI.COM](mailto:mark@BISCONTI.COM)>  
Subject: NY Times ED - Attack of the Telemarketers  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

New York Times - EDITORIAL

September 27, 2003

Attack of the Telemarketers

<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/09/27/opinion/27SAT1.html>

More than 50 million Americans have signed up for the federal "do not call" registry to protect themselves from phone solicitations. Rather than let these people eat dinner in peace, the telemarketing industry rushed into court. It persuaded two federal judges this week to strike down the registry. These decisions are as legally flawed as they are unpopular. They should be reversed on appeal, and the "do not call" registry should go forward.

Americans resent telemarketers' commandeering phones and phone lines that they do not pay for, to spread messages that are not wanted. And they are enraged by the latest technology, predictive dialers, which allows telemarketers to call several homes at once and connect to the first that answers, hanging up on everyone else.

The telemarketing industry talks about respecting people's privacy, but it argued in court that telemarketers have a constitutional right to call the 50 million Americans who do not want to hear from them.

A Federal District Court in Denver agreed with the industry that the "do not call" registry violates the First Amendment because it discriminates on the basis of content, treating commercial calls differently from charitable or political ones. The consumers who sign up are automatically protected from commercial solicitations, but blocking solicitations like charitable calls must be done on a charity-by-charity basis.

The telemarketers' First Amendment claims are serious ones, but the Denver court gave them too much weight, and the Federal Trade

Commission's defenses too little. These free-speech issues arise in a particular setting: not public spaces, but the homes of people who have expressly requested to be left alone. The Constitution recognizes Americans' special interest in maintaining privacy within their homes. And the communication here is purely commercial speech, which is less protected than speech that is more at the core of First Amendment values. It is true that the "do not call" registry makes distinctions based on speech content, something the government often cannot do, but it does so to focus on the heart of the telemarketing problem, and it provides avenues - albeit different ones - for blocking both commercial and charitable speech.

The other decision this week, by a federal judge in Oklahoma, is weaker still. It found that the F.T.C. had overstepped its authority when it established the registry. Even if the decision is not reversed on appeal, it will most likely be irrelevant. The Senate has voted 95 to 0, and the House 412 to 8, to give the F.T.C. the authority it needs.

The implications of the telemarketers' challenge go far beyond telemarketing. The legal battle lines are also being drawn now over no-fax registries and restrictions on unwanted e-mail. And as technology advances, there is no telling what other ways marketers will devise to speak to people against their will.

It is important that the law develop in ways that allow people to protect their privacy against these mounting invasions. Upholding "do not call" registries is the right place to start. In these cases, 50 million Americans, 95 senators and 412 members of the House are not wrong - two judges are.

---

Mark David Richards

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Sat, 27 Sep 2003 11:27:40 -0500  
Reply-To: Cynthia Nelson <[cnelson@NIU.EDU](mailto:cnelson@NIU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Cynthia Nelson <[cnelson@NIU.EDU](mailto:cnelson@NIU.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: NY Times ED - Attack of the Telemarketers  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

As far as the exemption for research, charities, political polls, one does wonder whether if telephone holders signing up for the DO NOT CALL list were given the option to also block these calls, which, if any, they would chose to not block.

regards, Cynthia Nelson

Cynthia Nelson  
Center for Governmental Studies  
Northern Illinois University  
DeKalb, IL 60115  
Voice 815.753.1918  
Fax 815.753.2305  
email cnelson@niu.edu

\*\*\*\*\* REPLY SEPARATOR \*\*\*\*\*

On 9/27/2003 at 11:07 AM Mark David Richards wrote:

>New York Times - EDITORIAL

>

>September 27, 2003

>

>Attack of the Telemarketers

>

><http://www.nytimes.com/2003/09/27/opinion/27SAT1.html>

>

>More than 50 million Americans have signed up for the federal "do not  
>call" registry to protect themselves from phone solicitations. Rather  
>than let these people eat dinner in peace, the telemarketing industry  
>rushed into court. It persuaded two federal judges this week to strike  
>down the registry. These decisions are as legally flawed as they are  
>unpopular. They should be reversed on appeal, and the "do not call"  
>registry should go forward.

>

>Americans resent telemarketers' commandeering phones and phone lines  
>that they do not pay for, to spread messages that are not wanted. And  
>they are enraged by the latest technology, predictive dialers, which  
>allows telemarketers to call several homes at once and connect to the  
>first that answers, hanging up on everyone else.

>

>The telemarketing industry talks about respecting people's privacy, but  
>it argued in court that telemarketers have a constitutional right to  
>call the 50 million Americans who do not want to hear from them.

>

>A Federal District Court in Denver agreed with the industry that the "do  
>not call" registry violates the First Amendment because it discriminates  
>on the basis of content, treating commercial calls differently from  
>charitable or political ones. The consumers who sign up are  
>automatically protected from commercial solicitations, but blocking  
>solicitations like charitable calls must be done on a charity-by-charity  
>basis.

>

>The telemarketers' First Amendment claims are serious ones, but the  
>Denver court gave them too much weight, and the Federal Trade  
>Commission's defenses too little. These free-speech issues arise in a

>particular setting: not public spaces, but the homes of people who have  
>expressly requested to be left alone. The Constitution recognizes  
>Americans' special interest in maintaining privacy within their homes.  
>And the communication here is purely commercial speech, which is less  
>protected than speech that is more at the core of First Amendment  
>values. It is true that the "do not call" registry makes distinctions  
>based on speech content, something the government often cannot do, but  
>it does so to focus on the heart of the telemarketing problem, and it  
>provides avenues - albeit different ones - for blocking both commercial  
>and charitable speech.

>  
>The other decision this week, by a federal judge in Oklahoma, is weaker  
>still. It found that the F.T.C. had overstepped its authority when it  
>established the registry. Even if the decision is not reversed on  
>appeal, it will most likely be irrelevant. The Senate has voted 95 to 0,  
>and the House 412 to 8, to give the F.T.C. the authority it needs.

>  
>The implications of the telemarketers' challenge go far beyond  
>telemarketing. The legal battle lines are also being drawn now over  
>no-fax registries and restrictions on unwanted e-mail. And as technology  
>advances, there is no telling what other ways marketers will devise to  
>speak to people against their will.

>  
>It is important that the law develop in ways that allow people to  
>protect their privacy against these mounting invasions. Upholding "do  
>not call" registries is the right place to start. In these cases, 50  
>million Americans, 95 senators and 412 members of the House are not  
>wrong - two judges are.

>  
>  
>-----

>Mark David Richards

>  
>-----

>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>signoff aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Sun, 28 Sep 2003 11:16:58 -0400  
Reply-To: [Scheuren@AOL.COM](mailto:Scheuren@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Fritz Scheuren <[Scheuren@AOL.COM](mailto:Scheuren@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Response Rate Issues -- Still More?  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="UTF-8"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Dear Colleagues:



=20  
Even though this thread has died down now, permit me please to post a further=20  
comment regarding the interpretation of survey response rates. My approach=20  
will be basically eclectic (thus incorporating much that has been said already)=20  
but also perhaps adding practical and theoretical considerations that may be=20  
worth still more discussion.=20  
I apologize in advance for the heavy use of the subjunctive but, as we all=20  
know, the short answer to most questions in our business is =E2=80=9CIt depends.=E2=80=9D The=20  
long answer, of course, begins with the same two words and then spell out=20  
qualifications. Below you will get some short answers and some long answers.=  
None=20  
will be complete answers, though. Sorry I am still just learning.  
Best to all, Fritz

---

=20  
Raw Nonresponse Rate is Mainly a Resource Measure?

- =20  
(1) Nonresponse rates are unambiguously a measure of resources expended,=20  
usually without an adequate return. Notice that this is not in the subjunctive. A=20  
response rate is unambiguously a measure of MUDA (waste in Japanese).  
(2) In some cases there may be valuable frame information about the=20  
nonrespondents that can help in understanding what bias, if any, their omission may=20  
create.=20  
(3) In such settings the nonresponse cases may contain information that could=20  
lead to making better estimates. If possible, we should use this information=20  
or even add to it.  
(4) By themselves (wish this could be underlined) raw nonresponse rates from=20  
a survey are not direct bias measures, just a flag that possible biases could=20  
exist.=20  
(5) Interpreting raw response rates as direct bias measures is a trap in my=20  
view. In this connection OMB is to be commended for abandoning the raw response=20  
rate standard of 75%.

=20  
Create Nonresponse Adjusted Estimates?

- =20  
(6) An adjustment for nonresponse may be of benefit to the final estimates=20  
(though a weighting class or post-stratification adjustment, say). Reweighting=

ng=20

adjustments, in fact, are quite common and generally may be appropriate, since

they can improve results.

(7) The recent announcement of the release of Census Bureau population totals on this LIST was welcomed in part because Census Bureau information on age, race and gender is often used in such adjustments.

(8) A weakness of much current practice, when an adjustment is made, is that the modeling step implied by the adjustment chosen may not be made explicit and its full consequences for the point estimate and the point estimates variance could go unaddressed.

(9) To be specific many polls use  $1/(\text{square root of the sample size})$  as the upper bound on the (95%) margin of error for a percentage. This may be a misleading calculation, however, depending on the design of the poll and what is done about nonresponse.

(10) Those of us in this business for a while will remember that, in the days when costs were lower, we used sample sizes of  $n = 1500$ , leading to an upper bound on the margin of error of plus/minus 3%, if you do the math.

(11) Technically that margin of error calculation only applies when there is no nonresponse and no reweighting is done. If there is nonresponse but no reweighting is done, then implicitly we are assuming the nonrespondents

are missing completely at random.

(12) Another way of thinking about missing completely at random is that if we keep the sample size fixed (commonly now at 1000 or less), then there is no added uncertainty due to nonresponse. But, obviously, reality is seldom that kind.

(13) When we are adjusting the survey by reweighting we are assuming a nonresponse model that says that nonrespondents are missing conditionally at random.

(14) For example, if we condition, say, on age-race-gender variables and adjust for shortfalls by reweighting using Census Bureau information, then we are assuming the respondents will be otherwise representative.

(15) Under the assumption of missing conditionally at random

=9D and after=20

adjusting as just described, an upper bound on the margin of error can be=20  
obtained under certain assumptions. But maybe it might be best to leave  
its=20=

actual=20

calculation to a separate note (perhaps submitted by someone else even?).

=20

(16) Incidentally, in my examination of polling practice, admittedly=20  
incomplete, I have yet to find anyone increasing the margin of error to acco=  
unt for=20

having reweighted the data to adjust for nonresponse. Love some examples ple=  
ase.

=20

All Models are False. Some are Useful?

=20

(17) As practitioners a few of us may remember instances where the =E2=80=  
=9Cmissing=20

completely at random=E2=80=9D model was =E2=80=9Croughly right,=E2=80=9D alt=  
hough in my experience=20

this model is generally too simple.=20

=20

(18) I have found more instances where =E2=80=9Cmissing conditionally at ran=  
dom=E2=80=9D=20

models, and the reweighting they implied, led to useful estimates that seeme=  
d =E2=80=9C

roughly right.=E2=80=9D Notice the word =E2=80=9Cseemed.=E2=80=9D=20

=20

(19) Still, especially for large samples, even missing conditionally at=20  
random models may be judged inadequate. Often this can occur because the var=  
iables=20

needed to make that assumption plausible were unavailable or unknown. Or, as=  
=20

our experience grows, we realize that, even if there are lots of variables t=  
o=20

be used to adjust, the models still are excessively simple.

=20

(20) I recommend that the margins of error we use be widened to account not=20  
only for the reweighting we do in adjusting for nonresponse but also to expr=  
ess=20

our belief (or better disbelief) in the model we choose for the nonresponse.=  
=20

Past predictions could be used as a guide here, to measure model uncertainty=  
.=20

Practitioners seem already to be doing something like this intuitively and=20  
informally. Some much more perhaps?

=20

(21) It might be better to call the results of this new kind of  
calculation=20=

a=20  
=E2=80=9Cmargin of mean square error=E2=80=9D to distinguish it from what ha=  
s come before=20

which is primarily a =E2=80=9Cmargin of sampling error.=E2=80=9D Again anothe=  
r posting might be=20

better that to try to develop this idea more. This is already an overlong=20

post.  
=20  
OK, Can We Stop Now?  
=20  
(22) I have told you a lot of =E2=80=9CIt Depends=E2=80=9D stories  
(Kipling=20=  
would have=20  
called them =E2=80=9CJust So=E2=80=9D stories.) You must admit that I cannot=  
be accused of false=20  
advertising, since I said this at the beginning. But pray tell us, you ask,=20  
where do we go from here?=20  
=20  
(23) Well, for starters, we need better measures of nonresponse biases, of=20  
how much our adjustments lowered them, how much bias remained and how to han=  
dle=20  
the residual bias more systematically when making inferences. Or, as one  
of=20=  
my=20  
bosses of some years ago from New York would have said, "It takes a horse to=  
=20  
beat a horse."  
=20  
To learn even more (than you were afraid to ask), maybe I should mention tha=  
t=20  
on December 3 there will be a session on nonresponse rates and their meaning=  
=20  
for survey operations and interpretation. The Washington Statistical Society=  
=20  
a Chapter of the American Statistical Association, will run the session. Als=  
o,=20  
I hope, the Washington Chapter of AAPOR will be cosponsoring it. Contact me=20  
if you want to attend and are not a member of either Chapter.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Sun, 28 Sep 2003 11:40:48 -0400  
Reply-To: Chris McCarty <[chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU](mailto:chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Chris McCarty <[chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU](mailto:chrism@BEBR.UFL.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Response Rate Issues -- Still More?  
Comments: To: [Scheuren@AOL.COM](mailto:Scheuren@AOL.COM), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
Content-transfer-encoding: base64

QSBjb3VwbGUgb2YgcGVvcGxlIGhhdmUgcG9zdGVkIHRoYXQgcmVzcG9uc2UgcmlF0ZXMgYXJlIG11  
YXN1cmVzIG9mIGVmZm9ydC4gIFRoZSAgbWFpbiByZWZzb24gZm9yIG15IG9yaWdpbmFsIHBvc3Qg  
d2FzIHRvIGdldCBzb21lIGJhY2tncm91bmQgZm9yIGVgc2hvcnQgYXJ0aWNsZSBzcGVjaWZpY2Fs  
bHkgYWJvdXQgdGhpcy4gIFdoaWxlIHJlc3BvbmlIiHJhdGVzIGFyZSB2ZXJ5IHNIbnNpdG12ZSB0  
byBlZmZvcnQsIHRoZm9yYXJlIGFsc28gYWZmZm9yYXJlIGFyZSB2ZXJ5IHNIbnNpdG12ZSB0  
dGhhdB0YXZlIG5vdGhpbmcmG8gZG8gd2l0aCBIZmZvcnQuICBjIHRoW5rIGVgYmlnIHBhcnQg



YW5kIGdlbmRlciBpcyBvZnRlbiB1c2VklGluIHNIY2ggYWRqdXN0bWVudHMuDQoJDQoJKDgpIEEg  
d2Vha25lc3Mgb2YgbXVjaCBjdXJyZW50IHByYWN0aWNILCB3aGVuIGFuIGFkanVzdG1lbnQgaXMg  
bWFkZSwgaXMgdGhhdA0KCXR0ZSBtb2RlbGluZyBzdGVwIGltcGxpZWQgYnkgdGhllGFkanVzdG1l  
bnQgY2hvc2VuIG1heSBub3QgYmUgbWfkZSBleHBsaWNpdA0KCWFuZCBpdHMgZnVsbCBjb25zZXF1  
ZW5jZXMgZm9yIHRoZSBwb2ludCBlc3RpbWF0ZSBhbMqGdGhllHBvaW50IGVzdGltYXRlcw0KCXZh  
cmlhbmNlIGNvdWxkIGdvIHVuYWRkcmVzc2VkLg0KCQ0KCSg5KSBUbyBiZSBzcGVjaWZpYyBtYW55  
IHBvbGxzIHVzZSAxLyhzcXVhemUgem9vdCBvZiB0aGUgc2FtcGxllHNpemUpIGFzIHRoZQ0KCXVw  
cGVyIGJvdW5kIG9uIHRoZSAoOTUlkSBtYXJnaW4gb2YgZXJyb3IgzM9yIGEgcGVyY2VudGFuZS4g  
VGhpcyBtYXkgYmUgYQ0KCW1pc2xlYWRpbmcgY2FsY3VsYXRpb24sIGhvd2V2ZXiSigrIcGVuZGlu  
ZyBvbiB0aGUgZGVzaWdulG9mIHRoZSBwb2xslGFuZCB3aGF0IGlzDQoJZG9uZSBhYm91dCBub25y  
ZXNwb25zZS4NCgkNCgkoMTApIFR0b3NIIG9mIHVzIGluIHRoaXMgYnVzaW5lc3MgZm9yIGEgd2hp  
bGUgd2lsbCBYZW1lbWJlciB0aGF0LCBpb25zZS4gY29zdHMgd2VyZSBsb3dl  
ciwgd2UgdXNlZCBzYW1wbGUgc2l6ZXMg2YgbiA9IDE1MDAsIGxlyWRpbmcgdG8gYW4gdXBwZXIN  
Cglib3VuZCBvbiB0aGUgbWfyZ2luIG9mIGVycm9yIG9mIHBsdXMvbWludXMgMyUsIGlmIHlvdSBk  
byB0aGUgbWfyZ2luIG9mIGVycm9yIG9mIHBsdXMvbWludXMgMyUsIGlmIHlvdSBk  
bGN1bGF0aW9uIG9ubHkgYXBwbGlscyB3aGVuIHRoZSJIIGlzDQoJbM8gbm9ucmVzcG9uc2UgYW5k  
IG5vIHJld2VpZ2h0aW5nIGlzIGRvbmUuIElmlHRoZSJIIGlzIG5vbnJlc3BvbnNIIGJ1dCBubw0K  
CXJld2VpZ2h0aW5nIGlzIGRvbmUuIHRoZS4gaW1wbGJjaXRseSB3ZSBhcmUgYXNzdW1pbmcgdGhl  
IG5vbnJlc3BvbnRlbnRzIGFyZSDigJwNCgltaXNzaW5nIGNvbXBsZXRIbHkgYXQgemFuZG9tLuKA  
nQ0KCQ0KCSgxMikgQW5vdGhlc3YXk2YgdGhpbmtpbmcgYWJvdXQg4oCcbWlzc2luZyBjb21w  
bGV0ZWx5IGF0IHJhbMrvbeKANSBpcyB0aGF0IGlmDQoJd2Uga2VlcCB0aGUgc2FtcGxllHNpemUg  
Zml4ZWQgKGNvbW1vbmx5IG5vdyBhdCAxMDAwIG9yIGxlc3MpLCB0aGVuIHRoZSJIIGlzDQoJbM8g  
YWRkZWQgdW5jZXJ0YWludHkgZHVlIHRvIG5vbnJlc3BvbnNlLiBcdXQsIG9idmlvdXNseSwgemVh  
bG10eSBpcyBzZWxkb20gdGhpew0KCWtpbmQuDQoJDQoJKDEzKSXBxaGVuIHdlIGFyZSBhZGp1c3Rp  
bmcgdGhllHN1cnZleSBieSBYzXdlawdodGluZyB3ZSBhcmUgYXNzdW1pbmcgYQ0KCW5vbnJlc3Bv  
bnNIIG1vZGVsIHRoYXQgc2F5cyB0aGF0IG5vbnJlc3BvbnRlbnRzIGFyZSDigJxtaXNzaW5nIGNv  
bmRpdGlvbmFsbHkgYXQgemFuZG9tLg0KCeKANQ0KCQ0KCSgxNCkgRm9yIGV4YW1wbGUslGlmIHdl  
IGNvbMpdGlvbiwgc2F5LCBvbiBhZ2UtemFjZS1nZW5kZXIgdMfyaWFibGVzIGFuZA0KCWFkanVz  
dCBmb3Igc2hvcnRmYWxscyBieSBYzXdlawdodGluZyB1c2luZyBDZW5zdXMgQnVyZWV1IGluZm9y  
bWF0aW9uLCB0aGVuIHdlIGFyZQ0KCWFzc3VtaW5nIHRoZSByZXNwb25kZW50cyB3aWxsIGJlIG90  
aGVyd2lzZSBYzXByZXNlbnRhdG12ZS4NCgkNCgkoMTUpIFVuZGVyIHRoZSBhc3N1bXB0aW9uIG9m  
IOKAnG1pc3NpbmcgY29uZG10aW9uYWxseSBhdCBYyW5kb23igJ0gYW5kIGFmdGVyDQoJYWRqdXN0  
aW5nIGFzIGp1c3QgZGVzY3JpYmVklCBhb25lc3BvbnRlbnRzIGFyZSDigJxtaXNzaW5nIGNv  
cm9yIGNhb25kZQ0KCW9idGFpbmVklHVuZGVyIGNlcnRhaW4gYXNzdW1wdGlvbnMuIEJ1dCBtYXli  
ZSBpdCBtaWdodCBiZSBiZXN0IHRvIGxlyXZlIG10cyBhY3R1YWwNCgljYXJldWxhdGlvbiB0byBh  
IHNlcGFyYXRlIG5vdGUgKHBlemlhcmhHMgc3VibW10dGVklGJ5IHNVbWVvbmUgZWxzZSBldmVuPyku  
DQoJDQoJKDE2KSBJbmNpZGVudGFsbHksIGluIG15IGV4YW1pbmF0aW9uIG9mIHBvbGxpbmceHJh  
Y3RpY2UsIGFkbW10dGVkbHkNCglpbmNvbXBsZXRIlCBJIghdmUgeWV0IHRvIGZpbmQgYW55b251  
IGluY3JlYXNpbmcgdGhllIG1hemdpbiBvZiBlcnJvciB0byBhY2NvdW50IGZveg0KCWhhdmluZyBy  
ZXdlawdodGVklHRoZSBkYXRhIHRvIGFkanVzdCBmb3Igbm9ucmVzcG9uc2UuIExvdmUgc29tZSB1  
eGFtcGxlcYBwbGVhc2UuDQoJDQoJQWxsIE1vZGVscyBhcmUgRmFsc2UuIFNvbWUgYXJlIFVzZWZ1  
bD8NCgkNCgkoMTcpIEFzIHByYWN0aXRpb25lcnMgYSBmZXcgb2YgdXMgbWfyZS4gY29zdHMgd2VyZSB1  
c3RhbMnlcyB3aGVyZSB0aGUg4oCcbWlzc2luZw0KCWNvbXBsZXRIbHkgYXQgemFuZG9t4oCdIG1v  
ZGVsIHdheyDigJxyb3VnaGx5IHJpZ2h0LOKAnSBhbHR0b3VnaCBpb25zZSBleHBlemlhbmNIDQoJ  
dGhpcyBtb2RlbCBpcyBnZW5lcmFsbHkgdG9vIHNPbXBsZS4NCgkNCgkoMTgpIEkgaGF2ZSBmb3Vu  
ZCBtb3JIIGluc3RhbMnlcyB3aGVyZSDigJxtaXNzaW5nIGNvbMpdGlvbmFsbHkgYXQgemFuZG9t  
4oCdDQoJbW9kZWxzLCBhbMqGdGhllIHJld2VpZ2h0aW5nIHRoZS4gaW1wbGllZCBwgbGVklHRvIHVz  
ZWZ1bCBlc3RpbWF0ZXMgdGhhdCBzZWVtZWQg4oCcDQoJcm91Z2hseSBYaWdodC7igJ0gTm90aWNl  
IHRoZSB3b3JkIOKAnHNIZW1lZC7igJ0NCgkNCgkoMTkpfIFN0aWxsLCBlc3BIY2lhbGx5IGZvciBs  
YXJnZSBzYW1wbGVzLCBldmVuIG1pc3NpbmcgY29uZG10aW9uYWxseSBhdA0KCXJhbMrvbSBtb2Rl  
bHMgbWfyZS4gY29zdHMgd2VyZSB1c3RhbMnlcyB3aGVyZSDigJxtaXNzaW5nIGNvb25kZSBzZSB2Y2N1ciBiZWNhdXNl  
IHRoZSB2YXJpYWJsZXNMNCgluZWVtZWQgdG8gbWFrZSB0aGF0IGFzc3VtcHRpb24gcGxhdXNpYmxl  
IHdlemUgdW5hdmFpbGFibGUgb3IgdW5rbm93bi4gT3IsIGFzDQoJb3VyIGV4cGVyaWVvY2UgZ3Jv  
d3MsIHdlIHJlYXpemUgdGhhdCwgZXZlbiBpZiB0aGVyZSBhcmUgbG90cyBvZiB2YXJpYWJsZXMG

dG8NCgliZSB1c2VkIHRvIGFkanVzdCwgdGhllIG1vZGVsCyBzdGlsbCBhcmUgZXhjaXNzaXZlbHkg  
c2ltcGxlLg0KCQ0KCSgyMCKgSSByZWNvbW1lbnQgdGhhdCB0aGUgbWFyZ2lucyBvZiBlcnJvciB3  
ZSB1c2UgYmUgd2lkZW5lZCB0byBhY2NvdW50IG5vdA0KCW9ubHkgZm9yIHRoZSBYdXdlWdodGlu  
ZyB3ZSBkbyBpbiBhZGp1c3RpbmcgZm9yIG5vbnJlc3BvbnNlIGJ1dCBhbHNvIHRvIGV4cHJlc3MN  
CglvdXIgYmVsaWVmlChvciBiZXR0ZXIglZGlzYmVsaWVmlKSBpbiB0aGUgbW9kZWwgd2UgY2hvb3NI  
IGZvciB0aGUgdm9ucmVzcG9uc2UuDUQoJUGFzdCBwcmVkaWN0aW9ucyBjb3VsZCBiZSB1c2VkIGFz  
IGegZ3VpZGUgaGVyZSwgdG8gbWVhc3VyZSBtb2RlbnCB1bnNlcnRhaW50eS4NCglQcmFjdGl0aW9u  
ZXJzIHNIZW0gYWxyZWfkeSB0byBiZSBkb2luZyBzb21ldGhpbmcgGlRZSB0aGlzIGludHVpdGl2  
ZWx5IGFuZA0KCWluZm9ybWFsbHkuIFNvbWUgXVjaCBtb3JlIHBlcmhhcHM/DQoJDQoJKDIXKSBj  
dCBtaWdodCBiZSBiZXR0ZXIgdG8gY2FsbCB0aGUgcmVzdWx0cyBvZiB0aGlzIG5ldyBraW5kIG9m  
IGNhbGN1bGF0aW9uIGENCgnigJxtYXJnaW4gb2YgbWVhbiBzcXVhemUgZXJyb3LigJ0gdG8gZGlz  
dGluZ3Vpc2ggaXQgZnJvbSB3aGF0IGhcyBjb21lIGJlZm9yZQ0KCXdoaWN0IGlziHByaW1hcmls  
eSBhIOKAnG1hcmdpbiBvZiBzYW1wbGluZyBlcnJvci7igJ0gQWdhaW4gYW5vdGhlcilBwb3N0aW5n  
IG1pZ2h0IGJIDQoJYmV0dGVyIHRoYXQgdG8gdHJ5IHRvIGRldmVsb3AgdGhpcyBpZGVhIG1vcuUu  
IFRoXMGaXMGYWxyZWfkeSBhbiBvdmVybG9uZw0KCXBvc3QuDUQoJDQoJT0ssIENhbiBXZSBTdG9w  
IE5vdz8NCgkNCgkoMjIpIEkgaGF2ZSB0b2xkIHlvdSBhIGxvdCBvZiDigJxJdCBEZXB1bmRz4oCd  
IHN0b3JpZXMgKEtpcGxpbmcgd291bGQgaGF2ZQ0KCWNhbGxlZCB0aGVtIOKAnEp1c3QgU2/igJ0g  
c3RvcmlleY4pIFlvdSBtdXN0IGFkbW10IHRoYXQgSSBjYW5ub3QgYmUgYWNjdXNIZCBvZiBmYWxz  
ZQ0KCWFkdMvYdGlzaW5nLCBzaW5jZSBjIHhhaWQgdGhpcyBhdCB0aGUgYmVnaW5uaW5nLiBCdXQg  
cHJheSB0ZWxsIHVzLCB5b3UgYXNrLA0KCXdoZXJlIGRvIHdlIGdVIGZyb20gaGVyZT8NCgkNCgko  
MjMpIFdlbGwsIGZvciBzdGFydGVycywgZ2UgdmVlZCBiZXR0ZXIglbWVhc3VyZXMgb2Ygdm9ucmVz  
cG9uc2UgYmlhc2VzLCBvZg0KCWhvdYBtdWNoIG91ciBhZGp1c3RtZW50cyBsb3dlcmVkiHRoZW0s  
IGhvdYBtdWNoIGJpYXMGemVtYWluZWQgYW5kIGhvdYB0byBoYW5kbGUNCgl0aGUgcmVzaWR1YWwg  
YmlhcYBtb3JlIHh5c3RlbnWF0aWNhbGx5IHdoZW4gbWFraW5nIGluZmVzZW5jZXMuIE9yLCBhcyBv  
bmUgb2YgXkNCglib3NzZXMgb2Ygc29tZSB5ZWfycyBhZ28gZnJvbSB0ZXcgWW9yayB3b3VsZCB0  
YXZlIHhhaWQsICJlZCB0YWtlcyBhIGhvcnNlIHRvDUQoJYmVhdCBhIGhvcnNlLiINCgkNCglUbyBs  
ZWFybiBlbmVulG1vcuUgKHRoYW4geW91IHdlcmUgYWZyYWlkIHRvIGFzayksIG1heWJlIEkge2hv  
dWxkIG1lbnRpb24gdGhhdA0KCW9uIERlY2VtYmVydMgdGhlcuUgd2lsbCBiZSBhIHhlc3Npb24g  
b24gdm9ucmVzcG9uc2UgcmF0ZXMgYW5kIHRoZWlyIG1lYW5pbmcNCglmb3Jgc3VydmV5IG9wZXJh  
dGlbnMgYW5kIGludGVycHJldGF0aW9uLiBUaGUgV2FzaGluZ3RvbiBTdGF0aXN0aWNhbCBTb2Np  
ZXR5LA0KCWEgQ2hhcHRlciBvZiB0aGUgQW1lcmJYW4gU3RhdGlzdGljYWwgQXNzb2NpYXRpb24s  
IHdpbGwgcGVuIHRoZSBzZXNzaW9uLiBBbHNvLA0KCUCkgaG9wZSwgdGhllFdhc2hpbmd0b24gQ2hh  
cHRlciBvZiBBQVBPUIB3aWxsIGJlIGNvc3BvbnNvcmluZyBpdC4gQ29udGFjdCBtZQ0KCWlmIHlv  
dSB3YW50IHRvIGF0dGVuZCBhbmQgYXJlIG5vdCBhIG1lbWJlciBvZiBlaXR0ZXIglQ2hhcHRlci4N  
CgkNCgktLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0t  
DQoJQXJjaGI2ZXM6IGh0dHA6Ly9saXN0cy5hc3UuZWR1L2FyY2hpdmVzL2FhcG9ybmlh0bWwN  
CglVbnN1YnNjcmliZT8gU2VuZCB1bWFpbCB0byBsaXN0cy5hc3UuZWR1IHdpdGggdGhpcyB0  
ZXh0Og0KCXNpZ25vZmYgYWfwb3JuZXQNCgkNCg0K

---

Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2003 00:43:34 -0400  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Subject: Re: Response Rate Issues -- Still More?  
Comments: To: Scheuren@AOL.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <14f.2453b229.2ca8556a@aol.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

We should all thank Fritz got hid thoughtful remarks about response error.=  
=20  
I would like to take issue, though, with one of his remarks. He talks about=  
=20

adjustments for age, race and sex as being used as a means of reducing the effect of nonresponse. He goes on to suggest that this component of the overall error should be reported along with sampling error.

I want to quibble with his use of this adjustment. The adjustments Fritz suggests, more properly called a ratio estimates, are not just a model correct for nonresponse. If there were no nonresponse we still might make such adjustments. If the characteristics of interest in the survey are correlated with the adjustment characteristics (age, sex, race), then there is a reduction in the sampling error. If the correlation is low or negative there is an increase in the sampling error.

We do not know, as Fritz said, the effect on the error due to nonresponse resulting from these adjustments. But the same logic would apply. The nonresponse error is most likely going down with high correlations and up with low ones.

My quibble is that one cannot automatically assume, as Fritz suggests, that the overall error has increased when there is nonresponse and these adjustments are made.

On another point, I believe nonresponse rates are a measure of resources expended only for a given sample design. Response rates may only be compared across surveys with common sample designs. Their is ambiguity about the energy expended that is not accounted for by the response rate, absent the sample design.

warren mitofsky

At 11:16 AM 9/28/03, Fritz Scheuren wrote:

>Dear Colleagues:

>

>Even though this thread has died down now, permit me please to post a further

>comment regarding the interpretation of survey response rates. My approach

>will be basically eclectic (thus incorporating much that has been said

>already)

>but also perhaps adding practical and theoretical considerations that may be

>worth still more discussion.

>

>I apologize in advance for the heavy use of the subjunctive but, as we all

>know, the short answer to most questions in our business is =E2=80=9CIt=20

>depends.=E2=80=9D The

>long answer, of course, begins with the same two words and then spell out

>qualifications. Below you will get some short answers and some long=20

>answers. None

>will be complete answers, though. Sorry I am still just learning.

>

>Best to all, Fritz

>

---



>  
>Raw Nonresponse Rate is Mainly a Resource Measure?  
>  
>(1) Nonresponse rates are unambiguously a measure of resources expended,  
>usually without an adequate return. Notice that this is not in the=20  
>subjunctive. A  
>response rate is unambiguously a measure of MUDA (waste in Japanese).  
>  
>(2) In some cases there may be valuable frame information about the  
>nonrespondents that can help in understanding what bias, if any, their=20  
>omission may  
>create.  
>  
>(3) In such settings the nonresponse cases may contain information that=  
>could  
>lead to making better estimates. If possible, we should use this=  
>information  
>or even add to it.  
>  
>(4) By themselves (wish this could be underlined) raw nonresponse rates=  
>from  
>a survey are not direct bias measures, just a flag that possible biases=  
>could  
>exist.  
>  
>(5) Interpreting raw response rates as direct bias measures is a trap in my  
>view. In this connection OMB is to be commended for abandoning the raw=20  
>response  
>rate standard of 75%.  
>  
>Create Nonresponse Adjusted Estimates?  
>  
>(6) An adjustment for nonresponse may be of benefit to the final estimates  
>(though a weighting class or post-stratification adjustment, say).=20  
>Reweighting  
>adjustments, in fact, are quite common and generally may be appropriate,=20  
>since  
>they can improve results.  
>  
>(7) The recent announcement of the release of Census Bureau population=  
>totals  
>on this LIST was welcomed in part because Census Bureau information on age,  
>race and gender is often used in such adjustments.  
>  
>(8) A weakness of much current practice, when an adjustment is made, is=  
>that  
>the modeling step implied by the adjustment chosen may not be made explicit  
>and its full consequences for the point estimate and the point estimates  
>variance could go unaddressed.  
>  
>(9) To be specific many polls use  $1/(\text{square root of the sample size})$  as the  
>upper bound on the (95%) margin of error for a percentage. This may be a  
>misleading calculation, however, depending on the design of the poll and=20  
>what is

>done about nonresponse.

>

>(10) Those of us in this business for a while will remember that, in the days

>when costs were lower, we used sample sizes of  $n = 3D 1500$ , leading to an upper

>bound on the margin of error of plus/minus 3%, if you do the math.

>

>(11) Technically that margin of error calculation only applies when there is

>no nonresponse and no reweighting is done. If there is nonresponse but no

>reweighting is done, then implicitly we are assuming the nonrespondents are

>are  $E2=80=9C$

>missing completely at random.  $E2=80=9D$

>

>(12) Another way of thinking about  $E2=80=9C$ missing completely at random  $E2=80=9D$  is

>that if

>we keep the sample size fixed (commonly now at 1000 or less), then there is

>no added uncertainty due to nonresponse. But, obviously, reality is seldom

>this

>kind.

>

>(13) When we are adjusting the survey by reweighting we are assuming a

>nonresponse model that says that nonrespondents are  $E2=80=9C$ missing

>conditionally at random.

> $E2=80=9D$

>

>(14) For example, if we condition, say, on age-race-gender variables and

>adjust for shortfalls by reweighting using Census Bureau information, then

>we are

>assuming the respondents will be otherwise representative.

>

>(15) Under the assumption of  $E2=80=9C$ missing conditionally at random  $E2=80=9D$  and after

>adjusting as just described, an upper bound on the margin of error can be

>obtained under certain assumptions. But maybe it might be best to leave

>its actual

>calculation to a separate note (perhaps submitted by someone else even?).

>

>(16) Incidentally, in my examination of polling practice, admittedly

>incomplete, I have yet to find anyone increasing the margin of error to

>account for

>having reweighted the data to adjust for nonresponse. Love some examples

>please.

>

>All Models are False. Some are Useful?

>

>(17) As practitioners a few of us may remember instances where the

> $E2=80=9C$ missing

>completely at random  $E2=80=9D$  model was  $E2=80=9C$ roughly right,  $E2=80=9D$

>although in my

>experience

>this model is generally too simple.

>

>(18) I have found more instances where missing conditionally at random

>models, and the reweighting they implied, led to useful estimates that

>seemed

>roughly right. Notice the word seemed.

>

>(19) Still, especially for large samples, even missing conditionally at

>random models may be judged inadequate. Often this can occur because the

>variables

>needed to make that assumption plausible were unavailable or unknown. Or, as

>our experience grows, we realize that, even if there are lots of variables

>to

>be used to adjust, the models still are excessively simple.

>

>(20) I recommend that the margins of error we use be widened to account not

>only for the reweighting we do in adjusting for nonresponse but also to

>express

>our belief (or better disbelief) in the model we choose for the nonresponse.

>Past predictions could be used as a guide here, to measure model uncertainty.

>Practitioners seem already to be doing something like this intuitively and

>informally. Some much more perhaps?

>

>(21) It might be better to call the results of this new kind of calculation

>a

>margin of mean square error to distinguish it from what has come before

>which is primarily a margin of sampling error. Again another posting

>might be

>better that to try to develop this idea more. This is already an overlong

>post.

>

>OK, Can We Stop Now?

>

>(22) I have told you a lot of It Depends stories (Kipling would have

>called them Just So stories.) You must admit that I cannot be

>accused of false

>advertising, since I said this at the beginning. But pray tell us, you ask,

>where do we go from here?

>

>(23) Well, for starters, we need better measures of nonresponse biases, of

>how much our adjustments lowered them, how much bias remained and how to handle

>the residual bias more systematically when making inferences. Or, as one

>of my

>bosses of some years ago from New York would have said, "It takes a horse

to  
>beat a horse."  
>  
>To learn even more (than you were afraid to ask), maybe I should mention=  
that  
>on December 3 there will be a session on nonresponse rates and their=  
meaning  
>for survey operations and interpretation. The Washington Statistical=  
Society,  
>a Chapter of the American Statistical Association, will run the session.=20  
>Also,  
>I hope, the Washington Chapter of AAPOR will be cosponsoring it. Contact me  
>if you want to attend and are not a member of either Chapter.

>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>signoff aapornet

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

212 496-2945  
212 496-0846 FAX

email: [mitofsky@mindspring.com](mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com)  
<http://www.mitofskyinternational.com>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2003 08:57:23 -0400  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Iraqi public opinion  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

The following appears in today's Washington Post.

The only remarkable thing is that someone checked the data and reported the true (insofar as that word applies to a Zogby poll) findings.

Jan Werner

---

Data Reveal Inaccuracies in Portrayal of Iraqis

By Walter Pincus  
Washington Post Staff Writer  
Monday, September 29, 2003; Page A14

Top Bush administration officials in the past weeks have been citing a pair of public opinion polls to demonstrate that Iraqis have a positive view of the U.S. occupation. But an examination of those polls indicates Iraqis have a less enthusiastic view than the administration has portrayed.

For example, in testimony before Congress, L. Paul Bremer III, the U.S. administrator in Iraq, and Deputy Defense Secretary Paul D. Wolfowitz both cited a recent Gallup Poll that found that almost two-thirds of those polled in Baghdad said it was worth the hardships suffered since the U.S.-led invasion ousted Saddam Hussein. Bremer also told Congress that 67 percent thought that in five years they would be better off, and only 11 percent thought they would be worse off.

That same poll, however, found that, countrywide, only 33 percent thought they were better off than they were before the invasion and 47 percent said they were worse off. And 94 percent said that Baghdad was a more dangerous place for them to live, a finding the administration officials did not discuss.

The poll also found that 29 percent of Baghdad residents had a favorable view of the United States, while 44 percent had a negative view. By comparison, 55 percent had a favorable view of France.

Similarly, half of Baghdad residents had a negative view of President Bush, while 29 percent had a favorable view of him. In contrast, French President Jacques Chirac drew a 42 percent favorable rating.

Earlier, on Sept. 14, Vice President Cheney on NBC's "Meet the Press" discussed findings from a Zogby International poll of 600 Iraqis done in August in conjunction with American Enterprise magazine. He described the poll as "carefully done" and said it found "very positive news in it in terms of the numbers it shows with respect to the attitudes to what Americans have done."

"The U.S. wins hands down," Cheney said, when Iraqis were asked what model of government they would prefer among five choices. Cheney's information, according to an aide, came from the American Enterprise essay on the poll that said 37 percent of respondents chose the United States, and 28 percent selected Saudi Arabia.

But a look at the raw data from the poll on the magazine's Web site revealed different figures. According to the data, only 21.5 percent chose the United States, while 20 percent refused to select any model, and 16 percent selected the Saudi government.

Cheney also said, "If you want to ask them do they want an Islamic government established, by two-to-one margins they say no, including the Shia population." He said that when asked how long they want the Americans to stay, "over 60 percent of the people polled said they want the U.S. to stay for at least another year."

But the poll also found that half of respondents said Western democracy would not work well in Iraq, while 40 percent said it would. Asked whether the United States would help or hurt Iraq over the next five years, 35 percent said the U.S. would help but half said it would hurt Iraq. Also, on the question of an Islamic government, the alternative offered was "or instead let all people practice their own religion," which implied that could not be done under the former.

© 2003 The Washington Post Company

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

Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2003 09:43:20 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: NY Times ED - Attack of the Telemarketers  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[200309271127400375.139E2705@corn.cso.NIU.EDU](mailto:200309271127400375.139E2705@corn.cso.NIU.EDU)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Back when I was at Georgia State University we did a state wide poll (the state was considering adopting a state-wide do not call list) and asked precisely this question. Of course I no longer have that data but I seem to recall (at least in Georgia) when we asked which groups they would like to block - telemarketers did worst and polling did best with charity and political marketing calls somewhere in the middle. Of course the people most likely to want to exclude pollsters are more than likely the ones who refused to complete the survey.

--  
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](mailto:mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Cynthia Nelson  
> Sent: Saturday, September 27, 2003 12:28 PM  
> To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)



>>  
>>A Federal District Court in Denver agreed with the industry that the "do not call" registry violates the First Amendment because it discriminates on the basis of content, treating commercial calls differently from charitable or political ones. The consumers who sign up are automatically protected from commercial solicitations, but blocking solicitations like charitable calls must be done on a charity-by-charity basis.

>>  
>>The telemarketers' First Amendment claims are serious ones, but the Denver court gave them too much weight, and the Federal Trade Commission's defenses too little. These free-speech issues arise in a particular setting: not public spaces, but the homes of people who have expressly requested to be left alone. The Constitution recognizes Americans' special interest in maintaining privacy within their homes. And the communication here is purely commercial speech, which is less protected than speech that is more at the core of First Amendment values. It is true that the "do not call" registry makes distinctions based on speech content, something the government often cannot do, but it does so to focus on the heart of the telemarketing problem, and it provides avenues - albeit different ones - for blocking both commercial and charitable speech.

>>  
>>The other decision this week, by a federal judge in Oklahoma, is weaker still. It found that the F.T.C. had overstepped its authority when it established the registry. Even if the decision is not reversed on appeal, it will most likely be irrelevant. The Senate has voted 95 to 0, and the House 412 to 8, to give the F.T.C. the authority it needs.

>>  
>>The implications of the telemarketers' challenge go far beyond telemarketing. The legal battle lines are also being drawn now over no-fax registries and restrictions on unwanted e-mail. And as technology advances, there is no telling what other ways marketers will devise to speak to people against their will.

>>  
>>It is important that the law develop in ways that allow people to protect their privacy against these mounting invasions. Upholding "do not call" registries is the right place to start. In these cases, 50 million Americans, 95 senators and 412 members of the House are not wrong - two judges are.

>>  
>>  
>>-----



>>Mark David Richards

>>

>>-----

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

>>Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

>>signoff aapornet

>

>-----

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

> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:

> signoff aapornet

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

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

=====  
Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2003 16:21:30 +0200

Reply-To: [braun@zuma-mannheim.de](mailto:braun@zuma-mannheim.de)

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

From: Michael Braun <[braun@ZUMA-MANNHEIM.DE](mailto:braun@ZUMA-MANNHEIM.DE)>

Organization: ZUMA

Subject: GERMAN ONLINE RESEARCH '04

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

-----  
CALL FOR PAPERS  
-----

Sixth International GOR Conference

GOR 04

GERMAN ONLINE RESEARCH '04

30th and 31st March, 2004

at the University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany

-----  
Organizers:  
-----

German Society for Online Research - DGOF e.V.

Social Survey Research Center,

Institute of Sociology, University Duisburg-Essen  
-----

The 6th German Online Research Conference 2004 is jointly organized by the German Society for Online Research (DGOF e.V.), and the Social Survey Research Center (Prof. Dr. Frank Faulbaum) of the

University of Duisburg-Essen. The conference will be held at the university campus in Duisburg.

Conference topics include theories, methods, and empirical findings concerning the internet, online communication, or mobile communication.

The aim of the conference is to document the progress of internet research, innovative developments, and practical experience, as well as to further dialogue between:

- researchers
  - researchers and users of internet research
  - universities and companies
  - customers and suppliers.
- 

-----  
Conference Languages:  
-----

English, German

-----  
Contributions:  
-----

Paper presentations, posters, and sessions can be proposed on the following topics:

Interactive Market- and Social Research

- Online- and Mobile Market Research
- Innovative Sampling approaches
- Cross-over Designs, Mixed-Modes' and Methods' Effects
- Usability Research, Usability Engineering, Usability Testing
- Online Experiments
- Online Surveys

Internet, Mobile Communication, and Civil Society

- Online Groups: Structures, Interaction, Community Building, and Effects
- Social and Psychological Effects of Internet Use
- Social Networks and Relationships: On-line and Off-line
- Online Community Software: Applications and Results
- Mobile Communication and Social Networks
- e-Democracy: Examples of Best Practice, Changes, and Problems
- Internet, Crime, Privacy Protection, and Deviant Behavior
- Digital Divide
- Internet, Social Movements, and Collective Action
- Internet and Science

e-Commerce and e-Controlling

- e-Business and e-Advertising
- Successful Evaluation of Web-Sites and e-Commerce

- Currencies of the Net: Benchmarking and Measurement of Range of Coverage
- Customer Relationship Management and Online Market Research
- Non-Reactive Methods of Data Collection and Data-Mining

#### Interpersonal Communication

- Computer Mediated Communication
- Mobile Communication and Life-Style
- Online-Gaming
- Trust and Credibility on the Internet
- e-Health
- Non-Reactive Methods of Data Collection of Interpersonal Communication
- Weblogs and Bloggers

#### The Internet Within and Outside of Organizations

- e-Learning on the Intranet and Internet
- Interactive Organizational Research, e.g. Online Employee Surveys
- Knowledge Exchange and Knowledge Management in Organizations (Intranet)
- Communities of Practice on the Internet: Design and Effects

---

#### Paper Presentations:

Paper presentations include oral presentations of max. 20 minutes plus 10 minutes for discussion.

Qualified contributions will be invited to submit the paper for publication in an international English language conference proceedings' volume or in an international English language journal.

#### Posters:

Posters will be discussed at fixed times. The best poster will receive a prize of Euro 500,-.

#### Sessions:

There will also be the opportunity to propose a group of interrelated presentations (max. 4-5 persons) within one session. For more information please contact the program committee (gorpaper04qdgo.de).

#### Workshops:

There will be tutorial workshops covering key

methods of internet research. These will be held by qualified researchers and practitioners. The workshops will take place the day commencing the GOR conference (March 29, 2004) as well as during the conference without overlapping with the presentations.

Participation in workshops is not free of charge and the number of participants will be restricted. Registered visitors of the conference have priority. More information about the workshops and registration is available at <http://www.dgof.de/indexe.htm>.

#### Exhibition Stand Space:

-----

Companies will have the opportunity to book exhibition stand space for presentations of products or services that offer solutions to problems of market- and social research on the Internet or Intranet. More information is available at [gororga04@dgof.de](mailto:gororga04@dgof.de).

#### Social Events and Membership Meeting:

-----

The traditional early-bird-meeting will take place on March 29th 2004. Already during this meeting visitors and participants will have the opportunity to socialize with colleagues, acquainting themselves with other researchers.

On Tuesday 30th April 2004, there will be a social event held during the evening which will include dinner and disco.

During the conference there will be a meeting for the members of the German Society for Online Research. The members will receive additional information about the meeting at a later date.

-----

-----

#### Submission Guidelines

-----

If you would like to contribute to the conference by presenting a paper or a poster, please send an abstract no later than:

September 30th 2003

to: [gorpaper04@dgof.de](mailto:gorpaper04@dgof.de)

Authors will receive notice of acceptance by:

November 17th 2003.

The preliminary program will be posted on December 1st, 2003 at the following url:

<http://www.dgof.de/indexe.htm>

The program committee will review abstracts. For accepted oral presentations transparencies or Power-Point files (preferably in English) are expected to be sent before the conference until February 29th 2004.

-----  
The abstract (of no more than 350 words) should be submitted in in the following format:

1. Title of the oral presentation or poster
2. Type (oral presentation or poster)
3. Author(s)
4. Address of first author (postal address, phone number, e-mail and URLs)
5. Central topic choice (max. 3), if applicable
6. Keywords (max. 4)
7. English text of abstract (max 350 words)

Submission format:

- 1) Please send your abstract in rich text (.rtf) file format to:

[gorpaper04@dgof.de](mailto:gorpaper04@dgof.de)

The subject line of your e-mail must contain the following text: "abstract"

- 2) In addition to sending the attachment, please include the abstract and the information 1-6 mentioned above in the body of your e-mail.

-----  
Conference Fees:  
-----

Conference fees include conference materials, two lunches, conference dinner, drinks and snacks during breaks.

Academic: 120 Euro

Students: 60 Euro

Presenting participants: 30 Euro (first authors only)

Non-academic (e.g., company representatives, free-lancers, consultants): 290 Euro

Early registrants, who register before January 31st 2004

receive a fee reduction of 20%.

DGOF members receive a fee reduction of 20% (membership application forms can be found at [http://www.dgof.de/dgof\\_antrage.pdf](http://www.dgof.de/dgof_antrage.pdf)).

For German participants conference fees have to be paid in advance in full.

Foreign participants may pay their fees at the conference venue. Day tickets are not available.

Registration for all participants will begin on December 01st 2003. Further detailed information will be posted continually at the following URL:

<http://www.dgof.de/indexe.htm>

-----  
Overview of the timeline:  
-----

|                   |                                                                                              |
|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 09/30/03          | Deadline for abstract submission                                                             |
| 11/17/03          | Feedback on acceptance                                                                       |
| 12/01/03          | Preliminary program will be published,<br>Registration begins                                |
| 01/31/04          | Deadline for fee-reduced early registrations                                                 |
| 02/29/04          | Deadline for sending transparencies or Power-<br>Point files for accepted oral presentations |
| 02/29/04          | Deadline for registration to workshops                                                       |
| 03/29/04          | Early-bird-meeting + workshops in Duisburg                                                   |
| 03/30/04-03/31/04 | Conference + workshops at the University of<br>Duisburg-Essen in Duisburg                    |

-----  
Summary of contacts:

Abstract submission: [gorpaper04@dgof.de](mailto:gorpaper04@dgof.de)

Business activities: [gororga04@dgof.de](mailto:gororga04@dgof.de)

Conference Website: <http://www.dgof.de/indexe.htm>

workshops: <http://www.dgof.de/indexe.htm>

Local organization: [office.gor@uni-duisburg.de](mailto:office.gor@uni-duisburg.de)  
-----

Contact address of the local organizing committee:

Conference office GOR 04  
c/o Prof. Dr. Frank Faulbaum  
Institute of Sociology  
University Duisburg-Essen  
Lotharstr. 65  
47048 Duisburg  
Germany

Phone +49 203-379-2532

Fax +49 203-379-4350

E-Mail: [office.gor@uni-duisburg.de](mailto:office.gor@uni-duisburg.de)

<http://soziologie.uni-duisburg.de/PERSONEN/faulbaum.html>

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

Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2003 11:54:28 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Another wrong definition of push polling  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

From  
<http://www.aljazeeraah.info/News%20archives/2003%20News%20archives/September/27%20n/Arab%20American%20News%20Focus.htm>

I'll Have My Polling With a Grain of Salt, Please As expected, the media, bored with the barnstorming exuberance of Howard Dean, has done their darndest to turn Wesley Clark into the "Next Big Thing." Take the recent CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll, which has Clark leading Howard Dean 22% to 13% with John Kerry and Richard Gephardt with 11% each, Joe Lieberman 10%, and the rest of the field in single digits. Pretty impressive numbers for Clark, right? But only to a point. A recent Zogby International poll found "Clark and Dean share the lead among Democratic presidential hopefuls, with 12% each. No other candidate reaches double digits." Why the difference? Zogby, unlike other polling firms, doesn't use "push polling," the practice where the pollster "pushes" respondents to make a decision, this early in a race. That's why, if you look closely at the two polls, you'll find that Zogby's has a vastly larger number of undecided voters (43%) than the CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll (15%), which is a much more accurate portrayal of the currently fragmented and undecided Democratic voter base.

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

Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2003 12:03:41 -0400  
Reply-To: Howard Schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Howard Schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>  
Subject: Iraq public opinion  
Comments: To: [aapor](mailto:aapor@asu.edu) <[aapor@asu.edu](mailto:aapor@asu.edu)>

MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The Washington Post article provided by Jan Werner looking more closely at poll results in Iraq is useful. There is also one methodological issue that needs careful consideration when surveys are done in places like Iraq and indeed in other countries where perceptions of sponsorship may well affect answers. In a 1990 survey-based experiment in Nicaragua, whether interviewers were perceived to come from the government or from the opposition party had an important impact on the results. (A brief summary of the experiment appeared in the NYTimes, op-ed page, March 7, 1990; a full report was in the Amer. J. Political Science, 1992, 36: 331-50.) Whether a poll in Iraq is thought to be sponsored by Americans or not, and whether the interviewers are seen to be of a particular ethnicity or religion (or Sunni as against Shia), may be as relevant as race of interviewer has turned out to be in the United States. Howard

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

---

Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2003 12:49:44 -0400  
Reply-To: Anna Greenberg <[agreenberg@GREENBERGRESEARCH.COM](mailto:agreenberg@GREENBERGRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Anna Greenberg <[agreenberg@GREENBERGRESEARCH.COM](mailto:agreenberg@GREENBERGRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: job postings  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-disposition: inline

## RESEARCH DIRECTOR

Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research, based in Washington, D.C., has an opening for RESEARCH DIRECTOR to direct and manage and all research services.=20

Responsibilities include: design of sampling frames and survey methodology.=  
Monitor the quality of data collection and focus group recruitment. =  
Scheduling and execution of all research. Contact for all research =  
vendors, obtain estimates and handle contract negotiations. Manage a =  
staff of 1-2.

Candidate profile: Should have knowledge of statistical sampling theory =  
and data collection techniques. Must have excellent communication =  
skills, and be detail oriented. Ability to work fast, under tight =  
timelines and high pressure. Must be willing to travel. MS Office =  
knowledge needed, Masters degree preferred, and language skills a plus. =  
Visit our website at [www.greenbergresearch.com](http://www.greenbergresearch.com).

Salary commensurate with experience. Submit cover letter, resume and =



salary requirements to jobs@greenbergresearch.com or fax to 202-289-8648.

\*\*\*\*\*=  
\*\*\*\*\*

## SENIOR ANALYST

Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research has an immediate opening for a SENIOR ANALYST in their Washington, DC office. GQR specializes in polls and focus groups across the globe for political campaigns and parties, public interest organizations and foundations as well as corporate crisis management. Visit our website at [www.greenbergresearch.com](http://www.greenbergresearch.com)

Responsibilities include: Act as lead analyst and project coordinator on major issue and political clients. Work with Principals to develop sample design, write questionnaires and focus group guidelines, manage internal research team, analyze data, write reports/ memos, present findings, and provide strategic advice to clients. =20

Candidate profile: Problem solver with a career interest in public opinion research or political strategy. Detail oriented person with excellent oral/communications skills, ability to work quickly, under tight timelines and high pressure. Strong writing and management skills. Team player and motivated, self-starter. Four or more years with quantitative/ qualitative issue driven research, campaigns or appropriate education background.

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

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

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

=====  
Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2003 13:14:49 -0400  
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Organization: Rider University  
Subject: Re: Another wrong definition of push polling  
Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

This is not the definition of a "push poll" as we generally define it. Any poll can be considered to "push" someone to make a decision by giving them a number of categorical responses and no "don't know" option (which is usually volunteered). "Push polling" refers to the practice of trying to influence, rather than measure, responses by using biased question wording. Perhaps someone should try to set whomever wrote this story straight.

"Leo G. Simonetta" wrote:

> From  
> <http://www.aljazeera.com/News%20archives/2003%20News%20archives/September/27%20n/Arab%20American%20News%20Focus.htm>

>  
> I'll Have My Polling With a Grain of Salt, Please As expected, the  
> media, bored with the barnstorming exuberance of Howard Dean, has done  
> their darndest to turn Wesley Clark into the "Next Big Thing." Take the  
> recent CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll, which has Clark leading Howard Dean  
> 22% to 13% with John Kerry and Richard Gephardt with 11% each, Joe  
> Lieberman 10%, and the rest of the field in single digits. Pretty  
> impressive numbers for Clark, right? But only to a point. A recent Zogby  
> International poll found "Clark and Dean share the lead among Democratic  
> presidential hopefuls, with 12% each. No other candidate reaches double  
> digits." Why the difference? Zogby, unlike other polling firms, doesn't  
> use "push polling," the practice where the pollster "pushes" respondents  
> to make a decision, this early in a race. That's why, if you look  
> closely at the two polls, you'll find that Zogby's has a vastly larger  
> number of undecided voters (43%) than the CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll  
> (15%), which is a much more accurate portrayal of the currently  
> fragmented and undecided Democratic voter base.

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

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

---

Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2003 13:55:12 -0400  
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Organization: Rider University  
Subject: Re: Iraq public opinion  
Comments: To: Howard Schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I thought I'd forward this to all and to Howard.

I heard a great story about interviewer effects from Mia Bloom who was interviewing people about their opinions on the Tamil Tigers in Sri Lanka.

When she first started interviewing, only a few people were willing to respond.

Later on, though, large numbers of respondents consented to the interview.

When she asked why the change had occurred, some of the respondents said "Well, when we saw that you and the people who answered were still alive, we figured it was okay to participate."

And we think we have problems.....

Howard Schuman wrote:

> The Washington Post article provided by Jan Werner looking more closely  
> at poll results in Iraq is useful. There is also one methodological  
> issue that needs careful consideration when surveys are done in places  
> like Iraq and indeed in other countries where perceptions of sponsorship  
> may well affect answers. In a 1990 survey-based experiment in  
> Nicaragua, whether interviewers were perceived to come from the  
> government or from the opposition party had an important impact on the  
> results. (A brief summary of the experiment appeared in the NYTimes,  
> op-ed page, March 7, 1990; a full report was in the Amer. J. Political  
> Science, 1992, 36: 331-50.) Whether a poll in Iraq is thought to be  
> sponsored by Americans or not, and whether the interviewers are seen to  
> be of a particular ethnicity or religion (or Sunni as against Shia), may  
> be as relevant as race of interviewer has turned out to be in the United  
> States. Howard

>

> -----

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

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

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

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

---

Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2003 14:16:12 -0400

Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>

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

From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>

Subject: Re: Another wrong definition of push polling

Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

In-Reply-To: <[3F786888.B1686637@rider.edu](mailto:3F786888.B1686637@rider.edu)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

When I come across a news story like this that uses push poll in a incorrect way I usually refer the author to the AAPOR definition.

But there is no link to email the author and, as a matter of fact, the authorship is not entirely clear to me from that page.

--

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

> Frank Rusciano wrote:  
> This is not the definition of a "push poll" as we generally define it.  
> Any  
> poll can be considered to "push" someone to make a decision by giving  
them  
> a  
> number of categorical responses and no "don't know" option (which is  
> usually  
> volunteered). "Push polling" refers to the practice of trying to  
> influence,  
> rather than measure, responses by using biased question wording.  
Perhaps  
> someone should try to set whomever wrote this story straight.  
>  
> "Leo G. Simonetta" wrote:  
>  
>> From  
>>  
>> <http://www.aljazeera.com/News%20archives/2003%20News%20archives/September/27%20n/Arab%20American%20News%20Focus.htm>  
>>  
>> I'll Have My Polling With a Grain of Salt, Please As expected, the  
>> media, bored with the barnstorming exuberance of Howard Dean, has  
done  
>> their darndest to turn Wesley Clark into the "Next Big Thing." Take  
the  
>> recent CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll, which has Clark leading Howard  
Dean  
>> 22% to 13% with John Kerry and Richard Gephardt with 11% each, Joe  
>> Lieberman 10%, and the rest of the field in single digits. Pretty  
>> impressive numbers for Clark, right? But only to a point. A recent  
Zogby  
>> International poll found "Clark and Dean share the lead among  
Democratic  
>> presidential hopefuls, with 12% each. No other candidate reaches  
double  
>> digits." Why the difference? Zogby, unlike other polling firms,  
doesn't  
>> use "push polling," the practice where the pollster "pushes"  
respondents  
>> to make a decision, this early in a race. That's why, if you look  
>> closely at the two polls, you'll find that Zogby's has a vastly  
larger  
>> number of undecided voters (43%) than the CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll  
>> (15%), which is a much more accurate portrayal of the currently

>> fragmented and undecided Democratic voter base.  
>>  
>> --  
>> 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

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

Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2003 15:50:28 -0400  
Reply-To: martin plissner <plissner@VERIZON.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: martin plissner <plissner@VERIZON.NET>  
Subject: WHY CAN'T REPORTERS WHO COVER POLLS EVER GET IT RIGHT?  
Comments: To: AAPORnet@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

In recent weeks this website was host to a spirited discussion of the =  
harm  
done to the good name of survey research by journalists untutored in =  
polling  
standards and practices and too lazy or dimwitted to seek the training =  
and  
advice which any number of AAPOR professionals were eager to provide. .

=20

With this in mind, I would like to call attention to what is surely the =  
most  
widely reported survey conducted thus far in the current presidential  
election cycle. For those who have not read the September 29 issue of  
Newsweek, I've attached the article in question. By last Thursday, =  
reports  
on this survey had appeared not only in Newsweek but on over 180 media  
outlets, including all of the country's major metropolitan papers (the  
Washington Post four times) and most of the broadcast and cable =  
networks.

All of those I looked at (a lot) repeated without qualification the  
assertions about the presidential race found in Newsweek.

=20

Now there is much in this article to excite contempt among the trained professionals of AAPOR. First of all, the survey report which found = General Clark an instant front-runner was done the day and the day after Clark's announcement - this in turn following news coverage in the days = preceding it which rivaled in breathlessness the run up to any entrance in a = presidential nomination race since, arguably, March of 1968.

=20

Clark, writes Newsweek's Laura Fording in her lead, "may have only = entered the race on Thursday, but he is already the Democratic front-runner. In = a survey of 377 Democrats and Democratic leanders, he is said to be = supported by 14% -- "outpacing" Howard Dean and Joe Lieberman (12% each), John = Kerry (10%) and Dick Gephardt (8%)

=20

Three paragraphs down, Fording informs her readers that the error margin = on the respondents whose views are reflected in her lead is plus or minus = six percentage points. In order words, if there had been a national primary = on September 18 and 19, it could have been Gephardt who turned out to be = the front-runner with 14% of the vote, and Clark who finished fifth with 8% = and, by the criteria of the National Council of Public Polls in its = post-election evaluations, the survey would be found impeccable. .

=20

How then can it be asserted without qualification that Clark "outpaces" = all his rivals, or even any of them? How is it possible to assert any kind = of rank order among five candidates all of whose support within the sample surveyed falls within that sample's margin of error.

=20

Elsewhere in the Newsweek report we are told that Clark "fares better" = in a match-up with President Bush than any other Democrat. We are told that = he trails the President by four points. Kerry as it happens trails by five

points. In this case the error margin is three points. Once again, to assert on this data that Clark fares better than his rivals against Bush smells to this admittedly untrained observer of malpractice.

=20

It doesn't stop. The overall headline which opens this segment of Newsweek starts with "Clark's early lead" ends with "Bush's ratings continue to slide."

How much, exactly, have those approval ratings continued to slide since a poll done the week before? ONE percentage point! Plus or minus three points - or so you can learn if you look four paragraphs later. If the reader does, and understands something which the Newsweek writer may or may not, Bush's approval rating could in fact have RISEN two points on the evidence submitted.

=20

Now it's quite possible that everything asserted as fact in this story is true. But God alone knows that. Certainly Newsweek does not. Nor do those who published any of the other polls conducted on these matters this past week. One has Howard Dean in front. Another has Dean and Clark tied. The two surveys which report Clark ahead of all the rest (Newsweek and Gallup) put his lead over the runner-up at 2 and 9 points respectively. (It should be noted, parenthetically, that we may be heading, as in 2000, towards another race in which these two surveys will often appear to have been conducted in different countries.)

=20

I'll leave it to others to evaluate the reporting of Gallup's survey by such clients as CNN and USA Today. What I think could use some scrutiny by AAPOR members concerned about the reporting of polls is the role in last week's Newsweek story of Princeton Survey Research Associates. According to Newsweek, it was PSRA which "conducted" the survey on which this story purports to be based. Is that ALL which this very well-regarded company did? In one sense, one would hope so.

=20

It is hard to imagine that anyone at PSRA signed off on this story =

before it  
went to the printer - or was even consulted much by the author in the =  
course  
of writing it. If that is true, however, it leads to the broader =  
question.  
Is it standard practice for polling firms to play such a hands-off role =  
in  
the way the findings of their public opinion surveys are presented to =  
the  
public. Even if they do not review the copy, do they at least pass =  
along a  
note with the printoffs pointing out (on the chance that some =  
ill-trained  
reporter working on deadline won't figure it out herself) such useful =  
things  
to know as a statistically insignificant difference among the top =  
candidates  
in its Democratic horse-race. =20

=20

Now I could be wrong on this, and if so I hope the folks at Princeton and  
elsewhere will straighten me out. Do the professionals who "conduct" =  
public  
polls at Princeton and elsewhere do everything possible to help their  
clients avoid publishing such garbage as Newsweek did last week and, if =  
so,  
are their clients resolutely rejecting their insistence? If not, and if  
they really care about the good name of polling, they need to do more =  
and to  
do it better. Otherwise I doubt there is any remedy to the sorry state =  
of  
things deplored at such length so recently on AAPORNET. Trust me. I =  
know  
the media. Forget about workshops.

=20

Marty Plissner

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

Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2003 16:24:39 -0400  
Reply-To: martin plissner <[plissner@VERIZON.NET](mailto:plissner@VERIZON.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: martin plissner <[plissner@VERIZON.NET](mailto:plissner@VERIZON.NET)>  
Subject: WHY CAN'T REPORTERS WHO COVER POLLS EVER GET IT RIGHT?  
Comments: To: [AAPORnet@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORnet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: multipart/mixed; boundary="Boundary\_(ID\_Wi8RR1Jiwj6EDE2fX2TNYA)"



This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

--Boundary\_(ID\_Wi8RRlJiwj6EDE2fX2TNYA)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

This is the Newsweek article referred to in the note I posted a few minutes ago.

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

--Boundary\_(ID\_Wi8RRlJiwj6EDE2fX2TNYA)  
Content-type: text/plain; name="=?us-ascii?Q?Campaign\_2004\_Clark's\_Charge.txt?="  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-disposition: attachment;  
filename="=?us-ascii?Q?Campaign\_2004\_Clark's\_Charge.txt?="

Campaign 2004: Clark=92s ChargeMSN Home | My MSN | Hotmail | =  
Search | Shopping | Money | People & Chat=20

=20  
Howard who? When he announced his candidacy, Wesley Clark became =  
the=20  
Democrats' new It Boy=20  
Campaign 2004: Clark=92s Charge =20  
The Race: The general did what he always does=97shot to the top of =  
his=20  
class. But his skin is thin, and the climb is steep. What Wesley =  
Clark=92s=20  
arrival does to the Democratic field =20

By Howard Fineman  
NEWSWEEK  
=20

Sept. 29 issue =97 After Al Qaeda attacked America, retired =  
Gen. Wes=20

Clark thought the Bush administration would invite him to join its =  
team.=20

After all, he=92d been NATO commander, he knew how to build =  
military=20

coalitions and the investment firm he now worked for had strong =  
Bush ties.=20

But when GOP friends inquired, they were told: forget it. =20

=20

=20

=20

=95 Buy Life Insurance

=95 MSNBC Hot List

=95 Yellow Pages

=95 expedia.com

=95 Shopping

=20

=20

=20

=20

=20

=20

WORD WAS THAT Karl Rove, the president=92s political =  
mastermind, had=20

blocked the idea. Clark was furious. Last January, at a conference =  
in=20

Switzerland, he happened to chat with two prominent Republicans, =  
Colorado=20

Gov. Bill Owens and Marc Holtzman, now president of the University =  
of=20

Denver. =93I would have been a Republican,=94 Clark told them, =  
=93if Karl Rove=20

had returned my phone calls.=94 Soon thereafter, in fact, Clark =  
quit his day=20

job and began seriously planning to enter the presidential =  
race=97as a=20

Democrat. Messaging NEWSWEEK by BlackBerry, Clark late last week =  
insisted=20

the remark was a =93humorous tweak.=94 The two others said it was =  
anything=20

but. =93He went into detail about his grievances,=94 Holtzman =  
said. =93Clark=20

wasn=92t joking. We were really shocked.=94=20

=20

Politics: Is Wes More?=20

=95 Audio: Evan Thomas, NEWSWEEK Assistant =

Managing=20

Editor, Washington and Jonathan Alter, NEWSWEEK =

Senior=20

Editor=20

=95 Audio: Listen to the complete weekly On Air =

show=20

They shouldn't have been: when Clark wades into the battle, he

expects to be taken seriously. Howard Dean knew to be careful when he and

Clark held what was supposed to be a secret conference three weeks ago in

L.A. Dean's advisers had warned their boss not to even hint that Clark

would be the running mate should Dean win the Democratic nomination. That

would have been both presumptuous and condescending, said a Dean aide.

Somehow, word of the meeting leaked as did the notion (hotly denied by

Dean insiders) that the VP slot indeed had been offered.

Online Mail Call: Our Readers Write About Wesley Clark

=20

## CLARK ENTERS THE RACE

Once again Clark was furious; once again his response was to gear

up. The day of the leak, Clark for the first time met his new senior PR

adviser, Mark Fabiani. The general asked him to suggest a possible chief

of staff. Fabiani nominated Ron Klain, who had filled that role for Al

Gore. What's his number? Clark asked and called immediately. Klain said

yes. Nine days later, Clark entered the race.

Can Wes Clark win the Democratic nomination?

No. Clark is too untested politically

Yes. His military experience makes him a perfect candidate

Wes Clark would be a great candidate for vice president

Vote to see results=20

Can Wes Clark win the Democratic nomination?

\* 56042 responses

No. Clark is too untested politically

24%

Yes. His military experience makes him a perfect candidate

57%

Wes Clark would be a great candidate for vice president

19%

Survey results tallied every 60 seconds. Live Votes reflect=20 respondents' views and are not scientifically valid surveys.

Now all of politics has to take Clark seriously=97as the = latest=20 NEWSWEEK Poll shows. Entering with a tremendous media splash, = =93the=20 general=94 seized the lead in the Democratic race. Among likely = voters,=20 Clark led with 14 percent, followed by Dean with 12, Sen. Joe = Lieberman=20 with 12, Sen. John Kerry with 10 and Rep. Dick Gephardt with 8. A=20 candidate called =93don=92t know=94 still led with 19 percent. = (And if Al Gore=20 and Hillary Clinton are added to the mix, they demolish the = field.) The=20 poll is notable for three reasons. It shows that Clark starts with = the=20 star power and on-paper credentials to be credible; he diminishes = the=20 entire field in equal proportion; and Democrats, yearning for a = winner=20 (and suddenly confident of their chances of beating President = Bush), still=20 haven=92t found their shining knight. =93He hurts all of us a bit, = at least=20 for now,=94 said Dean campaign manager Joe Trippi. =93Where it = goes from here?=20 Who knows? A lot will depend on the general himself.=94 Click here to read the transcript from Martha Brant's live talk on = Wesley=20 Clark. =20

Sept. 29, 2003 Cover Package: Wesley Clark=20

=95 Campaign 2004: Clark's Charge=20  
=95 Politics: The Water Walker=20  
=95 The Clark Critique=20  
=95 The Spouse: The General's Own MP=20  
=95 Alter: Why Money Won't Matter=20  
=95 Web Exclusive: Newsweek Poll--Clark Beating =

Other Dems=20

=95 Live Talk: Martha Brant joined us for a live =  
talk on=20  
Wesley Clark on Wed., Sept. 24. Read the =  
transcript.=20

Indeed, his first few days on the campaign trail were =  
anything but=20  
shock and awe. Never lacking for confidence, a firm believer in =  
the=20  
virtues of surprise, spoiling for a fight from the time he bought =  
his=20  
first toy soldier (at 5), Clark entered the race like the squad =  
leader of=20  
a commando raid. He=92d reconnoitered the battlefield for 18 =  
months,=20  
attending Washington dinners, meeting big-hitting donors, learning =  
the art=20  
of the sound bite as a contract player on CNN, sizing up the =  
candidate=20  
competition in chance encounters and green-room chats. By the =  
spring of=20  
2002, he was counseling with the likes of Democratic insiders =  
Donna=20  
Brazile and Donnie Fowler about whom to talk to, whom to hire and =  
where to=20  
travel, even while holding a job with Stephens Inc., in his home =  
of Little=20  
Rock, Ark. =93When our fund-raising folks sat down with him the =  
other day=20  
they were astonished,=94 said Fabiani. =93He=92d already met =  
everyone they were=20  
going to suggest that he see.=94=20

Wesley Clark announces candidacy

September 17, 2003 =97 Retired Gen. Wesley Clark announces =

his=20  
candidacy for president in Little Rock, Ark.

=20  
AT THE LAST MINUTE  
But to give himself the option of a retreat, and to =  
preserve the=20  
element of surprise, Clark didn=92t actually assemble his team =  
until the=20  
last minute, and didn=92t give the =93go=94 order until he had one =  
last=20  
conversation with his wife, Gert, the day before he ordered his =  
top people=20  
to fly to Little Rock for last Wednesday=92s announcement. As a =  
result,=20  
Clark had little experience dealing with the nuances of myriad =  
issues=97and=20  
no idea at all about how every word he uttered (in his entire =  
life) would=20  
be parsed, inflated and exploded by media looking for simple =  
declarations,=20  
clear stands and conflict, especially with other Democrats in the =  
field.=20  
Hours after his announcement, ABC=92s Mark Halperin asked Clark =  
for his=20  
personal ranking of the two most crucial U.S. Supreme Court =  
decisions of=20  
the last quarter century. The general drew a blank (but privately =  
vowed=20  
afterward to hit the books).

Gen. Wesley Clarke on his bid for president  
September 17, 2003 =97 Gen. Wesley Clark talks to MSNBC=92s =  
Chris=20  
Matthews about his presidential bid.

More seriously, Clark managed to create confusion about =  
his=20  
position on the war in Iraq=97opposition to which was supposed to =  
be his=20  
calling card. Pressed by reporters, Clark said he =93probably=94 =  
would have=20  
voted last year for the congressional resolution that authorized =  
George W.=20

Bush to go to war. Suddenly, the Democratic establishment=92s beau = ideal=97a=20 four-star foe of the war, a MacArthur who could not be branded a=20 McGovern=97seemed to fade into just another wishy-washy pol. From the Archives: The Man for the Moment, April 5,1999=20

What Clark meant, his aides scurried to say, was that he = would have=20 voted aye only to pressure Saddam Hussein into allowing more = inspections,=20 and as a way of scaring the United Nations into taking more = action. But=20 that was the rationale many Democrats in the Senate (including = Kerry and=20 Clinton) used to justify their yes vote. Dean, by contrast, agreed = with=20 Gore: that a yes vote on the resolution was tantamount to giving = Bush a=20 strategic blank check, sanctioning the president=92s theory of = pre-emptive=20 war. Dean says he would have voted no; Rep. Dennis Kucinich = actually did=20 so.

Clark=92s new spinners blamed the confusion on = reporters=92 refusal=20 (or inability) to understand fine distinctions=97and on Clark=92s = own naivete=20 about the brutish simple-mindedness of the campaign press corps. = Lacking=20 infrastructure (his new press secretary was using her husband=92s = cell=20 phone), Clark personally printed from his computer a sheaf of his = writings=20 showing his passionate opposition to the war per se. =93We screwed = up, but=20 we=92re learning,=94 one aide said. In Iowa, he declared he = =93never would have=20 voted for the war,=94 though war was precisely what the resolution = he=20 =93probably=94 would have supported authorized. From the Archives: Warrior's Rewards, August 9,1999=20 =20

=20

=95Al Sharpton  
=95Joe Lieberman  
=95Howard Dean

=95John Edwards  
=95Richard Gephardt  
=95John Kerry

=95Dennis Kucinich  
=95Carol Moseley Braun  
=95Bob Graham

=95Wesley Clark

## Printable version

The sound of such spinning tires on D-Day alarmed party =  
insiders.=20

Many view Clark as their best hope for derailing Dean, who will =  
raise more=20

cash than anyone else this quarter, and who is leading in polls in =  
key=20

early states. Clark is surprisingly at ease with voters on the =  
campaign=20

trail, and his time on cable schooled him in sound-bite science. =  
The=20

organizational tasks are daunting, but the battle plan is clear: =  
take off=20

in New Hampshire, win the following week in places such as South =  
Carolina,=20

Missouri, Oklahoma and Arizona. Clark knows the old Army saying: =  
plans are=20

useless when the war starts. Can he adapt fast enough? Over at the =  
White=20

House, they profess not to take the general seriously. Based on=20  
history=97his own and the country=92s=97that could turn out to be =  
a mistake.

=20

With Martha Brant with the Clark campaign

=20

=A9 2003 Newsweek, Inc.

=20

=20

=20

=20

Campaign 2004: Clark's Charge

Politics: The Water Walker

The Spouse: The General's Own MP

The Clark Critique

Why Money Won't Matter

MSNBC Cover Page

=20



=20

MSNBC READERS' TOP 10=20

Would you recommend this story to other readers?

not at all 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 =

highly=20

=20

=20

MSNBC is optimized for

=95 Microsoft Internet Explorer

=95 Windows Media Player =95 MSNBC Terms,  
Conditions and Privacy =A9 2003

=20

Cover | News | Business | Sports | Local News | Health | =

Technology=20

& Science | Entertainment=20

Travel | TV News | Opinions | Weather | Comics

InfoCenter | Newsletters | Search | Help | News Tools | Jobs =

| Write=20

Us | Terms & Conditions | Privacy=20

=20

MSN - More Useful Everyday

MSN Home | My MSN | Hotmail | Search | =

Shopping =20

| Money | People & Chat

=A92003 Microsoft Corporation. All rights reserved. Terms =  
of Use =20

Advertise Truste Approved Privacy Statement GetNetWise

Advertisement

=20

Newsweek National News

=20

=95 Campaign 2004: Clark's Charge

=95 Politics: The Water Walker

=95 The Spouse: The General's Own MP

=95 The Clark Critique

=20

Newsweek

=20

=95 Irreverent? Or Just Boorish?

=95 Clift: Why the Hillary Buzz Won't Go Away

=95 Starr: When Not to Root for the U.S.

=95 Dickey: Is Press to Blame For Iraqi Mess?

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

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

--Boundary\_(ID\_Wi8RRIJiwj6EDE2fX2TNYA)--  
=====

Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2003 17:49:02 -0400  
Reply-To: Corinne Kirchner <[corinne@AFB.NET](mailto:corinne@AFB.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Corinne Kirchner <[corinne@AFB.NET](mailto:corinne@AFB.NET)>  
Subject: Call for "Interest in presenting"  
Comments: To: [AAPORnet@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORnet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Hello AAPORnetters -

I am on the planning committee for an upcoming (April 2004) invitational conference on techniques to assure inclusion of people with disabilities in surveys. We are seeking expressions of interest in presenting or attending; travel funds will be available for some presenters. I am pasting below a letter from the federal agency co-chairs of the planning committee. Their contact info is provided in the letter, or you may contact me as a first step.

We look forward to strong participation from AAPOR researchers! Also, we hope you will circulate the notice to individuals or groups you think might be interested. If you could also let me know where you've sent it, that would be helpful, but not necessary.

Best, Corinne

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

-----  
Dear Colleague:

On April 19-20, 2004, the Federal Interagency Committee on Disability Research's (ICDR) Subcommittee on Disability Statistics will sponsor a conference to identify best practices in conducting surveys of people with disabilities. The meeting, to be held at the Capitol Hill Holiday Inn in Washington, D.C., is tentatively titled "Best Practices for Surveying People with Disabilities". David Keer and Paul Placek, Co-Chairs of the Subcommittee on Disability Statistics and of the conference-planning group, suggested I contact you since you may be doing research on this topic.

We are now in the process of identifying presenters and participants who have expertise in the following areas:

- identification of barriers and facilitators to survey participation by respondents with disabilities, including issues related to legislation and policy
- solutions and techniques for including respondents with disabilities in surveys, not limited to national surveys, that provide statistics related to public policy on disability
- description and evaluation of recent surveys that have made substantial attempts to reduce barriers, drawing lessons from them for a statement of best practices
- inclusion of persons with disabilities in all phases of disability survey planning/design/interviewer training/implementation/dissemination of results(i.e., Participatory Action Research, "Nothing About Us Without Us")
- assessment of technological innovations in survey data collection, including CAPI/CATI, self-paced audio and video surveys, E-mail surveys, and Web-based surveys, and their impact on inclusion of people with specific impairments
- assessment of the state of the art in survey design, emphasizing non-response bias and measurement of complex concepts, as they may affect disability-related statistics
- development of standards and best practices to assure maximum participation by people with disabilities in surveys

Participants will include representatives of federal agencies doing or using survey research, including member agencies of the ICDR; users and disseminators of survey statistics; representatives of disability advocacy and consumer organizations; and university and market researchers engaged in survey research. Public and private sector standard-setting organizations will be invited.

Travel support is available to selected non-Federal presenters. We invite you to contact the following members of the planning group by November 15 if you are interested in submitting an abstract or attending this conference. We also encourage you to share this announcement with others who are doing work in these areas.

Sincerely,

David Keer, MA, National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research/ED

Co-chair, Federal Interagency Subcommittee on Disability Statistics  
tel 202-205-5633; David.Keer@ed.gov

Paul Placek, PhD, National Center for Health Statistics/CDC

Co-chair, Federal Interagency Subcommittee on Disability Statistics  
tel 301-458-4437; PPlacek@cdc.gov

Juliana Cyril, PhD, National Center on Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities/CDC

tel 404-498-3014; JCyril@cdc.gov

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

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

=====  
Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2003 18:22:50 -0400

Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>

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

From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>

Subject: Re: NY Times ED - Attack of the Telemarketers  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

A couple of people asked me if I still had access to the data I referenced in a previous post and (eventually) I recalled that we had archived our data at the Odum Institute  
[http://www.irss.unc.edu/data\\_archive/home.asp](http://www.irss.unc.edu/data_archive/home.asp)

Upon review of the data I noticed that I had misremembered (the questions) and thought perhaps I'd better clarify for the group.

In case anyone else is interested here are the questions we asked and what we found:

Survey Date: 04/1997  
Sample: GEORGIA Residents 18 or older  
N=814

Next, some questions about restrictions on polling ... Many survey firms as well as direct marketers or telemarketers call consumers at home to gather information or to sell products. A national list upon which consumers could place their name if they did not wish to be called by certain groups has been proposed.

Do you think that consumers should have the right to place their name on a list that prevents them from being called by:  
(Percent saying yes)

|                                                                                                                                                                   |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Sales calls from Telemarketing companies                                                                                                                          |     |
| 92%                                                                                                                                                               |     |
| Requests for contributions from Charitable Organizations                                                                                                          |     |
| 80%                                                                                                                                                               |     |
| Political Surveys conducted by or for political parties or candidates                                                                                             | 75% |
| Scientific Research Polls for gathering information without a request for a contribution or purchase usually conducted by government or scientific organizations. | 68% |

If this list existed, would you pay five dollars to prevent each of the following groups from contacting you?  
(Percent saying yes)

|                                 |     |
|---------------------------------|-----|
| Telemarketers                   | 48% |
| Charitable Organizations        | 36% |
| Political Pollsters             | 37% |
| Scientific Survey Organizations | 29% |

When you are called on the telephone to participate in a

survey or poll would you say that you participate always, frequently, sometimes, or seldom?

Percent Responding

15% always  
26% frequently  
32% sometimes  
27% seldom  
<1% dk

--

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 30 Sep 2003 11:03:56 -0700  
Reply-To: "Mounts, Thea" <[Thea.Mounts@OFM.WA.GOV](mailto:Thea.Mounts@OFM.WA.GOV)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Mounts, Thea" <[Thea.Mounts@OFM.WA.GOV](mailto:Thea.Mounts@OFM.WA.GOV)>  
Subject: Satisfaction with Cultural and Recreational Opportunities  
Comments: To: "[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)" <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

We're trying to develop a measure of satisfaction with cultural and recreational opportunities in Washington state. Our plan is to add a question or questions to our statewide telephone population survey. Can anyone point me to some resources on how this might be measured?

Thanks--  
Thea

Thea N. Mounts  
Senior Forecasting Analyst  
Office of Financial Management  
Forecasting Division  
P.O. Box 43113  
Olympia, WA 98504-43113

Phone: (360) 902-0552  
FAX: (360) 664-8941  
E-mail: [thea.mounts@ofm.wa.gov](mailto:thea.mounts@ofm.wa.gov)

Washington State Population Survey:  
<http://www.ofm.wa.gov/sps/index.htm>

-----

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Tue, 30 Sep 2003 14:20:48 -0400  
Reply-To: Melissa Marcello <[mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM](mailto:mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Melissa Marcello <[mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM](mailto:mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Suggestions for Graduate-Level Class  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Hello,

I am currently reviewing materials for a grad-level class that I will be teaching on public opinion (and propaganda) this spring, and would really like input from folks on the list as to what they might suggest I include.

Thanks in advance for your suggestions.

Cheers,

Melissa

Melissa Marcello

Pursuant, Inc.

p 202.887.0070

f 800.567.1723

c 202.352.7462

Visit our website at [www.pursuantresearch.com](http://www.pursuantresearch.com)

---

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

Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

---

Date: Tue, 30 Sep 2003 16:26:38 -0400  
Reply-To: Mark Lamias <[Mark.Lamias@GRIZZARD.COM](mailto:Mark.Lamias@GRIZZARD.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mark Lamias <[Mark.Lamias@GRIZZARD.COM](mailto:Mark.Lamias@GRIZZARD.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Suggestions for Graduate-Level Class  
Comments: To: Melissa Marcello <[mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM](mailto:mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Melissa,

The APPOR site below has a list of suggested readings. I would suggest picking a few books and chapters from other books for the readings:

[http://www.aapor.org/default.asp?page=survey\\_methods/recommended\\_reading](http://www.aapor.org/default.asp?page=survey_methods/recommended_reading)

Sincerely yours,

Mark J. Lamias

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

From: Melissa Marcello [<mailto:mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM>]  
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2003 2:21 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Suggestions for Graduate-Level Class

Hello,

I am currently reviewing materials for a grad-level class that I will be teaching on public opinion (and propaganda) this spring, and would really like input from folks on the list as to what they might suggest I include.

Thanks in advance for your suggestions.

Cheers,

Melissa

Melissa Marcello

Pursuant, Inc.

p 202.887.0070

f 800.567.1723

c 202.352.7462

Visit our website at [www.pursuantresearch.com](http://www.pursuantresearch.com)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Tue, 30 Sep 2003 17:28:57 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Baghdad Urban Legends  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

This one is quite long so I am not going to post it in its entirety.

Baghdad Urban Legends

How come so many people think weapons of mass destruction have been found in Iraq, or that Saddam Hussein was personally involved in the September 11 attacks? Are the news media to blame?

By Lori Robertson

Lori Robertson is AJR's managing editor.

<http://www.ajr.org/Article.asp?id=3408>

--

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>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet