

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 LOG0311"

Date: Sun, 2 Nov 2003 11:00:24 -0500
Reply-To: Keith Neuman <keith.neuman@ENVIRONICS.CA>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Keith Neuman <keith.neuman@ENVIRONICS.CA>
Subject: Re: Legality of ethnicity survey questions in Canada
Comments: To: "Steen, Bob" <steenb@FLEISHMAN.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

I've been research in Canada for the past 15 or so years and have never come across any official restrictions on asking about ethnicity within the Canadian population. It is true, as someone else points out, that many will identify themselves as "Canadian", which requires further probing.

Keith Neuman
Environics Research Group

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of Steen, Bob
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2003 4:55 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Legality of ethnicity survey questions in Canada

On an international Web-based survey, we just had a Canadian respondent claim that "it is illegal in Canada to ask a question about ethnic background."

I imagine the respondent is misinformed, but we are asking our attorney to check.

Beyond job applications and other anti-discrimination settings, have any of you encountered prohibitions about asking specific types of background questions on privately-sponsored, opt-in surveys? In Canada or elsewhere. Thanks.

Bob Steen

Vice President
Fleishman-Hillard Knowledge Solutions
200 North Broadway
St. Louis, MO 63102

314-982-1752
steenb@fleishman.com <mailto:steenb@fleishman.com>

Fax: 314-982-9105

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: Sun, 2 Nov 2003 17:53:56 -0500
Reply-To: Erik Nisbet <ecn1@CORNELL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Erik Nisbet <ecn1@CORNELL.EDU>
Subject: methodological dispute: networks vs. nielsen media research
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Has anyone been following news of the reported dispute in the entertainment world over the measurement of Prime-Time Viewership this fall season? According to nielsen media research, viewership is down by 1 million viewers this fall as compared to last year, especially in key demographics - but the major networks and their own market research are saying not, that instead something is wrong with nielsen media measurement and methodology?

see
http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&u=/nm/20031031/tv_nm/television_sweeps_dc_1 for one of the news stories.

Of course none of the several news reports have provided methodological details what the issue really is - I was just curious from an academic and methodological viewpoint what the dispute is about?

Anyone know?

Erik Nisbet
Cornell University

Erik C. Nisbet
M.S. Candidate
Public Opinion & Political Communication
Department of Communication
Cornell University
Kennedy Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853
Ph: 607-254-7213
Fax: 607-255-7118

email: ecn1@cornell.edu

Research Associate & Project Manager
Survey Research Institute (SRI)
Cornell University
B12 Ives Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853
www.sri.cornell.edu

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

Date: Mon, 3 Nov 2003 08:10:23 -0500
Reply-To: Keith Neuman <keith.neuman@ENVIRONICS.CA>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Keith Neuman <keith.neuman@ENVIRONICS.CA>
Subject: On-line versus mail survey response patterns
Comments: To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I'd like to pose some questions about on-line versus traditional mail =
methods that I hope may be of interest to others as well:

We have recently conducted a test study of professionals in a mixed =
methodology fielding - both on-line and via traditional mail. These =
professionals were asked to rate the performance of several companies on =
service delivery attributes, as well as the importance of those =
attributes to them. Our analysis, as expected, shows a variety of =
interesting, yet potentially vexing, differences between the two methods =
in terms of the mean responses (no real problem with response =
distribution differences). These are systematic, and often, complexly =
systematic.

I would appreciate any input people could give me on this issue in two =
ways: 1) pointers to published articles, pre-prints or accessible =
electronic reports that speak to these issues; and/or 2) suggestions =
about amelioratives / correctives to them from your own past encounters =
with similar patterns.

Here is a brief list of what we have been finding:

1. Questions about the rated importance (1-5 Likert scaling, "not at =
all" to "very") of various factors to the respondent's companies =
performance ratings. On importance ratings we found a strong =
relationship between method used and the extremity of response. Paper =
and pencil (i.e., mail) respondents rated dimensions more extremely, =
both positively and negatively, than did on-line respondents. Even =
though the empirical range of the means of the attributes, all assessed =
on 1-5 scaling, was on the positive side of neutral (i.e., from about =
the neutral point, a 3, to 4.5), at the high end (means above 3.8-which =

is the grand mean) mail respondents gave more positive ratings of importance than did their on-line counterparts, and at the low end (means less than 3.8) they gave less positive ratings. Across 25 attributes assessed for importance, the correlation between (1) the overall study scale score for the attributes, and (2) the difference between the paper and pencil vs. on-line means for those attributes, was $r = .65$.

2. Questions assessing the performance of companies on the same dimensions as assessed above. The same effect as described in 1 above was in effect, but weaker overall, on the performance ratings. However, on a target-by-target basis, sometimes the ratings score-to-mean difference relation was strong, and sometimes it was weak. Some companies that were rated elicited no difference in mean ratings as a function of method ($r = 0.0$); other companies' ratings showed a strong scale position to method difference relation (correlations of $+0.55$ to $+0.60$). More complexly, for two companies showing two equally strong paper and pencil extremity effects, one might be based mainly on methods differences between means on performance attributes, whereas the locus of effect for the other company might be on other content. So there was an extremity effect (paper and pencil ratings more extreme in positive and negative directions than on-line ratings) X target (company rated) X substantive content area (type of rating attribute) three-way interaction effect. =20

3. At the same time as the above findings, we have found little evidence of inter-method distortion/bias for questions asking respondents to apportion 100 points (or percent-points) among several targets (e.g., total sales apportioned across four broad categories).

An input or suggestions are appreciated. Please send responses either to me directly or to AAPORNET.

Thanks in advance for your help,

Keith Neuman, Ph.D.
Senior Vice President
Environics Research Group Ltd.
ph: 613-230-5089
keith.neuman@environics.ca

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

Date: Mon, 3 Nov 2003 10:56:23 -0600
Reply-To: Barry Feinberg <bfeinberg@GFKCUSTOMRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Barry Feinberg <bfeinberg@GFKCUSTOMRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Job Posting
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT
Content-disposition: inline

Please see below:
Barry

Senior Marketing Research Associate

Join the Midtown Manhattan office of one of the nation's top marketing research firms.

Excellent opportunity for a talented individual with strengths in project management and research design. GfK-CRI consults with major corporations to meet business research information needs. Join us and thrive with one of the nation's top research firms!

As a team member at GfK-CRI's New York office, you will help handle the design, management, and analysis for custom research projects for our clients. This position requires 4-6 years custom marketing research design and project management experience, ideally working with financial services clients. Other experience with B2B clients and customer satisfaction projects a plus.

GfK Custom Research Inc. is a national, full service marketing research, customer satisfaction measurement and database marketing firm headquartered in Minneapolis with offices in New York and San Francisco. GfK-CRI is a member of the GfK Group, a leading international market research organization.

We offer an attractive compensation package, exceptional career development opportunities, and an excellent working environment. Our NY office is located at 475 Park Avenue South at 32nd Street.

If you have what we are looking for and would like to be considered, please send your resume to:

Etaylor@gfkcustomreseaech.com

Eileen Taylor
GfK Custom Research Inc.®
P. O. Box 27900
Minneapolis, MN 55427

Barry M. Feinberg, Ph.D.
Senior Vice President
Director, New York Office
GfK Custom Research Inc.

475 Park Avenue South, 12th Floor
New York, New York 10016
212-330-1484 (tel.)
212-684-8431 (fax.)
bfeinberg@gfkcustomresearch.com

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

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

Date: Mon, 3 Nov 2003 13:25:50 -0800
Reply-To: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>
Subject: Re: On-line versus mail survey response patterns
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <1A21B97B2989A247BB1FAE0BD6B4F202079805@envmail.environics.ca>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

>Paper and pencil (i.e., mail) respondents rated dimensions more
>extremely, both positively and negatively, than did on-line respondents.

Interesting. Here's some pure speculation: Completing a paper-and-pencil survey (and sending it back) may take a greater investment of time and energy than completing and submitting an online survey, so perhaps the paper-and-pencil respondents are more likely than the online respondents to be the most motivated to be heard (ie. those who are very dissatisfied or very satisfied).

Jerold Pearson, '75
Director of Market Research
Stanford Alumni Association
650-723-9186
jpearson@stanford.edu
<http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/>

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

Date: Mon, 3 Nov 2003 17:43:13 -0500

Reply-To: Nat Ehrlich <nehrlich@UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nat Ehrlich <nehrlich@UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re: On-line versus mail survey response patterns
Comments: To: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@STANFORD.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <4.3.1.2.20031103131520.00b31338@jpearson.pobox.stanford.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I had responded without speculation, but Pearson's idea is worth contemplating. It is another brick in the wall that supports the notion that web surveys provide a higher quality response than mail.

Nat Ehrlich

"Use it up, wear it out, make it do or do without"

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jerold Pearson
Sent: Monday, November 03, 2003 4:26 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: On-line versus mail survey response patterns

>Paper and pencil (i.e., mail) respondents rated dimensions more
>extremely, both positively and negatively, than did on-line respondents.

Interesting. Here's some pure speculation: Completing a paper-and-pencil survey (and sending it back) may take a greater investment of time and energy than completing and submitting an online survey, so perhaps the paper-and-pencil respondents are more likely than the online respondents to be the most motivated to be heard (ie. those who are very dissatisfied or very satisfied).

Jerold Pearson, '75
Director of Market Research
Stanford Alumni Association
650-723-9186
jpearson@stanford.edu
<http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/>

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, 4 Nov 2003 03:14:26 +0100
Reply-To: Lyberg Lars VL-S <lars.lyberg@SCB.SE>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Lyberg Lars VL-S <lars.lyberg@SCB.SE>
Subject: =?Windows-1252?Q?Fr=E5nvaro=2C_autosvar=3A_Vote_for_the_2004_T-Shirt_SI?=
=?Windows-1252?Q?ogan=21?=
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=Windows-1252
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I am away from my desk until November 24. Manuscripts and other JOS mail = should be sent to jos@scb.se as usual.

Lars Lyberg

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

=====
Date: Mon, 3 Nov 2003 21:15:55 -0500
Reply-To: via an auto-responder <broh@MIT.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: via an auto-responder <broh@MIT.EDU>
Subject: (Away from my e-mail) Re: Vote for the 2004 T-Shirt Slogan!
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <200311040210.hA42AXA2028798@fort-point-station.mit.edu>

I have received your message but I will be away from my desk until November 4. If you need help from someone in the COFHE office, please contact Ed Jacobson at eaj@mit.edu or by phone at (617) 253-5026.

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

=====
Date: Tue, 4 Nov 2003 03:16:32 +0100
Reply-To: Japtec Lilli U/MET-S <lilli.japtec@SCB.SE>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Japtec Lilli U/MET-S <lilli.japtec@SCB.SE>
Subject: =?Windows-1252?Q?Fr=E5nvaro=2C_autosvar=3A_Vote_for_the_2004_T-Shirt_SI?=
=?Windows-1252?Q?ogan=21?=
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=Windows-1252
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Thank you for your message. I'm on vacation and will be back in the = office November 19.

Lilli

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

Date: Tue, 4 Nov 2003 10:37:41 -0800
Reply-To: Richard Rands <rrands@CFMC.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Richard Rands <rrands@CFMC.COM>
Subject: Re: On-line versus mail survey response patterns
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <ANEJINEBMPDGIBEGBNFPEELLCBAA.nehrlich@umich.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

>From: "Janet Brigham Rands" <jjzbrands@earthlink.net>

>

>I'm not sure why I've never been added to AAPORNET, but here are some
>thoughts about different modes of administration of a questionnaire. I
>haven't written these up for publication, but will share them in the hope
>that they'll be useful to others.

>

>Recently we conducted a survey of dental hygienists, starting with a
>randomly selected sample of members of a professional association. We sent
>invitations by postal mail (because the professional org. does not have
>email addresses), and offered a \$15 gift card incentive. We enclosed an
>invitation letter (on letterhead from SRI International, where I'm a
>research psychologist) and provided an emerald-green card listing both a
>website where respondents could take the survey online, and a toll-free
>number that they could call to take the survey over the phone.

>

>Of 2,000 invitations, about 30 were returned as undeliverable. We cut the
>responses off at 600, since that was an ample sample, and since I was
>getting very weary of being awakened at 4 a.m. by dental hygienists from the
>East Coast. (The 800 number pointed to my home phone, because we didn't
>have time to set it up for my office phone.) Of the 600+ respondents, more
>than 92% opted to take the survey on the Web. The survey ran in WebSurvent,
>from CfMC. I interviewed approximately 50 hygienists over the phone. The
>duration of the study was from mid-August to the end of September.

>

>We compared Web vs. interview responses for each item on the survey. We
>found no significant differences on any items *except* a cluster of items in
>which we asked hygienists if they spoke to their patients about tobacco use,
>whether and how they spoke with their patients about the risks of tobacco
>use, and what if anything they recommended for treatment options. These
>questions (which led to open-ended responses via skip logic) had the most
>social-desirability loading (compared with such questions as, "How many
>patients do you see per week?"). The hygienists I interviewed were
>significantly more likely to indicate that they asked about tobacco,
>described risks, and provided treatment recommendations and options.

>

>What we do not know is whether the interview respondents represented

>different demographics than those who self-administered the questionnaire on
>the Web. Because of IRB and professional-organization restrictions, we did
>not acquire much demographic information. If we knew how such factors as
>age, years of professional experience, and Internet acumen and access were
>associated with response to those questions, we'd know whether the
>differences in responses were more related to being interviewed rather than
>to other factors.

>
>We are hoping to repeat and expand the survey, which was pilot work, with a
>larger sample and more extensive demographics. When we do, we'll be
>watching differences between self-administration and interview responses.

>
>One additional miscue is worth noting. I got a number of calls from
>hygienists who indicated that neither they nor their spouse could bring up
>the website of the survey. I knew it was running fine, so initially this
>baffled me. I quizzed them about their browsers, ISPs, etc. Then it dawned
>on me that they were mistaking a search engine for a browser, and they were
>entering our URL into a search engine. I then began instructing everyone
>calling with this problem to go to the very tip-top of their screen and
>enter the web address up there, *not* in the center of the screen. This
>worked. Next time, we'll enclose a little diagram of a computer screen,
>with an arrow pointing to the browser address line at the top. It won't
>work for everyone, but those who can't distinguish a browser from a search
>engine aren't likely to have customized their browsers much anyway. My
>step-daughter who works at Google tells me that they also run into this
>confusion among users.

>
>So...this doesn't answer your paper-vs-web question directly, but I hope
>it's useful. FWIW, we'll also be conducting an extensive tobacco-use survey
>over the next five years as part of a recently awarded NIH grant. Most of
>our questionnaires are sufficiently complex that we can't use paper-pencil
>versions, but we will be studying interview vs. self-administration
>reliability and validity extensively, and where paper-pencil versions of
>q'aires are feasible, we'll examine the statistics on those as well.

>
>Janet Brigham, Ph.D.
>SRI International
>Menlo Park, CA

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

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

Date: Tue, 4 Nov 2003 13:47:08 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Re: methodological dispute: networks vs. nielsen media research
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <PLEBKDGMOJOILHMEOKMGGENGCBAA.ecn1@cornell.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

It sounds like the prodigals are returning or were never really in the building or something:

THE HUNT FOR TV'S MISSING MEN

Media Buyers Scrutinize Male TV Viewership Numbers

<http://www.adage.com/news.cms?newsId=39085>

--

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 Erik Nisbet

> Sent: Sunday, November 02, 2003 5:54 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: methodological dispute: networks vs. nielsen media research

>

> Has anyone been following news of the reported dispute in the

> entertainment

> world over the measurement of Prime-Time Viewership this fall season?

> According to nielsen media research, viewership is down by 1 million

> viewers this fall as compared to last year, especially in key

> demographics

> -

> but the major networks and their own market research are saying not,
> that

> instead something is wrong with nielsen media measurement and

> methodology?

>

> see

>

> http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&u=/nm/20031031/tv_nm/televisio

> n_

> sweeps_dc_1 for one of the news stories.

>

> Of course none of the several news reports have provided
> methodological

> details what the issue really is - I was just curious from an academic
> and

> methodological viewpoint what the dispute is about?

>

> Anyone know?

>

> Erik Nisbet

> Cornell University

>

>

>
> Erik C. Nisbet
> M.S. Candidate
> Public Opinion & Political Communication
> Department of Communication
> Cornell University
> Kennedy Hall
> Ithaca, NY 14853
> Ph: 607-254-7213
> Fax: 607-255-7118
> email: ecn1@cornell.edu
>
> Research Associate & Project Manager
> Survey Research Institute (SRI)
> Cornell University
> B12 Ives Hall
> Ithaca, NY 14853
> www.sri.cornell.edu
>
> -----
> 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>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 4 Nov 2003 14:09:55 -0500
Reply-To: Yasamin Miller <yd17@CORNELL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Yasamin Miller <yd17@CORNELL.EDU>
Subject: Re: On-line versus mail survey response patterns
Comments: To: Richard Rands <rRANDS@CFMC.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <6.0.0.22.2.20031104103636.02c75088@mail.cfmc.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

If you only provided a URL link to the site, how did you ensure that your sample was legitimate and that some random web surfers did not enter it?

At 10:37 AM 11/4/2003 -0800, Richard Rands wrote:

>>From: "Janet Brigham Rands" <jzbrands@earthlink.net>

>>

>>I'm not sure why I've never been added to AAPORNET, but here are some thoughts about different modes of administration of a questionnaire. I haven't written these up for publication, but will share them in the hope that they'll be useful to others.

>>

>>Recently we conducted a survey of dental hygienists, starting with a randomly selected sample of members of a professional association. We sent invitations by postal mail (because the professional org. does not have

>>email addresses), and offered a \$15 gift card incentive. We enclosed an
>>invitation letter (on letterhead from SRI International, where I'm a
>>research psychologist) and provided an emerald-green card listing both a
>>website where respondents could take the survey online, and a toll-free
>>number that they could call to take the survey over the phone.

>>
>>Of 2,000 invitations, about 30 were returned as undeliverable. We cut the
>>responses off at 600, since that was an ample sample, and since I was
>>getting very weary of being awakened at 4 a.m. by dental hygienists from the
>>East Coast. (The 800 number pointed to my home phone, because we didn't
>>have time to set it up for my office phone.) Of the 600+ respondents, more
>>than 92% opted to take the survey on the Web. The survey ran in WebSurvent,
>>from CfMC. I interviewed approximately 50 hygienists over the phone. The
>>duration of the study was from mid-August to the end of September.

>>
>>We compared Web vs. interview responses for each item on the survey. We
>>found no significant differences on any items *except* a cluster of items in
>>which we asked hygienists if they spoke to their patients about tobacco use,
>>whether and how they spoke with their patients about the risks of tobacco
>>use, and what if anything they recommended for treatment options. These
>>questions (which led to open-ended responses via skip logic) had the most
>>social-desirability loading (compared with such questions as, "How many
>>patients do you see per week?"). The hygienists I interviewed were
>>significantly more likely to indicate that they asked about tobacco,
>>described risks, and provided treatment recommendations and options.

>>
>>What we do not know is whether the interview respondents represented
>>different demographics than those who self-administered the questionnaire on
>>the Web. Because of IRB and professional-organization restrictions, we did
>>not acquire much demographic information. If we knew how such factors as
>>age, years of professional experience, and Internet acumen and access were
>>associated with response to those questions, we'd know whether the
>>differences in responses were more related to being interviewed rather than
>>to other factors.

>>
>>We are hoping to repeat and expand the survey, which was pilot work, with a
>>larger sample and more extensive demographics. When we do, we'll be
>>watching differences between self-administration and interview responses.

>>
>>One additional miscue is worth noting. I got a number of calls from
>>hygienists who indicated that neither they nor their spouse could bring up
>>the website of the survey. I knew it was running fine, so initially this
>>baffled me. I quizzed them about their browsers, ISPs, etc. Then it dawned
>>on me that they were mistaking a search engine for a browser, and they were
>>entering our URL into a search engine. I then began instructing everyone
>>calling with this problem to go to the very tip-top of their screen and
>>enter the web address up there, *not* in the center of the screen. This
>>worked. Next time, we'll enclose a little diagram of a computer screen,
>>with an arrow pointing to the browser address line at the top. It won't
>>work for everyone, but those who can't distinguish a browser from a search
>>engine aren't likely to have customized their browsers much anyway. My
>>step-daughter who works at Google tells me that they also run into this
>>confusion among users.

>>

>>So...this doesn't answer your paper-vs-web question directly, but I hope
>>it's useful. FWIW, we'll also be conducting an extensive tobacco-use survey
>>over the next five years as part of a recently awarded NIH grant. Most of
>>our questionnaires are sufficiently complex that we can't use paper-pencil
>>versions, but we will be studying interview vs. self-administration
>>reliability and validity extensively, and where paper-pencil versions of
>>q'aires are feasible, we'll examine the statistics on those as well.

>>
>>Janet Brigham, Ph.D.
>>SRI International
>>Menlo Park, CA

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

Yasamin Miller, Director
Survey Research Institute - SRI
168 Ives Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853
tel: 607-255-0148
fax: 607-255-7118
em: yd17@cornell.edu

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

=====
Date: Tue, 4 Nov 2003 14:50:37 -0500
Reply-To: Scott.Crawford@MSIRESEARCH.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Scott.Crawford@MSIRESEARCH.COM
Subject: Re: On-line versus mail survey response patterns
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

You really can't say for sure that the differences you found had anything to do with the mode. (although they may be related) In your design the respondents self selected into either the Web or phone data collections. Fundamentally they could be different kinds of people (I'm talking more than just demographics here... their personalities, etc. are likely to be different... things that you really can't control for.) I would expect that respondents who chose to talk with someone over the phone would be more positive. Just that choice alone shows that they are more social...

In your future studies, I would encourage you to (if possible) keep a clean experiment with respondents randomly assigned to mode treatments (without allowing for self-selection)... there is still a lot to be learned about how respondents answer differently between modes. And it is rare to see a well controlled experiment that isn't influenced by self selection. We

need more studies like that to be conducted and shared.

Scott Crawford
Research Director
MSIResearch
scott.crawford@msiresearch.com
734/542-7796 (office)
734/542-7620 (fax)

Richard Rands
<rrands@CFMC.C To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
OM> cc:
Sent by: Subject: Re: On-line versus mail

survey response patterns
AAPORNET
<AAPORNET@asu.
edu>

11/04/2003
01:37 PM
Please respond
to Richard
Rands

>From: "Janet Brigham Rands" <jzbrands@earthlink.net>

>

>I'm not sure why I've never been added to AAPORNET, but here are some
>thoughts about different modes of administration of a questionnaire. I
>haven't written these up for publication, but will share them in the hope
>that they'll be useful to others.

>

>Recently we conducted a survey of dental hygienists, starting with a
>randomly selected sample of members of a professional association. We
sent
>invitations by postal mail (because the professional org. does not have
>email addresses), and offered a \$15 gift card incentive. We enclosed an
>invitation letter (on letterhead from SRI International, where I'm a
>research psychologist) and provided an emerald-green card listing both a
>website where respondents could take the survey online, and a toll-free
>number that they could call to take the survey over the phone.

>

>Of 2,000 invitations, about 30 were returned as undeliverable. We cut the
>responses off at 600, since that was an ample sample, and since I was
>getting very weary of being awakened at 4 a.m. by dental hygienists from

the
>East Coast. (The 800 number pointed to my home phone, because we didn't
>have time to set it up for my office phone.) Of the 600+ respondents,
more
>than 92% opted to take the survey on the Web. The survey ran in
WebSurvent,
>from CfMC. I interviewed approximately 50 hygienists over the phone. The
>duration of the study was from mid-August to the end of September.
>
>We compared Web vs. interview responses for each item on the survey. We
>found no significant differences on any items *except* a cluster of items
in
>which we asked hygienists if they spoke to their patients about tobacco
use,
>whether and how they spoke with their patients about the risks of tobacco
>use, and what if anything they recommended for treatment options. These
>questions (which led to open-ended responses via skip logic) had the most
>social-desirability loading (compared with such questions as, "How many
>patients do you see per week?"). The hygienists I interviewed were
>significantly more likely to indicate that they asked about tobacco,
>described risks, and provided treatment recommendations and options.
>
>What we do not know is whether the interview respondents represented
>different demographics than those who self-administered the questionnaire
on
>the Web. Because of IRB and professional-organization restrictions, we
did
>not acquire much demographic information. If we knew how such factors as
>age, years of professional experience, and Internet acumen and access were
>associated with response to those questions, we'd know whether the
>differences in responses were more related to being interviewed rather
than
>to other factors.
>
>We are hoping to repeat and expand the survey, which was pilot work, with
a
>larger sample and more extensive demographics. When we do, we'll be
>watching differences between self-administration and interview responses.
>
>One additional miscue is worth noting. I got a number of calls from
>hygienists who indicated that neither they nor their spouse could bring up
>the website of the survey. I knew it was running fine, so initially this
>baffled me. I quizzed them about their browsers, ISPs, etc. Then it
dawned
>on me that they were mistaking a search engine for a browser, and they
were
>entering our URL into a search engine. I then began instructing everyone
>calling with this problem to go to the very tip-top of their screen and
>enter the web address up there, *not* in the center of the screen. This
>worked. Next time, we'll enclose a little diagram of a computer screen,
>with an arrow pointing to the browser address line at the top. It won't
>work for everyone, but those who can't distinguish a browser from a search
>engine aren't likely to have customized their browsers much anyway. My
>step-daughter who works at Google tells me that they also run into this

>confusion among users.
>
>So...this doesn't answer your paper-vs-web question directly, but I hope
>it's useful. FWIW, we'll also be conducting an extensive tobacco-use
survey
>over the next five years as part of a recently awarded NIH grant. Most of
>our questionnaires are sufficiently complex that we can't use paper-pencil
>versions, but we will be studying interview vs. self-administration
>reliability and validity extensively, and where paper-pencil versions of
>q'aires are feasible, we'll examine the statistics on those as well.
>
>Janet Brigham, Ph.D.
>SRI International
>Menlo Park, CA

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, 4 Nov 2003 15:00:44 -0500
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Organization: Bisconti Research, Inc.
Subject: Iraq and Peace in the World - EU public opinoin
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

European Public Opinion About Iraq and Peace in the World
Survey conducted Oct. 8-16, 2003
Flash Eurobarometer - European Commission - Link to Full Report:
http://europa.eu.int/comm/public_opinion/flash/fl151_iraq_full_report.pdf

One question in particular hit a nerve...

EU embarrassed as poll labels Israel world's biggest threat

<http://www.eubusiness.com/afp/031103170505.xmn7mrha=20>

03 November 2003 =20

=3D =3D ATTENTION -, ADDS Israeli, Italian presidency reax ///=20

The European Union scrambled Monday to contain the fallout from a public opinion poll that -- to Israel's fury -- labelled the Jewish state the

biggest threat to world peace.=20

The United States was just behind Israel in the global danger league, in joint second place with North Korea and Iran, according to the "Eurobarometer" poll requested by the European Commission.=20

The results were part of a survey last month on Europeans' attitudes in the aftermath of the Iraq war, which also found that more than two-thirds of EU citizens think that the US-led war was wrong.=20

The Israeli embassy in Brussels voiced outrage at the findings, which said that 59 percent of Europeans see Israel as a threat to world peace.=20

"Europeans seem blind to Israeli victims and suffering. Instead, they have put the Jewish state below the level of the worst pariah state and terror organizations," it said in a statement.=20

"We are not only sad but outraged. Not at European citizens, but at those who are responsible for forming public opinion," the embassy added.=20

"Israel's desperate struggle for peace and security for its people has been distorted beyond recognition in often one-sided and emotionally charged media coverage."=20

The poll had already prompted angry reactions after details were leaked by the Spanish daily El Pais last week.=20

The Israeli ambassador to Italy -- which currently holds the EU presidency -- told the daily Il Messagero Monday that the poll could have significant diplomatic consequences.=20

"It seems to me that the only aim of this poll was to denigrate Israel at a very delicate time, and I think it will it much more difficult for Europe to fulfill its ambition to play a part in the peace process," said Ehud Gol.=20

The EU's Italian presidency tried to play down the results, insisting they did not reflect the official EU position.=20

"The result of the survey, based on an ambiguous question, does not reflect

the position of the European Union which has been voiced on numerous occasions," Italian Foreign Minister Franco Frattini said in a statement.=20

"The EU is all the more annoyed since it is fully aware that the Israeli population is hit hard by terrorism," it said, criticising the "false signal" that the survey sent out.=20

According to the Eurobarometer poll, based on interviews with 500 people in each of the 15 EU states, some 59 percent of Europeans replied "yes" when asked whether or not Israel presents a threat to peace in the world.=20

A total of 53 percent said Iran, North Korea and the United States pose a threat, followed by 52 percent for Iraq, 50 percent for Afghanistan and 48 percent for Pakistan.=20

Countries lower down the list included Syria, Libya, Saudi Arabia, China, India, Russia and Somalia. The EU itself was described as a threat by eight percent of respondents.=20

The EU survey was presented in the form of a list of 15 countries, from which some 7,515 respondents were asked to say which ones they thought pose a threat to world peace.=20

Commission spokesman Gerassimos Thomas was repeatedly asked why the Palestinian territories were not included, while for example the survey asked Europeans about the threat from Somalia. "It is not a country," he replied when pressed over the Palestinians.=20

The European Commission said Israel's anger was "legitimate" but refused to get drawn into whether the poll findings were valid.=20

"I think the (Israeli) reaction was a very legitimate reaction," the spokesman for the EU's executive arm told reporters.=20

But he added: "It is not our task to interpret each and every survey. We don't place excessive emphasis on one poll result."=20

Text and Picture Copyright C 2003 AFP. All other copyright C 2003 EUbusiness Ltd. All rights reserved. This material is intended solely for personal use.

Any other reproduction, publication or redistribution of this material without the written agreement of the copyright owner is strictly forbidden and any breach of copyright will be considered actionable.=20

Number of discussions: 18

Mark David Richards
=20

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

Date: Tue, 4 Nov 2003 16:07:48 -0800
Reply-To: "Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D." <jonathanbrill@EARTHLINK.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D." <jonathanbrill@EARTHLINK.NET>
Subject: Fw: On-line versus mail survey response patterns
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Colleagues:

This thread has been very interesting to me because of my numerous experiences with web surveys in which I used multi-item scale measures that had been validated using alternative survey media.

I have found that performance of established scales often disintegrates when used on web surveys. In my experience using dozens of such scales, I have found that:

1. Empirical evidence supporting claims of scale unidimensionality often disappears.
2. Measures of internal consistency (e.g. Chronbach's Alpha) often deteriorate to the point that reliability is unacceptable (e.g., I have seen published alphas greater than .85 fall below .6 many times -- and this has happened to me using scales ranging from 3 to 10 items). Sometimes, I chose to subsequently check the alphas among a small subsample using paper and pencil questionnaires only to find (every time I did this) that the observed alpha approximated claimed for it in the literature.
3. Patterns of scale intercorrelations, when common sets of scales are repeated on different web surveys, often change dramatically bearing little resemblance to the patterns observed previously.

In addition to these disconcerting experiences, many other findings (measuring behavioral reports and characteristics of the sample) I have observed have seemed suspect to the point where my management laughed and (in my view, and based on other census data we had on the sample population) correctly dismissed entire survey efforts as ludicrous and invalid. I have therefore come to the conclusion (hypothesis) that web surveys may involve a

distraction factor whereby participants often pay little attention to the task at hand (relative to the attention typically given surveys conducted by other media) and, for this reason, web based survey research offers little value to serious attitude researcher efforts. I do not trust web surveys at all and my experiences using them has convinced me that using them to make decisions is a very foolish thing to do. Web surveys seem good for entertainment value only, much like self selected call in polls.

Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.
57 Flint Locke Lane
Medfield, Massachusetts 02052
Telephone: 508.359-6675
E-mail: jonathan.brill.wh82@wharton.upenn.edu

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

From: <Scott.Crawford@MSIRESEARCH.COM>
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 04, 2003 11:50 AM
Subject: Re: On-line versus mail survey response patterns

> You really can't say for sure that the differences you found had anything
> to do with the mode. (although they may be related) In your design the
> respondents self selected into either the Web or phone data collections.
> Fundamentally they could be different kinds of people (I'm talking more
> than just demographics here... their personalities, etc. are likely to be
> different... things that you really can't control for.) I would expect
> that respondents who chose to talk with someone over the phone would be
> more positive. Just that choice alone shows that they are more social...
>
> In your future studies, I would encourage you to (if possible) keep a
clean
> experiment with respondents randomly assigned to mode treatments (without
> allowing for self-selection)... there is still a lot to be learned about
> how respondents answer differently between modes. And it is rare to see a
> well controlled experiment that isn't influenced by self selection. We
> need more studies like that to be conducted and shared.

> *****

> Scott Crawford
> Research Director
> MSIResearch
> scott.crawford@msiresearch.com
> 734/542-7796 (office)
> 734/542-7620 (fax)

>
>
> Richard Rands
> <rrands@CFMC.C To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> OM> cc:
> Sent by: Subject: Re: On-line versus
mail survey response patterns

> AAPORNET
> <AAPORNET@asu.
> edu>

>
>
> 11/04/2003
> 01:37 PM
> Please respond
> to Richard
> Rands

>>From: "Janet Brigham Rands" <jzbrands@earthlink.net>

>>I'm not sure why I've never been added to AAPORNET, but here are some
>>thoughts about different modes of administration of a questionnaire. I
>>haven't written these up for publication, but will share them in the hope
>>that they'll be useful to others.

>>Recently we conducted a survey of dental hygienists, starting with a
>>randomly selected sample of members of a professional association. We
> sent
>>invitations by postal mail (because the professional org. does not have
>>email addresses), and offered a \$15 gift card incentive. We enclosed an
>>invitation letter (on letterhead from SRI International, where I'm a
>>research psychologist) and provided an emerald-green card listing both a
>>website where respondents could take the survey online, and a toll-free
>>number that they could call to take the survey over the phone.

>>Of 2,000 invitations, about 30 were returned as undeliverable. We cut
the
>>responses off at 600, since that was an ample sample, and since I was
>>getting very weary of being awakened at 4 a.m. by dental hygienists from
> the
>>East Coast. (The 800 number pointed to my home phone, because we didn't
>>have time to set it up for my office phone.) Of the 600+ respondents,
> more
>>than 92% opted to take the survey on the Web. The survey ran in
> WebSurvent,
>>from CfMC. I interviewed approximately 50 hygienists over the phone.
The
>>duration of the study was from mid-August to the end of September.

>>We compared Web vs. interview responses for each item on the survey. We
>>found no significant differences on any items *except* a cluster of items
> in
>>which we asked hygienists if they spoke to their patients about tobacco
> use,
>>whether and how they spoke with their patients about the risks of tobacco
>>use, and what if anything they recommended for treatment options. These

>>questions (which led to open-ended responses via skip logic) had the most
>>social-desirability loading (compared with such questions as, "How many
>>patients do you see per week?"). The hygienists I interviewed were
>>significantly more likely to indicate that they asked about tobacco,
>>described risks, and provided treatment recommendations and options.
>>
>>What we do not know is whether the interview respondents represented
>>different demographics than those who self-administered the questionnaire
> on
>>the Web. Because of IRB and professional-organization restrictions, we
> did
>>not acquire much demographic information. If we knew how such factors
as
>>age, years of professional experience, and Internet acumen and access
were
>>associated with response to those questions, we'd know whether the
>>differences in responses were more related to being interviewed rather
> than
>>to other factors.
>>
>>We are hoping to repeat and expand the survey, which was pilot work, with
> a
>>larger sample and more extensive demographics. When we do, we'll be
>>watching differences between self-administration and interview responses.
>>
>>One additional miscue is worth noting. I got a number of calls from
>>hygienists who indicated that neither they nor their spouse could bring
up
>>the website of the survey. I knew it was running fine, so initially this
>>baffled me. I quizzed them about their browsers, ISPs, etc. Then it
> dawned
>>on me that they were mistaking a search engine for a browser, and they
> were
>>entering our URL into a search engine. I then began instructing everyone
>>calling with this problem to go to the very tip-top of their screen and
>>enter the web address up there, *not* in the center of the screen. This
>>worked. Next time, we'll enclose a little diagram of a computer screen,
>>with an arrow pointing to the browser address line at the top. It won't
>>work for everyone, but those who can't distinguish a browser from a
search
>>engine aren't likely to have customized their browsers much anyway. My
>>step-daughter who works at Google tells me that they also run into this
>>confusion among users.
>>
>>So...this doesn't answer your paper-vs-web question directly, but I hope
>>it's useful. FWIW, we'll also be conducting an extensive tobacco-use
> survey
>>over the next five years as part of a recently awarded NIH grant. Most
of
>>our questionnaires are sufficiently complex that we can't use
paper-pencil
>>versions, but we will be studying interview vs. self-administration
>>reliability and validity extensively, and where paper-pencil versions of
>>q'aies are feasible, we'll examine the statistics on those as well.

>>
>>Janet Brigham, Ph.D.
>>SRI International
>>Menlo Park, CA
>
>-----
> 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, 4 Nov 2003 22:56:44 +0100
Reply-To: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>
Subject: Re: Iraq and Peace in the World - EU public opinion
Comments: To: mark@bisconti.com, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <[005701c3a30e\\$560edc70\\$6801a8c0@MARK](mailto:005701c3a30e$560edc70$6801a8c0@MARK)>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

This study made huge headlines in Europe. main problem is of course 'question wording'. Naming Israel could very well stand for 'middle eastern Israeli-Palestinian conflict', something entirely different!. making the choice not to use Palestine (as it is not seen as a country) jeopardizes the validity. Perhaps follow up analysis could shed some light on this. For instance is there a correlation between naming Israel and other 'middle eastern' countries like Libya, and Syria? For the Dutch there appears to be such an association.

Second point is that the conclusions stated in the newspapers: Israel seen as biggest threat... are not a correct translation of the research findings. One was asked to name countries that are a threat, not to rank order them in order of biggest threat.

Thanks for sending the link to the full report. I will certainly use this in my methods & statistics classes!

Peaceful greetings, Edith

At 03:00 PM 11/4/2003 -0500, Mark David Richards wrote:
>European Public Opinion About Iraq and Peace in the World
>Survey conducted Oct. 8-16, 2003
>Flash Eurobarometer - European Commission - Link to Full Report:
>http://europa.eu.int/comm/public_opinion/flash/fl151_iraq_full_report.pdf
>

>-----
>One question in particular hit a nerve...
>-----

>
>EU embarrassed as poll labels Israel world's biggest threat
>|

Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, MethodikA
Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam
tel + 31 20 622 34 38 fax + 31 20 330 25 97
e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl

Hope is like a small light in the dark
It keeps the nightmares away till the dawn of a new world

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

=====
Date: Tue, 4 Nov 2003 14:11:32 -0800
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
Subject: Re: On-line versus mail survey response patterns
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

My experience at web surveys ... as someone who has participated in =
software design, fielded surveys, analyzed survey data, and taken them =
... is that they can be used very effectively, but they are usually used =
inappropriately. Not that survey abuse is uncommon in other media (see =
next email). If you are fielding a short, say, 2 to 8 minute survey, =
with no more than one or two sets of matrix questions (people HATE =
these), with easy to understand scales, concise text where little, if =
any attention needs to be paid to instructions, to someone who is =
interested in the topic, with a target population that is reachable =
using an email invite or pop-up, then yes, they can work great. But =
violate one of those guidelines, then you run smack into respondent =
burden, and they bail, either by terminating, or by providing bogus =
answers. In many cases, the survey is designed so poorly that in order =
to continue one has to give a bogus answer.=20

Leora

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D. [<mailto:jonathanbrill@EARTHLINK.NET>]
> Sent: Tuesday, November 04, 2003 4:08 PM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Fw: On-line versus mail survey response patterns
>=20
>=20
> Colleagues:
>=20
> This thread has been very interesting to me because of my numerous

> experiences with web surveys in which I used multi-item scale=20
 > measures that
 > had been validated using alternative survey media.
 >=20
 > I have found that performance of established scales often=20
 > disintegrates when
 > used on web surveys. In my experience using dozens of such=20
 > scales, I have
 > found that:
 >=20
 > 1. Empirical evidence supporting claims of scale=20
 > unidimensionality often
 > disappears.
 >=20
 > 2. Measures of internal consistency (e.g. Chronbach's Alpha) often
 > deteriorate to the point that reliability is unacceptable=20
 > (e.g., I have seen
 > published alphas greater than .85 fall below .6 many times --=20
 > and this has
 > happened to me using scales ranging from 3 to 10 items). =20
 > Sometimes, I chose
 > to subsequently check the alphas among a small subsample=20
 > using paper and
 > pencil questionnaires only to find (every time I did this)=20
 > that the observed
 > alpha approximated claimed for it in the literature.
 >=20
 > 3. Patterns of scale intercorrelations, when common sets of=20
 > scales are
 > repeated on different web surveys, often change dramatically=20
 > bearing little
 > resemblance to the patterns observed previously.
 >=20
 > In addition to these disconcerting experiences, many other findings
 > (measuring behavioral reports and characteristics of the=20
 > sample) I have
 > observed have seemed suspect to the point where my management=20
 > laughed and
 > (in my view, and based on other census data we had on the=20
 > sample population)
 > correctly dismissed entire survey efforts as ludicrous and=20
 > invalid. I have
 > therefore come to the conclusion (hypothesis) that web=20
 > surveys may involve a
 > distraction factor whereby participants often pay little=20
 > attention to the
 > task at hand (relative to the attention typically given=20
 > surveys conducted by
 > other media) and, for this reason, web based survey research=20
 > offers little
 > value to serious attitude researcher efforts. I do not trust=20
 > web surveys at
 > all and my experiences using them has convinced me that using=20
 > them to make

> decisions is a very foolish thing to do. Web surveys seem good for
> entertainment value only, much like self selected call in polls.

>=20

> Jonathan E. Brill, Ph.D.

> 57 Flint Locke Lane

> Medfield, Massachusetts 02052

> Telephone: 508.359-6675

> E-mail: jonathan.brill.wh82@wharton.upenn.edu

>=20

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

> From: <Scott.Crawford@MSIRESEARCH.COM>

> To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

> Sent: Tuesday, November 04, 2003 11:50 AM

> Subject: Re: On-line versus mail survey response patterns

>=20

>=20

>> You really can't say for sure that the differences you=20

> found had anything

>> to do with the mode. (although they may be related) In=20

> your design the

>> respondents self selected into either the Web or phone data=20

> collections.

>> Fundamentally they could be different kinds of people (I'm=20

> talking more

>> than just demographics here... their personalities, etc.=20

> are likely to be

>> different... things that you really can't control for.) I=20

> would expect

>> that respondents who chose to talk with someone over the=20

> phone would be

>> more positive. Just that choice alone shows that they are=20

> more social...

>>

>> In your future studies, I would encourage you to (if=20

> possible) keep a

> clean

>> experiment with respondents randomly assigned to mode=20

> treatments (without

>> allowing for self-selection)... there is still a lot to be=20

> learned about

>> how respondents answer differently between modes. And it=20

> is rare to see a

>> well controlled experiment that isn't influenced by self=20

> selection. We

>> need more studies like that to be conducted and shared.

>>

>>

>> *****

>> Scott Crawford

>> Research Director

>> MSIResearch

>> scott.crawford@msiresearch.com

>> 734/542-7796 (office)

>> 734/542-7620 (fax)

>>
>>
>>
>> Richard Rands
>> <rrands@CFMC.C To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>> OM> cc:
>> Sent by: Subject: Re:=20

> On-line versus
> mail survey response patterns
>> AAPORNET
>> <AAPORNET@asu.
>> edu>

>> 11/04/2003
>> 01:37 PM
>> Please respond
>> to Richard
>> Rands

>>> From: "Janet Brigham Rands" <jzbrands@earthlink.net>

>>> I'm not sure why I've never been added to AAPORNET, but=20
> here are some
>>> thoughts about different modes of administration of a=20
> questionnaire. I
>>> haven't written these up for publication, but will share=20
> them in the hope
>>> that they'll be useful to others.

>>>
>>> Recently we conducted a survey of dental hygienists,=20
> starting with a
>>> randomly selected sample of members of a professional=20
> association. We
>> sent
>>> invitations by postal mail (because the professional org.=20
> does not have
>>> email addresses), and offered a \$15 gift card incentive. =20
> We enclosed an
>>> invitation letter (on letterhead from SRI International,=20
> where I'm a
>>> research psychologist) and provided an emerald-green card=20
> listing both a
>>> website where respondents could take the survey online,=20
> and a toll-free
>>> number that they could call to take the survey over the phone.
>>>
>>> Of 2,000 invitations, about 30 were returned as=20
> undeliverable. We cut

> the
>>>responses off at 600, since that was an ample sample, and=20
> since I was
>>>getting very weary of being awakened at 4 a.m. by dental=20
> hygienists from
>> the
>>>East Coast. (The 800 number pointed to my home phone,=20
> because we didn't
>>>have time to set it up for my office phone.) Of the 600+=20
> respondents,
>> more
>>>than 92% opted to take the survey on the Web. The survey ran in
>> WebSurvent,
>>>from CfMC. I interviewed approximately 50 hygienists over=20
> the phone.
> The
>>>duration of the study was from mid-August to the end of September.
>>>
>>>We compared Web vs. interview responses for each item on=20
> the survey. We
>>>found no significant differences on any items *except* a=20
> cluster of items
>> in
>>>which we asked hygienists if they spoke to their patients=20
> about tobacco
>> use,
>>>whether and how they spoke with their patients about the=20
> risks of tobacco
>>>use, and what if anything they recommended for treatment=20
> options. These
>>>questions (which led to open-ended responses via skip=20
> logic) had the most
>>>social-desirability loading (compared with such questions=20
> as, "How many
>>>patients do you see per week?"). The hygienists I interviewed were
>>>significantly more likely to indicate that they asked=20
> about tobacco,
>>>described risks, and provided treatment recommendations=20
> and options.
>>>
>>>What we do not know is whether the interview respondents=20
> represented
>>>different demographics than those who self-administered=20
> the questionnaire
>> on
>>>the Web. Because of IRB and professional-organization=20
> restrictions, we
>> did
>>>not acquire much demographic information. If we knew how=20
> such factors
> as
>>>age, years of professional experience, and Internet acumen=20
> and access
> were

>>> associated with response to those questions, we'd know whether the
>>> differences in responses were more related to being=20
> interviewed rather
>> than
>>> to other factors.
>>>
>>> We are hoping to repeat and expand the survey, which was=20
> pilot work, with
>> a
>>> larger sample and more extensive demographics. When we=20
> do, we'll be
>>> watching differences between self-administration and=20
> interview responses.
>>>
>>> One additional miscue is worth noting. I got a number of=20
> calls from
>>> hygienists who indicated that neither they nor their=20
> spouse could bring
> up
>>> the website of the survey. I knew it was running fine, so=20
> initially this
>>> baffled me. I quizzed them about their browsers, ISPs,=20
> etc. Then it
>>> dawned
>>> on me that they were mistaking a search engine for a=20
> browser, and they
>> were
>>> entering our URL into a search engine. I then began=20
> instructing everyone
>>> calling with this problem to go to the very tip-top of=20
> their screen and
>>> enter the web address up there, *not* in the center of the=20
> screen. This
>>> worked. Next time, we'll enclose a little diagram of a=20
> computer screen,
>>> with an arrow pointing to the browser address line at the=20
> top. It won't
>>> work for everyone, but those who can't distinguish a browser from a
> search
>>> engine aren't likely to have customized their browsers=20
> much anyway. My
>>> step-daughter who works at Google tells me that they also=20
> run into this
>>> confusion among users.
>>>
>>> So...this doesn't answer your paper-vs-web question=20
> directly, but I hope
>>> it's useful. FWIW, we'll also be conducting an extensive=20
> tobacco-use
>> survey
>>> over the next five years as part of a recently awarded NIH=20
> grant. Most
> of
>>> our questionnaires are sufficiently complex that we can't use

> paper-pencil
>> >versions, but we will be studying interview vs. self-administration
>> >reliability and validity extensively, and where=20
> paper-pencil versions of
>> >q'aires are feasible, we'll examine the statistics on=20
> those as well.
>>>
>> >Janet Brigham, Ph.D.
>> >SRI International
>> >Menlo Park, CA
>>
>> -----
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:=20
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
>>
>> -----
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:=20
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
>=20
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:=20
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
>=20

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

Date: Tue, 4 Nov 2003 17:15:45 -0500
Reply-To: Nat Ehrlich <nehrlich@UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nat Ehrlich <nehrlich@UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re: Iraq and Peace in the World - EU public opinion
Comments: To: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@XS4ALL.NL>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <5.1.0.14.2.20031104224442.01c42b58@pop.xs4all.nl>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Note that in the key question, "For each country, say whether you believe it is a threat to world peace" the country that scored the highest percentage of yes votes in a given country was the United States -- 88% of Greek respondents answered Yes to the question.
Interesting? Perhaps the Greeks were reasoning that, since we have the greatest stockpile of nuclear weapons, and could if we chose unleash a nuclear holocaust that would wipe out every organism on the planet, that we are the biggest threat.

Nat Ehrlich

"Use it up, wear it out, make it do or do without"

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of Edith de Leeuw

Sent: Tuesday, November 04, 2003 4:57 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Iraq and Peace in the World - EU public opinion

This study made huge headlines in Europe. main problem is of course 'question wording'. Naming Israel could very well stand for 'middle eastern Israeli-Palestinian conflict', something entirely different!. making the choice not to use Palestine (as it is not seen as a country) jeopardizes the validity. Perhaps follow up analysis could shed some light on this. For instance is there a correlation between naming Israel and other 'middle eastern' countries like Libya, and Syria? For the Dutch there appears to be such an association.

Second point is that the conclusions stated in the newspapers: Israel seen as biggest threat... are not a correct translation of the research findings. One was asked to name countries that are a threat, not to rank order them in order of biggest threat.

Thanks for sending the link to the full report. I will certainly use this in my methods & statistics classes!

Peaceful greetings, Edith

At 03:00 PM 11/4/2003 -0500, Mark David Richards wrote:

>European Public Opinion About Iraq and Peace in the World

>Survey conducted Oct. 8-16, 2003

>Flash Eurobarometer - European Commission - Link to Full Report:

>http://europa.eu.int/comm/public_opinion/flash/fl151_iraq_full_report.pdf

>

>-----

>One question in particular hit a nerve...

>-----

>

>EU embarrassed as poll labels Israel world's biggest threat

>|

Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, MethodikA

Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam

tel + 31 20 622 34 38 fax + 31 20 330 25 97

e-mail edithl@xs4all.nl

Hope is like a small light in the dark

It keeps the nightmares away till the dawn of a new world

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, 4 Nov 2003 17:41:17 -0500
Reply-To: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
Subject: Re: Iraq and Peace in the World - EU public opinion
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>, Nat Ehrlich <nehrlich@UMICH.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <ANEJINEBMPDGIBEGBNFPOELOCBAA.nehrlich@umich.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

>
> Note that in the key question, "For each country, say whether you
> believe it
> is a threat to world peace" the country that scored the highest percentage
> of yes votes in a given country was the United States -- 88% of Greek
> respondents answered Yes to the question.
> Interesting? Perhaps the Greeks were reasoning that, since we have the
> greatest stockpile of nuclear weapons, and could if we chose unleash a
> nuclear holocaust that would wipe out every organism on the
> planet, that we
> are the biggest threat.

Or perhaps they noticed that we just caused a mid-east conflict with no justification, a position that 95% of the Greek public agreed with. Note that they are in closest proximity.

Andy Beveridge

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

Date: Tue, 4 Nov 2003 14:41:35 -0800
Reply-To: Paolo Gardinali <paolo@SURVEY.UCSB.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Paolo Gardinali <paolo@SURVEY.UCSB.EDU>
Subject: Re: Iraq and Peace in the World - EU public opinion
Comments: To: Nat Ehrlich <nehrlich@UMICH.EDU>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <ANEJINEBMPDGIBEGBNFPOELOCBAA.nehrlich@umich.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Tue, 4 Nov 2003, Nat Ehrlich wrote:

> Note that in the key question, "For each country, say whether you believe it
> is a threat to world peace" the country that scored the highest percentage
> of yes votes in a given country was the United States -- 88% of Greek
> respondents answered Yes to the question.
> Interesting? Perhaps the Greeks were reasoning that, since we have the
> greatest stockpile of nuclear weapons, and could if we chose unleash a

> nuclear holocaust that would wipe out every organism on the planet, that we
> are the biggest threat.

Closer to current events: the Greek position on the threat to peace is consistent with their disapproval of the US invasion of Irak:

"Today, would you say that the military intervention of the United States and their allies in Iraq was absolutely justified, rather justified, rather not justified or not justified at all?"

95% of the respondents considered it not justified or not justified at all, and 82% are in the "not at all" category.

Could it also be for the CIA role in the bloody 1967 coup?

Cheers,

--

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

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

Date: Wed, 5 Nov 2003 09:40:49 -0500
Reply-To: mmichaels@michaelsresearch.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Maureen Michaels <mmichaels@MICHAELSRESEARCH.COM>
Organization: Michaels Opinion Reserach, Inc.
Subject: NY Times Op Ed
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

This appeared in Monday's New York Times. I've seen the list and virtually all targeted researchers are at universities throughtout the country.

--Maureen Michaels

Op-Ed Columnist: The Big Chill at the Lab

November 3, 2003
By BOB HERBERT

A list of nearly 200 scientific researchers has been compiled and given to federal officials by the Traditional Values Coalition, a conservative group that goes wild over gay issues and federal funding of research

related to human sexuality.

The list, which has sent a chill through some researchers, is being used by the coalition and its government allies in attempts to discredit the researchers and challenge or revoke their federal grants. It's a sloppy, dangerous and wildly inaccurate list, put together by people who are freaked out by the content of the studies, and unconcerned about their value.

The targeted studies cover a wide range of topics related to health and sexuality, including H.I.V. and AIDS, sexually transmitted diseases and adolescent sexual behavior.

The Web site of the Traditional Values Coalition is bizarrely fixated on sexual matters. The banner headline on the home page the other day blared, "HOMOSEXUAL URBAN LEGENDS: The Series . . ."

The site complained that "nearly \$100 million has gone to research many projects which reasonable people, even those with no particular religious or political perspective, would view as prurient."

For a right-wing coalition to be hung up on these matters is one thing. But the coalition's list, which includes some of the most respected scientists and institutions in the country, is circulating among members of Congress and was forwarded to the National Institutes of Health, which is responsible for awarding the crucially important grants.

"It has a lot of people very nervous," said Dr. Thomas Coates, a professor in the Division of Infectious Diseases at the David Geffen School of Medicine at U.C.L.A. "People who have made a career out of this kind of research - well, when you see your name on a list you wonder what's going to happen to your funding."

"The list itself is less important than the context in which it's been generated," said Dr. Judith Auerbach, a vice president of the American Foundation for AIDS Research. Until recently Dr. Auerbach headed the Office of AIDS Research at the National Institutes of Health.

"The context is that in recent months there have been a series of specific inquiries to the N.I.H. from Congressional committee members, through their staffs in particular, asking about specific grants and specific grantees based apparently on the content of those grants."

The content is usually related to such matters as the AIDS virus, high-risk sexual behavior and other topics linked in some way to sexuality.

"Those inquiries come in a very negative tone," said Dr. Auerbach. "And they cast aspersions on the quality and the content of the science - from someone who doesn't know how to conduct science, and is not a scientist. So the N.I.H. has been put in the position frequently in the last year of having to re-justify research that has already been peer-reviewed, approved and funded."

Science has to suffer when the know-nothings come traipsing through the laboratories, infecting the research with their religious beliefs and political ideologies. Andrea Lafferty is the executive director of the Traditional Values Coalition, which she says represents more than 43,000 churches.

"What makes us unique among all the conservative groups," she said, "is that I believe we truly represent the body of Christ."

Ms. Lafferty said she personally gave the list of scientific researchers to Representative Billy Tauzin, a Louisiana Republican who is chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee. One of its subcommittees has been reviewing the awarding of grants by N.I.H.

"We never said any grant on there was bad," said Ms. Lafferty. But she said she wanted to know why the grants were being funded, and why so many had to do with H.I.V. and AIDS.

Ms. Lafferty acknowledged that her group has a problem with homosexuality. "We're concerned that it's a behavior-based lifestyle, that you're not born that way," she said.

She insisted that the coalition does not oppose research on H.I.V. and AIDS, but added, "How many times do you have to study something to find out how to stop the spread of AIDS?"

The public officials who got their hands on this sinister list could have thrown it in the garbage. Instead, the list is circulating, like an insidious disease, and some scientists are worried that they are not immune. =A0

<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/11/03/opinion/03HERB.html?ex=3D1068966252&ei=3D=1&en=3D5ffee38231ecadfa>

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

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

Date: Wed, 5 Nov 2003 11:45:48 -0500
Reply-To: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>
Subject: New AAPOR Policy Impact Award
Comments: To: AAPORnet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable
Content-disposition: inline

Dear AAPOR members,
I'm very pleased to post below an announcement of a new "AAPOR Policy = Impact Award." The purpose of the award is to recognize "outstanding =

research that has had a clear impact on improving policy decisions, =
practice, and discourse," either in the public or private sectors. The =
award will be conferred at our Annual Conference in May 2004. Deadline =
for submissions is March 1, 2004.

The award statement follows:

AAPOR Policy Impact Award

Introduction. A key purpose of opinion and other survey research is to =
facilitate better informed decisions. AAPOR wishes to recognize outstanding=
research that has had a clear impact on improving policy decisions, =
practice, and discourse, either in the public or private sectors.

Nominations. Research organizations or individuals are encouraged to =
submit nominations detailing:

=B7 the policy issues under study

=B7 how the research strategy addressed the issues

=B7 all methods utilized to conduct the research

=B7 how the research shaped or influenced decisions or policy =
formulation or public discourse about it

=B7 assessment of how the resulting policy, practice or decision was =
informed by the research or how the research had an impact on the quality =
of public debate.

The nominations should come in the form of case studies. There is no one =
set formula or format for these submissions. Since there is a time lag =
between completion of studies and demonstrated policy impact, this award =
does not specify a specific time frame for study completion. Generally, =
we expect that studies will have been completed in the past five years or =
so. =20

Jury Process. Entries will be evaluated by a committee chaired by AAPOR's =
Past President, who will be responsible for appointing four additional =
jury members, subject to the approval by the AAPOR Council. The Award may =
not be given every year.

Submission Deadline: March 1, 2004.

Award Place/Date: 59th Annual AAPOR Conference

Phoenix, Arizona

May 15, 2004

Inquiries and Submissions. Please address any inquiries about the Award =
and the entry process to: =20

Mark Schulman

AAPOR Past President

Schulman, Ronca, & Bucuvalas, Inc.

145 E. 32nd Street, Suite 500

New York, NY 10016

email: m.schulman@srbi.com <mailto:m.schulman@srbi.com>, or=20

voice: 212-779-7700.=20

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

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

signoff aapornet

Date: Wed, 5 Nov 2003 09:19:36 -0800

Reply-To: Richard Rands <rrands@CFMC.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Richard Rands <rands@CFMC.COM>
Subject: Re: On-line versus mail survey response patterns
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

This was a pilot, as I noted. It was NOT designed to be a test of interview vs. self-administration -- it was designed to gather information for a proposal, so that we would know better what the professional interests of dental hygienists are. We were simply trying to get information as quickly as we could from as many dental hygienists as we could, so we would have a better sense of their interests and preferences.

Coincidentally, we decided to compare the results from self-administered vs. interview respondents so that we could exercise some caution in interpreting the results from any questions that differed between modalities. Those differences were what I reported here earlier.

It wasn't an experiment -- although I do believe that such experiments should be conducted. It's very difficult to get funding for methodological work, however.

As to whether personality was involved in who called and who didn't-- maybe, maybe not. As a psychologist, I'm fairly skeptical about most of what passes for delineations of personality, even in the most psychometrically valid instruments. It's not somewhere I'm intending to go, but I do suspect that there might be some age (for which the term demographics is a broad surrogate) factor in who called for an interview and who didn't.

Those who called almost all apologized for not having Internet access. A few were temporarily without access, due to a broken computer or somesuch. What amazed me was that more than 92% opted to use the Internet -- the figures I've seen for Internet penetration in middle-class America certainly didn't lead me to expect a figure that high. Some respondents accessed it at work, however.

(I am beginning to regret ever mentioning this. I think I will shortly crawl back into my hole of anonymity.)

Janet

>>You really can't say for sure that the differences you found had anything
>>to do with the mode. (although they may be related) In your design the
>>respondents self selected into either the Web or phone data collections.
>>Fundamentally they could be different kinds of people (I'm talking more
>>than just demographics here... their personalities, etc. are likely to be
>>different... things that you really can't control for.) I would expect
>>that respondents who chose to talk with someone over the phone would be
>>more positive. Just that choice alone shows that they are more social...
>>
>>In your future studies, I would encourage you to (if possible) keep a
clean
>>experiment with respondents randomly assigned to mode treatments (without
>>allowing for self-selection)... there is still a lot to be learned about

> >how respondents answer differently between modes. And it is rare to see
a
> >well controlled experiment that isn't influenced by self selection. We
> >need more studies like that to be conducted and shared.
> >
> >
> >*****
> >Scott Crawford
> >Research Director
> >MSIResearch
> >scott.crawford@msiresearch.com
> >734/542-7796 (office)
> >734/542-7620 (fax)

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

Date: Wed, 5 Nov 2003 09:22:21 -0800
Reply-To: Richard Rands <rrands@CFMC.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Richard Rands <rrands@CFMC.COM>
Subject: Re: On-line versus mail survey response patterns
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

As I explained, we postal-mailed the invitations to hygienists whose names we bought from one of their professional societies. Included with the invitation letter was a card with the survey URL, a unique alphanumeric password, and an 800 number. It would've been nigh unto impossible for a random web surfer to crack the code, come up with a password, and pretend to be a dental hygienist. We also watched closely for face validity on the responses, particularly the open-ended responses. We had no hint that anyone but dental hygienists participated, and since we were asking questions such as what topics they prefer in continuing-education courses,

I assumed that since using unique passwords is standard procedure for invited, self-administered Web-based surveys, it was superfluous to weigh my comments down with all the procedural details, since that wasn't the focus of my remarks. If you have any further procedural questions, please feel free to email me directly.

Janet Brigham, Ph.D.
SRI International
Menlo Park, CA
jzbrands@earthlink.net

>
> >If you only provided a URL link to the site, how did you ensure that your sample
> >was legitimate and that some random web surfers did not enter it?

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

Date: Wed, 5 Nov 2003 13:30:26 -0500
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Organization: Bisconti Research, Inc.
Subject: Estimating response rate to postcards soliciting feedback
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I am looking for examples of response rates to postcards soliciting feedback/comments that are included with a product/publication order. Can anyone help?

Mark David Richards

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

Date: Wed, 5 Nov 2003 11:50:13 -0800
Reply-To: Ellis Godard <ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ellis Godard <ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU>
Subject: Re: Estimating response rate to postcards soliciting feedback
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Reponses rates are probably product- and even industry-specific, but I'm told that the rate for cards included with CDs is 2-3% and the rate for cards included with book orders is 1-2%. If the cards cost about 3 cents each (in high bulk) to print and insert, that comes to about a buck fifty per respondent.

-eg

> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Mark David Richards
> Sent: Wednesday, November 05, 2003 10:30 AM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Estimating response rate to postcards soliciting feedback

>
>
> I am looking for examples of response rates to postcards
> soliciting feedback/comments that are included with a
> product/publication order. Can anyone help?
>
>
> -----
> Mark David Richards
>
> -----
> 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: Thu, 6 Nov 2003 07:41:53 -0500
Reply-To: Paul Braun <pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Paul Braun <pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Refusal Conversions
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

May I ask what the current policy is with respect to refusal conversions? I own several phone centers throughout the country and we do a fair amount of RDD survey research. As a result of refusal conversions, I have on my desk on a weekly basis inquiries from various states' attorney's general.

At this point, I need to ask if others are experiencing the same issues and what they are doing about it. I am keeping my attorney very busy. I too like a good response rate, but I seem to be getting the gitters every time someone asks me to give a dial disposition because of the refusal rates and my inability to muster the courage to redial any household who has refused.

Regards to all,

Paul Braun
Braun Research Incorporated

Phone 609-279-1600
Fax 609-279-1318
E-mail pbraun@braunresearch.com <<mailto:pbraun@braunresearch.com>>
URL www.braunresearch.com <<http://www.braunresearch.com>>

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

Date: Thu, 6 Nov 2003 08:15:49 -0500
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <cporter@HP.UFL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Colleen Porter <cporter@HP.UFL.EDU>
Subject: Qualifications for IRB
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Content-disposition: inline

In our recent discussions about IRB issues, much has been made about the notion of having survey researchers on the IRB.

Stephen Blumberg, himself an IRB chair, put it this way:

"If your IRB will be reviewing surveys and sampling plans, then they are bound by law to either include survey researchers among their membership (45 CFR 46.107a) or to invite independent consultants with expertise in this area to assist in their review of the issues (45 CFR 46.107f)."

So my question is, what qualifies as "expertise"? What level of training-experience-credentials should we expect?

And are the qualifications different for looking at a survey instrument versus reviewing a sampling plan? (I suspect so--in the health care setting where I work, many investigators use surveys as part of their clinical trial, but have no clue about RDD telephone surveys.)

Any input greatly appreciated, and I'll post a summary if y'all would rather send email offlist.

Colleen

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

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

Date: Thu, 6 Nov 2003 08:30:15 -0500
Reply-To: Robert Ladner <rladner@behavioralscience.com>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Robert Ladner <rladner@BEHAVIORALSCIENCE.COM>
Organization: BSR
Subject: Re: Refusal Conversions
Comments: To: Paul Braun <pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

At Behavioral Science Research, we have moved away from aggressive refusal conversions except in cases where unusually strict quotas make it necessary to do hand-to-hand combat with reluctant respondents.

First, we have determined that the kinds of answers we get from the "convertees" are no different from the kinds of answers we get from more acquiescent respondents. If the demography is the same and the answers are the same, what are we gaining by chasing these folks down?

Secondly -- particularly in light of the Do Not Call registry -- we feel that if a person refuses an interview, that person does not want to talk to us in the first place, and we will respond with a single follow-up conversion attempt to ask if there was a problem with the first interviewer's demeanor, accent, voice or manner that brought the respondent to refuse. If there is no problem and the respondent is warmed by the tone of the first attempt, we proceed with the interview. After all, it's a live number. But if there is any negative response to the interview, we apologize for the intrusion and terminate the call. We have very few lawyers calling us.

Robert Ladner, PhD
President, Behavioral Science Research
Coral Gables, FL 33134
1-800-282-2771

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

From: "Paul Braun" <pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM>
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Sent: Thursday, November 06, 2003 7:41 AM
Subject: Refusal Conversions

> May I ask what the current policy is with respect to refusal
> conversions? I own several phone centers throughout the country and we
> do a fair amount of RDD survey research. As a result of refusal
> conversions, I have on my desk on a weekly basis inquiries from various
> states' attorney's general.
>

> At this point, I need to ask if others are experiencing the same issues
> and what they are doing about it. I am keeping my attorney very busy.
> I too like a good response rate, but I seem to be getting the gitters
> every time someone asks me to give a dial disposition because of the
> refusal rates and my inability to muster the courage to redial any
> household who has refused.
>
> Regards to all,
>
> Paul Braun
> Braun Research Incorporated
>
> Phone 609-279-1600
> Fax 609-279-1318
> E-mail pbraun@braunresearch.com <mailto:pbraun@braunresearch.com>
> URL www.braunresearch.com <http://www.braunresearch.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: Thu, 6 Nov 2003 11:26:23 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: A Pew Report: The 2004 Political Landscape
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Lots of interesting results in their 2003 Values study.

<http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?ReportID=196>

I found it interesting that about 60 of both Democrats and Republicans favor a national identity card (Part 9: Other Issues).

--

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, 6 Nov 2003 14:00:54 -0500
Reply-To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Support for Bush by College Students
Comments: To: aapor <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

There is a report in various places of a recent survey of college students showing considerable approval for George W. Bush, noticeably higher than for the general public. The report I read was at the following site:

<http://www.news.harvard.edu/gazette/2003/10.30/12-bushlove.html>

I've learned that the sample size was 1,202 and it was intended to represent all four year colleges and universities in the U.S. The survey was carried out by telephone, probably not easy to do in reaching students, but I was not able to learn the response rate. It is worth noting that studies during the height of the protest against the Vietnam War indicated that there was much more support for the war among college students generally than there was on major universities and college that were centers of protest. The same kind of disjunction may be the case here. Howard

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

Date: Thu, 6 Nov 2003 14:39:09 -0500
Reply-To: elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Betsy Martin <elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV>
Subject: FYI--International Journal on Public Opinion Research--Call for Papers On Iraq
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

(Embedded image moved to file: pic29663.pcx)

Public Opinion and the War in Iraq

Call for Papers

The war in Iraq saw polls conducted across more than forty countries, widespread demonstrations, and governments acting in accord with public=

opinion in some countries while seeming to defy it in others.

In September 2004, the International Journal of Public Opinion Research=

intends to publish a special issue on Public Opinion and the War in Ira=

q.

Subsequently, articles may be expanded or supplemented and published as=

a

book.

Papers are invited on any aspect of public opinion in relation to the
build-up, conduct, or aftermath of the war. These might include studies=

of

support and opposition in particular countries or cross-national

comparisons; studies of difference around gender, ethnicity or other

dimensions; and comparisons with wars fought at other times - including=

the

first Gulf War - or in other places.

Articles might cover the media's construction of public opinion, includ=

ing

the construction and coverage of polled opinion; the performance of the=

polls, including their skill in anticipating reactions to the turn of

events; talkback radio, the use of focus groups, the Internet, and the

anti-war movement.

Contributors might also consider how public opinion was understood or
portrayed by political parties and other political actors, to justify

certain sorts of actions or to rule out others ? whether in statements =

to

the public or in crafting political strategies.

The Journal is particularly keen to attract papers that link empirical
material to social or political theory, or to theories of public opinio=

n,

political communication or propaganda.

Papers should be 15 to 20 pages long, A4, double-spaced, including tabl=

es
and graphs; longer papers may be considered for the Journal and will be=

considered for a book. Contributions should be in English, although

contributors from the non-English speaking world are encouraged to subm=

it

their papers in their own language. Where papers are deemed suitable fo=

r

review, the Journal can provide support for an English translation.

However, the abstract and title of the manuscripts as well as the autho=

r's

affiliation have to be in English.

Contributors should register their interest by sending a 200-word outli=

ne

of their proposed paper to Professor Murray Goot (Guest Editor), Department of Politics and International Relations, Macquarie University, Sydney, New South Wales 2109, Australia, at murray.goot@mq.edu.au.

The deadline for receipt of full papers is November 28. These should be sent as Word documents (text) or in Excel (tables and graphs). Four hard copies are also required.

Contributors are advised to consult a recent copy of the Journal for the style guide or to contact the Journal's managing editor, Professor Wolfgang Donsbach, at IJPOR@mailbox.tu-dresden.de.

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

Date: Thu, 6 Nov 2003 15:22:02 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Manufacturing consent since 1946
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

<http://hartfordadvocate.com/gbase/News/content?oid=oid:41337>

Still Undecided?
Reaching those who cannot make up their minds

by Alan Bisbort - November 6, 2003

STAFF PHOTO ILLUSTRATION

How can a person NOT know how they feel about Bush?

The World This Week

"If they don't believe me now, will they ever believe me?" - "Boy With the Thorn In His Side" -- The Smiths

I am fascinated by political polls. I don't believe any of them but I still study them to understand how, as Noam Chomsky put it, consent gets manufactured in America. I've talked to Douglas Schwartz, director of one of the most prestigious opinion-gaugers in the country (Quinnipiac

University Polling Institute) and I have studied the legacy of the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, at the University of Connecticut. Though I don't doubt the sincerity or integrity of anyone involved with these efforts, I still don't believe what polls tell me.

That may, of course, just be a quirk of yours truly. I still don't use ATM machines or direct deposit. I have never used a hair dryer, call waiting or even a cell-phone. I never walk on top of those grates that dot big city sidewalks.

All that notwithstanding, the myriad polls tossed at Americans -- from 800 numbers posted on TV screens to instant mouse-clicks on the Internet -- are, in my opinion, table setters for the status quo. They start a process that keeps the power structure intact by "manufacturing" views, which are later scientifically recorded by the likes of Quinnipiac, Roper, Zogby and Pew polls, which are then cited as conventional political wisdom.

Let me give a simple example. AOL recently offered a poll about politics and "hate." That is, on AOL's main screen, beneath photographs of Bill Clinton and George W. Bush, the question was posed: "Who is the most hated?" When you click on the link to the actual poll, you find that, in fact, you do not get to vote on the relative loathsomeness of these two men. You are, instead, asked to gauge the level of animosity in American politics (good, bad, terrible, etc.), and then to decide whether this "hate" is mostly coming from the left-wing or the right-wing.

Simple enough, right? Let's back up and look at those photos of Clinton and Bush again. Bush looks less simian than usual, devoid of his normal overgrown-frat-boy smirk. Clinton, on the other hand, is squeezed into a tux, his face flush, his expression sour and his brow furrowed in that maddening manner that instantly recalls the finger-pointing "never had sex with that woman" Slick Willie we were spoon-fed by the All Monica Networks for years. It's the least flattering photograph of Bill Clinton imaginable. The hidden message is obvious (Bush may be hated now, but let's not forget how much we REALLY HATE Clinton). Also, the final vote tally -- the actual vote count available on most AOL quick polls -- wasn't posted for this poll, presumably because the numbers show that most Americans believe the hate is right-wing-bred and that Bush is dramatically more hated than Clinton ever was, even in his darkest Monica moments.

Am I suggesting that the results of such a poll be taken seriously? No. But consider the 35 million AOL users exposed to this (they have no choice; it's on the welcome screen, the first thing they see when they sign on). AOL users are, in general, economically stable, registered voters; they also average 71.4 minutes online daily. Though AOL's poll is laughably unscientific, it establishes an idea in the subliminal layers of its users' minds. If any of these users are later asked by legitimate polls, like Quinnipiac, that sliver of mental gristle is still there (e.g., Bush is less hateful than Clinton, therefore, Republicans are better than Democrats).

It is my contention that polls are the first step in propagating or

sustaining comforting myths (e.g., Republicans are paragons of "family values" and "Christian love"; Democrats are "tax-and-spend liberals who ejaculate on interns' dresses"). Polls purport to reveal "truths" that are really lies, then get people to go along by playing on the human impulse to stick with "winners" and view the political world in black and white rather than the shades of gray by which they view the rest of their lives. (Oh my gosh, 88 percent of my fellow Americans ecstatically approve of the job done by Bush, who I think is incapable of leading a Cub Scout troop through a cornfield maze, much less a country through a quagmire of his own making, so I better go along).

The only thing about polls that I don't, or can't, understand are the respondents who are almost chronically "Undecided," the ones who check the box marked "I Don't Know." How can a person NOT know how they feel about George W. Bush? What is it that they can't decide about scorched earth and flag-draped coffins? When they're lost in the wilderness, do they say, "let's go that way, no, this way, no, never mind, let's just sit here on our asses and hope someone rescues us"?

When will they ever NOT be undecided?

If polls offer any kinder, gentler truths about American politics, it may be this: The key to change in America is to locate this chronically undecided segment and reach them with a consistent, compelling message that has long-term credibility.

In the process, we may even put the pollsters out of business.

--

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, 6 Nov 2003 15:52:46 -0500
Reply-To: "Langer, Gary E" <Gary.E.Langer@ABC.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Langer, Gary E" <Gary.E.Langer@ABC.COM>
Subject: Re: Support for Bush by College Students
Comments: To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The last time I looked into the Harvard IOP survey I was told it was sampled off a list of 3.7 million 2- and 4-year college students compiled from school telephone directories. The Statistical Abstract

reports a projected U.S. undergraduate population of 13.6 million. Response rate is probably a trivial concern in comparison to noncoverage.

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

From: Howard Schuman [mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU]=20
Sent: Thursday, November 06, 2003 2:01 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Support for Bush by College Students

There is a report in various places of a recent survey of college students showing considerable approval for George W. Bush, noticeably higher than for the general public. The report I read was at the following site:

<http://www.news.harvard.edu/gazette/2003/10.30/12-bushlove.html>

I've learned that the sample size was 1,202 and it was intended to represent all four year colleges and universities in the U.S. The survey was carried out by telephone, probably not easy to do in reaching students, but I was not able to learn the response rate. It is worth noting that studies during the height of the protest against the Vietnam War indicated that there was much more support for the war among college students generally than there was on major universities and college that were centers of protest. The same kind of disjunction may be the case here. Howard

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: Thu, 6 Nov 2003 17:02:35 -0500
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Organization: Bisconti Research, Inc.
Subject: FW: washingtonpost.com Camera-works video on the DC Presidential
Primary
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Check out this Camera-works video clip on the DC Jan. 13 advisory =
Primary...

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/mmedia/nation/110503-12v.htm>

The DNC does not recognize DC's primary because it is advisory ("beauty contest") and does not result directly in delegate selection (some super-delegates have pledged their vote to the winner however). It may = be a

test of the African-American and urban vote early in the campaign, = however.

No opinion polls have yet been conducted in DC (as far as I am aware); speculation is that Dean is leading but it is anybody's guess.

Mark David Richards=20

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

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

Date: Thu, 6 Nov 2003 17:22:44 -0500
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Organization: Rider University
Subject: Re: Support for Bush by College Students
Comments: To: "Langer, Gary E" <Gary.E.Langer@ABC.COM>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

One problem with using school telephone directories is that many (if not most) of this generation uses cell phones. Do the directories list them? I know, for instance, that my son never used his land phone in college after his freshman year. This would be an interesting case for a follow-up, given the questions we've raised regarding the problem of cell phones and survey research.

"Langer, Gary E" wrote:

> The last time I looked into the Harvard IOP survey I was told it was
> sampled off a list of 3.7 million 2- and 4-year college students
> compiled from school telephone directories. The Statistical Abstract
> reports a projected U.S. undergraduate population of 13.6 million.
> Response rate is probably a trivial concern in comparison to
> noncoverage.

>

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

> From: Howard Schuman [<mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU>]

> Sent: Thursday, November 06, 2003 2:01 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Support for Bush by College Students

>

> There is a report in various places of a recent survey of college

> students showing considerable approval for George W. Bush, noticeably
> higher than for the general public. The report I read was at the
> following site:
> <http://www.news.harvard.edu/gazette/2003/10.30/12-bushlove.html>
>
> I've learned that the sample size was 1,202 and it was intended to
> represent all four year colleges and universities in the U.S. The
> survey was carried out by telephone, probably not easy to do in reaching
> students, but I was not able to learn the response rate. It is worth
> noting that studies during the height of the protest against the Vietnam
> War indicated that there was much more support for the war among college
> students generally than there was on major universities and college that
> were centers of protest. The same kind of disjunction may be the case
> here. Howard

> -----
> 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

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

Date: Fri, 7 Nov 2003 08:25:11 -0500
Reply-To: dawn.v.nelson@CENSUS.GOV
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Dawn V. Nelson" <dawn.v.nelson@CENSUS.GOV>
Subject: DC AAPOR - - Nov 12th - - Warren Mitofsky Seminar & Happy Hour
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Dear National AAPOR members:

Please forgive any cross postings - - DC AAPOR has a great seminar and
happy hour planned for next Wednesday and we want to get the word out.

=
=20
=
=20
*****=
****=
** =
=20
=
=20

American Association for Public Opinion Research =
 =20
 Washington/Baltimore Chapter =
 =20
 =20
 Seminar & Happy Hour =
 =20
 =20
 DC AAPOR is pleased to announce this upcoming seminar. =A0The DC AAPOR=
 =20
 Executive Council will host a members' happy hour immediately followin=
 g =20
 the talk, complimentary appetizers provided. =A0Rub elbows with our sp=
 eaker =20
 as well as meet new members and swap stories from the field. Non-membe=
 rs, =20
 membership applications will be available at the seminar. =A0For ten d=
 ollars=20
 (six dollars for students), become a DC-AAPOR chapter member and join =
 us =20
 at the happy hour! =
 =20
 =20
 Topic: "Exit Polls and the California Recall Election" =
 =20
 =20
 Speaker: Warren J. Mitofsky, Mitofsky International =
 =20
 =20
 Date & Time: =
 =20
 Wednesday, November 12, 2003 =
 =20
 Seminar - 4:00-5:30pm =
 =20
 Happy Hour - 6:00-8:00pm =
 =20
 =20
 Location Seminar =
 =20
 BLS Conference and Training Center (basement level) =
 =20
 Room #1, Postal Square Building =
 =20
 2 Massachusetts Ave., NE, Washington, DC =
 =20
 (Enter on First St., NE, and bring a photo ID.) =
 =20

=20
Location Happy Hour =
=20
Capitol City Brewing Company =
=20
2 Massachusetts Ave., NE, Washington, DC =
=20
=20
Metro: Union Station, Red Line =
=20
=20
RSVP: To be placed on the visitors list, please RSVP no later than Fri=
day,=20
November 7. (We need your response by Friday to give a head count to C=
ap =20
City for food ordering). =A0Please respond on our website by going to =
=20
<http://www.dc-aapor.org/events.php> and follow the instructions under t=
he =20
RSVP section. =A0NOTE: There are multiple options on the RSVP (talk & =
happy =20
hour, talk only, or happy hour only). If you are unable to use the web=
site=20
RSVP form, call Jim Caplan, Secretary, at 703-696-5848. =
=20
=20
=20
Abstract: The California Recall Election on October 7th created =
=20
considerable media attention. =A0In addition to being the first electi=
on to =20
recall a United States Governor in 82 years, Arnold Schwarzenegger's =
=20
entrance kindled an explosion of interest in the race. =A0Much of the =
=20
election analysis came from exit polling provided by two companies, Ed=
ison=20
Media Research and Mitofsky International. =A0The California Recall El=
ection=20
posed many special problems. The time frame was short; there were only=
76 =20
days between when the election =
=20
was announced and election day itself. Given the urgent and historic =
=20
nature of the recall and that the new polling and projection system wo=
uld =20
not be operational until January 2004, special sampling, operational a=
nd =20
estimation considerations also arose. These, the influence of the surv=
ey =20

taking climate and the implications for future exit polling and =
=20
projections, will be discussed. =
=20
=
=20
Note: If you did not get an e-mail notice of this meeting but want one=
for=20
future meetings, please email us at info@dc-aapor.org. =
=20
=
=20

=

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

Date: Fri, 7 Nov 2003 11:06:04 -0500
Reply-To: Eric Plutzer <exp12@PSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Eric Plutzer <exp12@PSU.EDU>
Subject: Support for Bush by College Students
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
In-Reply-To: <200311070547.AAA79628@f05n16.cac.psu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

You can find the topline for the IOP poll at:
http://www.iop.harvard.edu/iopstudents/survey/fall_2003_topline.pdf

The topline look reasonable until you get to the demographics:
46% of the sample are first year college students.

Even accounting for attrition and an attempt to sample community colleges, this seems way too high and is considerably higher than previous IOP polls using the same sampling frame.

Since the poll was fielded in October, 46% of the respondents had spent no more than six weeks in college and this may account for some of the contradictory findings -- since this is a period of information overload and most first year students are at the very beginning of a process of exploring politics and "finding themselves" politically.

The other aspect to consider quite critically is the percentage saying they will "definitely vote." Many AAPORNET readers have extensive experience in determining likely voters and I'd be interested if you have any insights into whether such screening methods are equally valid and reliable with 18-21 year olds (I'd guess not).

-- Eric

At 12:00 AM 11/7/2003, you wrote:

>Date: Thu, 6 Nov 2003 15:52:46 -0500

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

>Subject: Re: Support for Bush by College Students

>

>The last time I looked into the Harvard IOP survey I was told it was

>sampled off a list of 3.7 million 2- and 4-year college students

>compiled from school telephone directories. The Statistical Abstract

>reports a projected U.S. undergraduate population of 13.6 million.

>Response rate is probably a trivial concern in comparison to

>noncoverage.

Eric Plutzer

Department of Political Science

Penn State University

Voice: 814/865-6576

<http://polisci.la.psu.edu/faculty/plutzer/>

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

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

Date: Fri, 7 Nov 2003 13:53:57 -0500

Reply-To: elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Betsy Martin <elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV>

Subject: Tune In....

Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

...your radios to NPR this afternoon from 2 to 4, eastern time. I understand several AAPOR members were interviewed on Ira Flato's "Science Friday" show.

Betsy Martin

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

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

Date: Fri, 7 Nov 2003 14:13:14 -0500

Reply-To: NPSchiavone@AOL.COM

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Nicholas Schiavone <NPSchiavone@AOL.COM>

Subject: Thanks for the alert. Here's a link to Science Friday - NPS

Re: Tune In....

Comments: To: elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV, AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

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

Talk of the Nation: Science Friday
With Ira Flatow

Read Ira Flatow's Bio=20

Participate in the Discussion=20

Visit the Science Friday site.=20

Talk of the Nation: Science Friday=AE is a science talk-show which can be heard=20

each Friday afternoon, 2-4 pm ET over National Public Radio (NPR). Science=20

Friday=AE is hosted by veteran NPR science correspondent Ira Flatow. Have=20

questions, comments, suggestions about the site or show? Contact us at scifr=

i@npr.org=20

Science Friday =AE is produced by Samanna Productions, Inc., and is a=20

registered service mark. Science Friday=AE is supported by a generous

grant=20=

from the=20

National Science Foundation, the Noyce Foundation, and the Alfred P. Sloan=20

Foundation

Nicholas P. Schiavone, LLC

A Strategic Business Consultancy for Media, Marketing & Measurement

Based on

The Core Principles of Management, Branding & Research

8 Fernwood Avenue

Rye, New York 10580-3507

Office (914) 967-7293

Fax (425) 930-5015

Mobile (917) 561-5965

This e-mail and any attachments thereto are intended=20

only for use by the addressee(s) named herein=20

and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. =20

If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail,=20

you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying=20

of this e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited. =20

If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify me=20

by return e-mail and permanently delete the original=20

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

Date: Fri, 7 Nov 2003 14:16:00 -0500

Reply-To: elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Betsy Martin <elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV>
Subject: Tune In (more)....
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

In case you're interested, here's a direct link to "Science Friday":
http://www.sciencefriday.com/pages/2003/Nov/hour1_110703.html

And on this page one can apparently listen from one's computer, either live or archived.
<http://www.sciencefriday.com/>

Betsy

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

Date: Fri, 7 Nov 2003 14:16:27 -0500
Reply-To: NPSchiavone@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nicholas Schiavone <NPSchiavone@AOL.COM>
Subject: Live link to Science Friday/ WBUR-FM Boston -- NPS Re: Tune In....
Comments: To: elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

In a message dated 11/7/2003 1:58:02 PM Eastern Standard Time, elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV writes:
...your radios to NPR this afternoon from 2 to 4, eastern time. I understand several AAPOR members were interviewed on Ira Flato's "Science Friday" show.
<http://www.wbur.org/>

Between 2-3 PM, Friday, Eastern Standard time

Nicholas P. Schiavone, LLC
A Strategic Business Consultancy for Media, Marketing & Measurement
Based on
The Core Principles of Management, Branding & Research
8 Fernwood Avenue
Rye, New York 10580-3507

Office (914) 967-7293
Fax (425) 930-5015
Mobile (917) 561-5965

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
=====

Date: Fri, 7 Nov 2003 14:28:18 -0500
Reply-To: NPSchiavone@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nicholas Schiavone <NPSchiavone@AOL.COM>
Subject: ALSO: Gary Langer did a superb job on TOTN yesterday. Must Listening -- NPS
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Comments: cc: elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

In a message dated 11/7/2003 1:58:02 PM Eastern Standard Time, elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV writes:
...your radios to NPR this afternoon from 2 to 4, eastern time. I understand several AAPOR members were interviewed on Ira Flato's "Science Friday" show.

Betsy Martin

Talk of the Nation
Thursday, November 6, 2003

Guests:

Gary Langer
*Director of Polling, ABC News
Richard Burkholder
*Director, International Polling, Gallup Organization

Iraqi Polling

<http://www.npr.org/rundowns/rundown.php?prgId=5&prgDate=current>

Nicholas P. Schiavone, LLC
A Strategic Business Consultancy for Media, Marketing & Measurement
Based on
The Core Principles of Management, Branding & Research
8 Fernwood Avenue
Rye, New York 10580-3507

Office (914) 967-7293
Fax (425) 930-5015
Mobile (917) 561-5965

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

Date: Fri, 7 Nov 2003 14:41:22 -0500
Reply-To: Beth Schapiro <beth@SCHAPIRORESEARCHGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Beth Schapiro <beth@SCHAPIRORESEARCHGROUP.COM>
Subject: Job posting
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

SCHAPIRO RESEARCH GROUP
Research Analyst

Schapiro Research Group, Inc. is a 20 year-old public opinion research firm. In addition to the consistently high quality of its research and analysis, SRG is known for astute strategic recommendations and outstanding client

service. The firm conducts telephone, mail, online, and focus group research for a varied national clientele including corporations, non-profit advocacy and membership organizations, government agencies, political candidates for office, and referendum campaigns.

This is a partner track position with considerable room for advancement. Responsibilities include: managing projects; supervising research staff; determining research needs; designing questionnaires and moderator's guides; analyzing data; writing reports; communicating findings to clients; and assisting with marketing.

The ideal candidate will be an excellent communicator, a talented researcher, and an organized detail-oriented manager with high professional standards and ethics. The ideal candidate will have: advanced degree in political science; 3+ years experience in quantitative and qualitative analysis; 3+ years experience managing research projects; 3+ years experience supervising research staff; proficiency in methodology and statistical analysis; knowledge of SPSS; ability to summarize pertinent information; and superior writing skills.

Competitive salary and good benefits package. Send cover letter, resume, and salary requirements to:

Beth S. Schapiro, Ph.D.
President
Schapiro Research Group, Inc.
127 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 812
Atlanta, GA 30303
404-581-0058 - fax
beth@schapiroresearchgroup.com
www.schapiroresearchgroup.com

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

Date: Mon, 10 Nov 2003 10:37:56 -0500
Reply-To: Lori Kaplan <LKaplan@NPR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Lori Kaplan <LKaplan@NPR.ORG>
Subject: Opinion regarding a proposed scale
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

Hello I'm seeking input on a scale question. My organization is looking to replicate a study performed in 1997. The consultant used then and who is under contract now is advocating the use of a three point scale: "agree",

"disagree" and "undecided". The consultant is arguing that the use of a limited scale will encourage individuals to write more in the verbatim comment sections.

From my experience I just don't believe this to be true, and I believe that a limited scale makes it more difficult for respondents and I know that it is not in line with any other instruments that we've used in the past or that we will use in the future.

Please share with me your thoughts on the proposed scale. I appreciate any thoughts or guidance you might have.

Best regards,
Lori

Lori A. Kaplan
Research Manager
npr
Audience & Corporate Research
635 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington DC 20001
v. 202.513.2811
f. 202.513.3041

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

Date: Mon, 10 Nov 2003 13:17:47 -0500
Reply-To: DivaleBill@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: William Divale <DivaleBill@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: Opinion regarding a proposed scale
Comments: To: LKaplan@NPR.ORG, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Lori

I tend to agree with you. I prefer 4 points: Strongly Agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. Also, by scale, do you mean the response to a single item, or a summative scale wher several items tap different aspects of a domain, such as self-esteem, etc.

In either case, "undecided" allows the respondent to opt out. I prefer to force them to make a choice because most people have a "choice" in mind anyway.

Bill

William Divale, Ph.D.
Professor of Anthropology
Director, MARC (Minority Access to Research Careers) Honors Program
Director, Social Science Survey Research Laboratory
York College, CUNY
Jamaica, NY 11451
718-262-2982
Fax 262-3790

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

Date: Mon, 10 Nov 2003 12:48:49 -0600
Reply-To: "Steen, Bob" <steenb@FLEISHMAN.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Steen, Bob" <steenb@FLEISHMAN.COM>
Subject: Re: Opinion regarding a proposed scale
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

There was a string on AAPORNET some time ago about the merits of Strongly agree, tend to agree, tend to disagree, strongly disagree that I found compelling. Perhaps you could dig that out of the archives or someone else could point you to it. In my experience, respondents like the opportunity to differentiate their responses, but are not likely to be sufficiently involved for this to drive them to an open end qualification of their closed end-response.

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: William Divale [<mailto:DivaleBill@AOL.COM>]
Sent: Monday, November 10, 2003 12:18 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Opinion regarding a proposed scale

Lori

I tend to agree with you. I prefer 4 points: Strongly Agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. Also, by scale, do you mean the response to a single item, or a summative scale wher several items tap different aspects of a domain, such as self-esteem, etc.

In either case, "undecided" allows the respondent to opt out. I prefer to force them to make a choice because most people have a "choice" in mind anyway.

Bill

William Divale, Ph.D.
Professor of Anthropology
Director, MARC (Minority Access to Research Careers) Honors Program
Director, Social Science Survey Research Laboratory York College, CUNY
Jamaica, NY 11451 718-262-2982 Fax 262-3790

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, 10 Nov 2003 13:36:41 -0500
Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Opinion regarding a proposed scale
Comments: To: "DivaleBill@AOL.COM" <DivaleBill@AOL.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

I would agree that offering a range of intensities increases the likelihood of a decisive response. In addition, analysis of 'undecided' or other mid-point responses often shows that respondents professing to be undecided give other responses which are more like the responses given by the respondents who offer a negative opinion. When this is the case, I would support a weighting of responses that reflects that bias, e.g. Strongly agree = +2, Agree = +1, Undecided = -0.5, Disagree = -1, Strongly Disagree = -2. Especially when there is a sizable proportion of respondents, why not see if corroborative data makes for a more valid interpretation?

Nat Ehrlich
Michigan State University
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research
517-355-6672

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

From: William Divale [<mailto:DivaleBill@AOL.COM>]
Sent: Monday, November 10, 2003 1:18 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Opinion regarding a proposed scale

Lori

I tend to agree with you. I prefer 4 points: Strongly Agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. Also, by scale, do you mean the response to a single item, or a summative scale wher several items tap different aspects of a domain, such as self-esteem, etc.

In either case, "undecided" allows the respondent to opt out. I prefer to force them to make a choice because most people have a "choice" in mind anyway.

Bill

William Divale, Ph.D.
Professor of Anthropology
Director, MARC (Minority Access to Research Careers) Honors Program
Director, Social Science Survey Research Laboratory
York College, CUNY
Jamaica, NY 11451
718-262-2982
Fax 262-3790

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, 10 Nov 2003 13:27:43 -0600
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Organization: Market Shares Corporation
Subject: Re: Opinion regarding a proposed scale
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I remember seeing a paper on this in the past. Can't recall the source.

It was concluded that a scale with *agree strongly, agree some, disagree some, disagree strongly* options reduces the don't know response. Given the options of "some", more respondents are willing to agree or disagree and thus reduce the don't know response.

This statement makes it sound like this is a self-administered questionnaire.

- > The consultant is arguing that the use of a
- > limited scale will encourage individuals to write more in the verbatim
- > comment sections.

My experience with open-end questions in self-administered questionnaires is that response is very light - only 25% in a convention survey we did last month. If this is a self-administered questionnaire, I would put more priority on the wording of structured questions.

Nick

Lori Kaplan wrote:

- >
- > Hello I'm seeking input on a scale question. My organization is looking to
- > replicate a study performed in 1997. The consultant used then and who is
- > under contract now is advocating the use of a three point scale: "agree",
- > "disagree" and "undecided". The consultant is arguing that the use of a
- > limited scale will encourage individuals to write more in the verbatim
- > comment sections.
- >
- >>From my experience I just don't believe this to be true, and I believe that
- > a limited scale makes it more difficult for respondents and I know that it
- > is not in line with any other instruments that we've used in the past or
- > that we will use in the future.
- >
- > Please share with me your thoughts on the proposed scale. I appreciate any
- > thoughts or guidance you might have.
- >
- > Best regards,
- > Lori
- >
- >
- > _____
- > Lori A. Kaplan
- > Research Manager
- > npr
- > Audience & Corporate Research
- > 635 Massachusetts Ave., NW
- > Washington DC 20001
- > v. 202.513.2811
- > f. 202.513.3041
- >
- > -----
- > 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, 10 Nov 2003 12:22:08 -0800
Reply-To: steve johnson <stevej@nsdssurvey.org>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: steve johnson <stevej@NSDSSURVEY.ORG>

Subject: Re: Opinion regarding a proposed scale

Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The problem with the use of "some" or "somewhat" is that it can mean agree somewhat AND disagree somewhat. I once did an experiment where I used this working and then later asked the same question with out the qualifer. When I did this about 15% of those who said somewhat agree switched to disagree when the modifier was removed. I think it is best to use Strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree and then record the other options if demanded by the respondent. Thsi is not the complete range of options, but it works best if choice is what you are trying to learn about.

Best

Steve Johnson

President, Northwest Survey & Data Services

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

From: "Nick Panagakis" <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Monday, November 10, 2003 11:27 AM

Subject: Re: Opinion regarding a proposed scale

> I remember seeing a paper on this in the past. Can't recall the source.

>

> It was concluded that a scale with *agree strongly, agree some, disagree
> some, disagree strongly* options reduces the don't know response. Given
> the options of "some", more respondents are willing to agree or disagree
> and thus reduce the don't know response.

>

> This statement makes it sound like this is a self-administered
questionnaire.

>

>> The consultant is arguing that the use of a
>> limited scale will encourage individuals to write more in the verbatim
>> comment sections.

>

> My experience with open-end questions in self-administered
> questionnaires is that response is very light - only 25% in a convention
> survey we did last month. If this is a self-administered questionnaire,
> I would put more priority on the wording of structured questions.

>

> Nick

>

> Lori Kaplan wrote:

>>

>> Hello I'm seeking input on a scale question. My organization is looking
to

>> replicate a study performed in 1997. The consultant used then and who is
>> under contract now is advocating the use of a three point scale:

"agree",

>> "disagree" and "undecided". The consultant is arguing that the use of a

>> limited scale will encourage individuals to write more in the verbatim

>> comment sections.
>>
>> >From my experience I just don't believe this to be true, and I believe
that
>> a limited scale makes it more difficult for respondents and I know that
it
>> is not in line with any other instruments that we've used in the past or
>> that we will use in the future.
>>
>> Please share with me your thoughts on the proposed scale. I appreciate
any
>> thoughts or guidance you might have.

>>
>> Best regards,
>> Lori

>>
>> _____
>> Lori A. Kaplan
>> Research Manager
>> npr
>> Audience & Corporate Research
>> 635 Massachusetts Ave., NW
>> Washington DC 20001
>> v. 202.513.2811
>> f. 202.513.3041

>>
>> -----
>> 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: Mon, 10 Nov 2003 14:35:46 -0800
Reply-To: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>
Subject: FCC Approves Home-To-Cell Number Rule
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

FCC Approves Home-To-Cell Number Rule

JONATHAN D. SALANT, Associated Press, Nov 10, 2003

WASHINGTON (AP) - Federal regulators gave the go-ahead Monday for consumers

to switch their home phone numbers to their cell phones.

The Federal Communications Commission said people will be able to transfer their numbers as long as their wireless coverage area overlaps the location of their conventional phone.

In some cases, cell customers also will be able to transfer their numbers to conventional phones. However, the FCC said it needed to gather more information so it could expand the number of people who could do so.

The new home-to-cell number and the limited cell-to-home rules take effect Nov. 24, the same day wireless customers will be able to keep their numbers when they switch cell phone companies. The rules govern customers living in the 100 most populous metropolitan areas and take effect six months later for all others.

"After today, it's easier than ever to cut the cord," FCC Chairman Michael Powell said. "By firmly endorsing a customer's right to untether themselves from the wireline network - and take their telephone number with them - we act to eliminate impediments to competition between wireless and wireline services."

Consumer advocates have long said that technological advances made it unnecessary for phone customers to have different home and cell numbers, and that they should be allowed to take their cell phone numbers with them when they change companies.

"When we reduce the switching costs of going from one carrier to another, you're making the market more competitive," said Chris Murray, legislative counsel for Consumers Union, which publishes Consumer Reports magazine.

"There's both the economic cost of a new phone number - having to print new business cards, having to potentially contact everyone who might have your phone number - and massive inconvenience," he said."

It should take a few days to handle requests from customers wishing to switch landline numbers to cell phones. During the busy Christmas holiday season, customers may have to wait longer for the transfers.

Consumers who want to switch companies could have new service as quickly as 2 1/2 hours after the new carrier has contacted the old provider. The switch will take longer if more than one line is involved.

Federal Communications Commission: <http://www.fcc.gov>

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

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

=====
Date: Mon, 10 Nov 2003 17:05:07 -0600
Reply-To: "Steen, Bob" <steenb@FLEISHMAN.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Steen, Bob" <steenb@FLEISHMAN.COM>

Subject: Consumer expectations on "free offers"
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

I am starting a search for consumer research on their expectations when they see something advertised as "free." I can also use research on other expectations from advertising or package labels about "sale", "two-for-the-price-of-one, etc."

The general area of interest is consumer expectations on the veracity of advertising claims. I will be checking a number of archives and source, but would appreciate any leads to research findings or expertise otherwise not available.

Feel free to respond directly to me. If you would like a summary of the contributions, let me know.

Thanks.

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

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

Date: Mon, 10 Nov 2003 23:12:30 -0500
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Subject: Primary considerations
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Happy Veterans' Day! =20

I have an update on the DC Jan. 13 primary--but sorry, no polling data =
to
report just yet. Some polls will be underway soon. Five Presidential
candidates last week submitted letters together to the Board of =
Elections
and Ethics asking to be removed from the ballot of the Jan. 13 DC

Presidential Advisory Primary (called a "Beauty Contest" by the DNC). =
The
five said it violated DNC rules to participate in the DC Jan. 13 =
primary.
In fact, because DC agreed with the DNC to makes its primary a "beauty
contest," it does not violate DNC rules. The DNC told the candidates =
not to
expend any resources on DC's advisory primary and only Sharpton attended =
the
annual Kennedys/King dinner. DC Democrats are fuming and the mayor
described the situation as D.C. getting "Royally Dissed" by Clark, =
Kerry,
Gephardt, Edwards, and Lieberman. Local elected officials were asking =
that
the Presidential candidates discuss the issue of disenfranchisement in =
the
capital--and to be prepared to deal with that issue if they win. The
Council and Mayor are now preparing emergency legislation to put the =
five
candidates back on the ballot with no opt out clause. The option will =
be
for the candidates and/or the DNC to sue, I suppose. SO, let's see, how
would you formulate the question for a candidate preference poll in DC?!
Read some info below. mark

Mark David Richards

NBC4

D.C. Could Require Candidates On Primary Ballot
Five Democrats Choose Not To Participate

POSTED: 7:04 p.m. EST November 10, 2003
UPDATED: 7:05 p.m. EST November 10, 2003

WASHINGTON -- Five major Democratic presidential candidates who removed
their names last week from the District's Jan. 13 primary may find their
names back on the ballot, whether they like it or not.=20

The candidates have said they're just following national party rules. =
But
D.C. Democrats are insulted and fighting back.=20

The candidate letters arrived last week. Sens. Joe Lieberman, John =
Edwards,
John Kerry, Rep. Richard Gephardt and Wesley Clark have asked to have =
their
names taken off the D.C. primary ballot.=20

They said that D.C.'s nonbinding primary on Jan. 13 comes before Iowa =
and
New Hampshire and violates party rules.=20

Local D.C. leaders don't buy that. D.C. Council member Jack Evans, a strong supporter of D.C.'s early primary to highlight the city's lack of voting rights, told News4 that he'll introduce legislation to put all five names back on the city's ballot.=20

The original bill gave candidates a chance to opt out. The new bill will require all candidates to be listed.=20

City officials said the District is an ideal forum for candidates with its high percentage of African-American voters and candidates should want to campaign here.

A spokesman for the Democratic National Committee, Tony Welch, told News4 that the DNC opposes any early contests and is fighting a straw ballot in Florida for the same reasons.

=20

The Washington Times Reports [03:29 AM]=20

Local Democrats rip 5 who will skip D.C. primary

By Brian DeBose
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Five Democratic presidential candidates have pulled out of the 2004 D.C. primary.=20

Rep. Richard A. Gephardt of Missouri, Sen. John Edwards of North Carolina, Sen. John Kerry of Massachusetts, Sen. Joe Lieberman of Connecticut and Wesley Clark sent letters to the D.C. Board of Elections yesterday asking that their names be removed from the ballot.=20

The move frustrated local Democrats, who called the candidates "losers" and said that the primary is better off without them. The D.C. primary is Jan. 13.=20

"This action is as much about their inability to win here in January as it is about their lack of commitment for voting rights for the District of Columbia," said A. Scott Bolden, chairman of the D.C. Democratic Party. "This latest action only validates the importance of the Jan. 13 primary, because when put to the test, these five candidates have cut and run, =

and
now we all know they weren't the right ones to begin with."=20

The withdrawal leaves former Vermont Gov. Howard Dean, the Rev. Al =
Sharpton,
former Sen. Carol Moseley Braun of Illinois, and Rep. Dennis J. Kucinich =
of
Ohio, on the ballot.=20

All Democratic candidates except for Mr. Kerry have said they will
participate in the D.C. Caucus, which will take place Feb. 14.=20

None of the five candidates who withdrew from the ballot yesterday =
showed up
for the Kennedys-King Dinner, the local party's major fund-raising event
that was held Nov. 1. Mr. Lieberman and Mr. Gephardt pulled out of the
dinner three days before the event, Mr. Bolden said.=20

The letters sent to the Elections Board by Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Gephardt =
and
Mr. Kerry are dated Nov. 6. The letters sent by Mr. Clark, a retired =
Army
general, and Mr. Edwards are not dated.=20

All five candidates cite Democratic National Committee Delegates =
Selection
Rules "10A and 12H," as their reason for not participating in the D.C.
primary. The rules prohibit any caucuses, conventions or primaries =
before
the traditional first votes in Iowa and New Hampshire.=20

Mr. Gephardt told The Washington Times in February that he would not =
violate
DNC rules. "We said all along that this is not a DNC-sanctioned primary =
and
we won't violate the rules," a spokeswoman for the Gephardt campaign =
said
yesterday.=20

Telephone messages left at the campaign offices of the other four =
candidates
who withdrew were not returned last night.=20

D.C. Council member Jack Evans, Ward 2 Democrat, said the candidates =
have
made a poor decision. Mr. Evans said city officials had worked with the =
DNC
to ensure that the primary complied with all party rules. "Not only have
three of the candidates - Lieberman, Gephardt and Kerry, who all live =
here -
disrespected their hometown, they've disrespected African Americans."=20

Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Gephardt and Mr. Kerry own homes in Georgetown.=20

The District is more than 60 percent black and about 85 percent of the city's registered voters are Democrats. It is regarded as a Southern = city in presidential elections.=20

"It was gutless the way they did this as a team, and it represents why = they are dead last in the polls," Mr. Evans said. Mr. Evans said he and = council member Vincent Orange, Ward 5 Democrat, will draft a bill to put the = five candidates back on the ballot, "because our residents deserve a fair and open primary."=20

Mr. Evans and seven other Democrats on the 13-member D.C. Council have endorsed Mr. Dean. Mayor Anthony A. Williams has not committed himself = to a candidate.=20

Council member Adrian M. Fenty, Ward 4 Democrat who endorsed Mr. Dean, = said the absence of the five candidates won't matter. "I always find it funny when these guys who are losing pull out," Mr. Fenty said. "They weren't going to win anyway, and they weren't campaigning here. And it is = indicative of what they think about the District and urban issues in general."

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

Date: Tue, 11 Nov 2003 10:53:40 -0500
Reply-To: robert_stevenson@unc.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Robert L. Stevenson" <rlstev@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Subject: Re Harry Wilson's query about the formation of an IRB
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

My response to Harry's IRB concern is: be afraid, be very afraid.

Here is what I got back from our IRB earlier a couple of weeks ago in response to a request for the statewide poll we've been doing for 25+ years with administrative details unchanged in the past four or five years:

Thank you for submitting your proposal, JOMC 03-046, Carolina Poll. As currently conducted, your interviewer provides no contact information to the interviewee unless she or he specifically asks, "who's in charge?" Also, no contact information is given for the IRB, and no instruction is given the interviewer should someone ask about her or his rights as a research participant. Research participants should be

provided this information without having to ask for it.

Before I can consider your proposal for approval, I would like you to add the following information (or please explain why you do not want to add the information) at the end of the survey: "if you have any questions about the survey, you may contact Professor Robert Stevenson at 919-962-4082 or via e-mail at robert_stevenson@unc.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Academic Affairs Institutional Review Board at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill at 919-962-7761 or at aa-irb@unc.edu."

As I see it, there are three areas of problems we face with IRB now that are likely to continue and almost certain to get worse.

1. Mission creep. Give a boy a hammer and everything becomes a nail; give an IRB board proposals to review, and they find more and more things to change and requirements to add. Because IRBs change regularly and (apparently) operate deliberately without explicit, usable guidelines, every proposal becomes a crap-shoot. Procedures that were acceptable in the past may not be today; what passes muster today may not tomorrow. The bureaucratic imperative is to tighten existing requirements and add new ones, never to loosen them. Has anyone ever had an IRB recommendation that you drop something because it's really unnecessary?

2. Protectionism. Two areas here. One is to assume greater and greater responsibility for guaranteeing rights of participants (see above), even when participants don't know they have them. I am reminded of a good middle-class student (real case, but not this university) who said, until she took a class in women's studies, she didn't realize she was oppressed. Do respondents who answer questions in a telephone poll really not know that they can hang up? If they answer the kinds of questions most of us ask, what rights are even at stake?

The other is the suspicion that the real motive behind a lot of new IRB oversight is to protect the institution from headlines like "University Researcher Admits Faking Data" (it happened here) or "Parents Protest Study of Teens' Sex Life." Since the IRB covers any research on any living human or animal, we end up with absurdities like getting journalists to sign statements that they agree to be interviewed and acknowledge that are not likely to suffer serious harm if they talk to a student writing an undergraduate thesis. At one point, a lot of journalism research could claim exemption from IRB on the basis that it had no lasting value, but even that loophole has been closed.

3. Bureaucratic imperative. I remember when Nixon was rebuffed when he tried to eliminate the National Tea-Tasting Board. Every politician promises to reduce government, and none succeeds. IRB committee members aren't elected, but I suspect they might do the same. In our circumstance, our departmental/school IRB must get at least five signatures, from the principal investigator or faculty

adviser to the dean, but has no authority to decide anything, even that the project is exempt. Only the Academic Affairs IRB -- one of five on campus -- has any authority, even the authority to decide that anything we agree on is acceptable. I'm reminded of Larry Summer's quip about no one washing a rental car; it's hard to take the local board review seriously when our only power is to sign and send forward.

As most know, the feds recently decided that oral history is exempt from IRB. It is some comfort to know that interviewing a seasoned war correspondent will no longer have to include written assurance that the experience will not be harmful. The local buzz now is that local IRBs could continue the IRB requirement for any contact with a living person regardless of the circumstances and federal requirement. Or at a minimum, that we might still have to fill out forms and get IRB concurrence that that project doesn't require us to fill out forms and get IRB concurrence.

By the way, our IRB accepted my counterproposal that the poll end with the statement: "That's all of the questions. Do you have questions or comments on the survey?" If yes, a window opens, and the interviewer writes down anything the respondent says and, if asked, provides contact information for the project director and IRB. My guess is that we'll get one request for the results and that I'll get at most one inquiry or complaint. I probably will also propose that this requirement be eliminated from future polls, but I'm not optimistic.

Robert L. Stevenson
UNC-CH School of Journalism
CB 3365 Carroll Hall
Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365 USA
Email: robert_stevenson@unc.edu
Web: www.unc.edu/~rlstev
Voice: +1.919.962-4082

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

=====
Date: Wed, 12 Nov 2003 09:44:55 -0500
Reply-To: "Dimitropoulos, Linda L." <lld@RTI.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Dimitropoulos, Linda L." <lld@RTI.ORG>
Subject: Winner of the annual AAPOR t-shirt slogan contest
Comments: To: "AAPORNET (aapornet@asu.edu)" <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

The winner is Kristin Olson of ISR at Michigan. Kristine will walk away with all of the fabulous prizes!

The winning entry is:

Public Opinion Research: Fighting the war against error

Information on how you can order a t-shirt will be forthcoming with the registration materials and information.

Linda

Linda L. Dimitropoulos, Ph.D.
Health Services Program
Survey Research Division
RTI International
203 N. Wabash Suite #1900
Chicago, IL 60601
phone: 312/456-5246
fax: 312/456-5250
lld@rti.org <mailto:lld@rti.org>

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

=====
Date: Wed, 12 Nov 2003 10:44:54 -0700
Reply-To: "Stephen J. Blumberg" <swb5@CDC.GOV>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Stephen J. Blumberg" <swb5@CDC.GOV>
Subject: Re: Harry Wilson's query about the formation of an IRB

It is OK to be afraid (or "very afraid") of reviews of our research, but let us make sure that the fear is properly placed. I can't (and won't) defend everything that IRBs may do, but the examples that Prof. Stevenson presents are largely out of the control of the IRB:

1) 45 CFR 46.116 states that "the following information shall be provided to each subject...(7) an explanation of whom to contact for answers to pertinent questions about the research and research subjects' rights." If an investigator does not feel that such an explanation is appropriate, it is the responsibility of the investigator to ask for and justify a waiver of this information. Without such a request, it appears that the IRB correctly noted the absence of information that is required by the regulations.

2) IRBs do have explicit usable guidelines. They are the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 45, Part 46. These provide the minimum standards that must be met, and in my experience, the biggest complaints from investigators are criticisms of the regulations, not of the IRB. Because these guidelines provide the "floor," they specify what is necessary, not what is unnecessary. It should not be surprising, therefore, that IRBs usually ask for necessary things to be added and do not concern themselves with identifying information that may be unnecessary.

3) It is true that procedures that were acceptable in the past may not be acceptable today. Ethical standards for survey research tend to get more stringent over time, particularly as people's desires for privacy increase. For example, privacy concerns for personal health information increased to the point that HIPAA rules were necessary. But remember that procedures that were not acceptable in the past may become acceptable as well. For example, it is far more acceptable to ask about sexual behaviors in the last 20 years than at any time before that.

4) I believe that most people know they can hang up the phone. But some people clearly do not, or else telemarketing and telephone scams would be far less prevalent. Besides, 45 CFR 46.116 requires that participants be told that they "may discontinue participation at any time" and that "participation is voluntary." This means that it is not permissible under the regulations to just assume that everyone knows they can hang up.

5) Whether a right to privacy exists in the law, most people feel that they should have one. It should be unethical to ask people to give up that right without explaining the purpose to which the answers will be used and the extent to which privacy and confidentiality will be protected. This is the right that is at stake. Of course, if a survey is anonymous, then this right does not necessarily need to be protected; that explains why anonymous surveys are exempt from the regulations.

6) Institutions are supposed to protect themselves from headlines; they should not rely on an IRB (though I'm sure that some improperly do). I assume that this "headline-protection" is the reason for so many signatures on your IRB forms. Those people are supposed to stop the protocol if they feel that the research would put the institution at risk. But let me be clear: There is no IRB regulation that specifies that anyone needs to review the protocol prior to the IRB review. If you need five signatures prior to the review, this is an operating practice put in place by your institution, not by the IRB or by the regulations.

7) I don't understand your concern with having journalists (when they are the subjects of an interview) sign consent forms. Journalists are not required to participate in interviews. So, it is appropriate to ask them if they want to participate. When asking a person to participate in a research study, a consent form is required (45 CFR 46.117). This requirement may be waived if the research "involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context. (45 CFR 46.117c(2)). But again, it is the responsibility of the investigator to ask for and justify a waiver of this documentation.

To everyone who is having trouble with an IRB: Read the regulations. Know where the regulations give IRBs discretion and where they do not. Ask for waivers when appropriate. And blame administrative problems on administrators, not on IRBs.

--Stephen--

Stephen J. Blumberg, Ph.D.
Co-Chair, Institutional Review Board

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

Date: Wed, 12 Nov 2003 19:14:17 -0500
Reply-To: jellis@saturn.vcu.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jim Ellis <jellis@SATURN.VCU.EDU>
Organization: SERL
Subject: Re: Harry Wilson's query about the formation of an IRB
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <LISTSERV%2003111210445450@LISTS.ASU.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I think this thread has been enlightening.

I would just like to follow up more explicitly on Dr. Blumberg's note =
that
there are possibilities for requesting modifications to full consent
requirements. Then, I have a new question to pose, near the bottom of =
this
message. I'm sorry for the length of this e-mail.

45 CFR 46.116 (a) states that "Except as provided in=20
paragraph (c) or (d) of this section, in seeking informed consent the=20
following information shall be provided to each subject: <etc.>"

So there are exceptions to full consent, and these exceptions are =
allowed
and defined by the regulations.

Paragraph (c) states "An IRB may approve a consent procedure which does =
not
include,=20
or which alters, some or all of the elements of informed consent set=20
forth above, or waive the requirement to obtain informed consent=20
provided the IRB finds and documents that..." either it is a project =
related
to public benefits programs AND the research could not be practicably
carried out without the alteration or waiver. (I think a good example =
would
be eliminating the requirement for written consent in an RDD survey =
setting
for such a demonstration project).

Paragraph (d) starts with the identical qualification language and lays =
out
a 4-step test for alteration or waiver of informed consent:
" (1) The research involves no more than minimal risk to the subjects;

(2) The waiver or alteration will not adversely affect the rights and welfare of the subjects;

(3) The research could not practicably be carried out without the waiver or alteration; and

(4) Whenever appropriate, the subjects will be provided with additional pertinent information after participation."

I think most RDD telephone surveys of the general public clearly satisfy this four-step test. Perhaps point (3) is the diciest, but I would argue that -- in many cases -- the increases in nonresponse, overall data collection costs, and respondent confusion that seem to be caused by overly detailed and intimidating "full consent" language at the beginning of telephone surveys are not balanced by any increase in human subjects protection.

Because the IRB's job is to balance reasonably foreseeable risks to human subjects against reasonably foreseeable gains in knowledge created by the research, insistence on "the letter of the law" for minimal risk surveys can appear to be much ado about a tiny marginal increase in human subjects protection (if any increase at all) at the expense of significant losses to data quality, data cost (where higher costs are usually expressed as smaller sample sizes and, therefore, loss of statistical efficiency) and most important of all, general trust in the survey method among our respondent pool.

I think the basic problem I have seen is that some IRB reviewers may not be willing to exercise the latitude that they are explicitly given in the regulations, even when they are explicitly requested to do so and are provided with the regulatory language cited above. Maybe they are speculating on the possibility of irate respondents or lawsuits instead of thinking about human subjects protection, maybe they are applying criteria more appropriate to clinical trials that would use invasive or dangerous procedures, maybe they are new to the IRB and are simply following a set of guidelines they received and are unwilling or unable to exercise some judgment.

Whew! Well, having got that off my chest, let me pose a different question:

Can an IRB require a researcher to make modifications to informed consent language as the only condition required to make the research exempt from IRB

review? Note that exempt research includes (45 CFR 46.101(a)2):
"2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:

(i) Information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation."

The criteria for exemption have nothing to do with the consent language that is employed in the survey. Obviously, ethical research practice requires an approach that models the IRB regulations, maintains respect for research subjects, conforms to other applicable regulations or laws, etc. But how can an IRB withhold a finding of "exempt" conditional on changes to the consent language of the survey, when consent language has nothing to do with the criteria for exemption, and once the research is exempt the IRB has no authority over the research? Am I missing something?

Jim Ellis
Director, Technical Division
Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory
Virginia Commonwealth University

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

=====

Date: Wed, 12 Nov 2003 23:28:33 -0500
Reply-To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>
Subject: Re: Harry Wilson's query about the formation of an IRB
Comments: To: jellis@saturn.vcu.edu
Comments: cc: AAPORnet List server <aapornet@asu.edu>
In-Reply-To: <[003501c3a97b\\$1442cea0\\$72d9ac80@GRACELAN.prod.srl.vcu.edu](mailto:003501c3a97b$1442cea0$72d9ac80@GRACELAN.prod.srl.vcu.edu)>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Content-disposition: inline

Jim: Your response is on the money and I would SO like to know the answer to the question you pose. Our IRB does this ALL the time: you'll be exempt IF you do x, y, z that has nothing to do with exemption criteria.

Tom

--On Wednesday, November 12, 2003 7:14 PM -0500 Jim Ellis
<jellis@SATURN.VCU.EDU> wrote:

> I think this thread has been enlightening.

>

> I would just like to follow up more explicitly on Dr. Blumberg's note that

> there are possibilities for requesting modifications to full consent

> requirements. Then, I have a new question to pose, near the bottom of this

> message. I'm sorry for the length of this e-mail.

>

> 45 CFR 46.116 (a) states that "Except as provided in

> paragraph (c) or (d) of this section, in seeking informed consent the

> following information shall be provided to each subject: <etc.>"

>

> So there are exceptions to full consent, and these exceptions are allowed

> and defined by the regulations.

>

> Paragraph (c) states "An IRB may approve a consent procedure which does

> not include,

> or which alters, some or all of the elements of informed consent set

> forth above, or waive the requirement to obtain informed consent

> provided the IRB finds and documents that..." either it is a project

> related to public benefits programs AND the research could not be

> practicably carried out without the alteration or waiver. (I think a good

> example would be eliminating the requirement for written consent in an

> RDD survey setting for such a demonstration project).

>

> Paragraph (d) starts with the identical qualification language and lays

> out a 4-step test for alteration or waiver of informed consent:

> " (1) The research involves no more than minimal risk to the subjects;

> (2) The waiver or alteration will not adversely affect the rights

> and welfare of the subjects;

> (3) The research could not practicably be carried out without the

> waiver or alteration; and

> (4) Whenever appropriate, the subjects will be provided with

> additional pertinent information after participation."

>

> I think most RDD telephone surveys of the general public clearly satisfy

> this four-step test. Perhaps point (3) is the diciest, but I would argue

> that -- in many cases -- the increases in nonresponse, overall data

> collection costs, and respondent confusion that seem to be caused by

> overly detailed and intimidating "full consent" language at the beginning

> of telephone surveys are not balanced by any increase in human subjects

> protection.

>

> Because the IRB's job is to balance reasonably foreseeable risks to human

> subjects against reasonably foreseeable gains in knowledge created by the

> research, insistence on "the letter of the law" for minimal risk surveys

> can appear to be much ado about a tiny marginal increase in human subjects

> protection (if any increase at all) at the expense of significant losses

> to data quality, data cost (where higher costs are usually expressed as

> smaller sample sizes and, therefore, loss of statistical efficiency) and

> most important of all, general trust in the survey method among our

> respondent pool.

>

> I think the basic problem I have seen is that some IRB reviewers may not

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

Date: Wed, 12 Nov 2003 23:17:31 -0800
Reply-To: LinChiat@insight.rr.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: LinChiat Chang <linchiat@INSIGHT.RR.COM>
Subject: Validating Survey Estimates
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <1068566020.3fb10604a87ec@webmail8.isis.unc.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Jon Krosnick and I are looking for evidence that assesses the accuracy of survey estimates of aggregate rates at which behavioral events occur (e.g. crime rates, immunization rates, tobacco use rates, consumer expenditure, drinking and driving), by comparisons with non-survey data documenting the same rates.

For example, the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) provides estimates of crime rates in the US, and so does the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) database, which contains official reports from law enforcement agencies.

If you know of (1) any past work validating a survey rate estimate against an alternative data source, or (2) any instances in which a survey estimate could be compared with an alternative data source, even if the comparison has not yet been made, we would be grateful to learn about it.

Thank you!

LinChiat

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

Date: Thu, 13 Nov 2003 11:21:03 -0700
Reply-To: "Stephen J. Blumberg" <swb5@CDC.GOV>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Stephen J. Blumberg" <swb5@CDC.GOV>
Subject: Re: Harry Wilson's query about the formation of an IRB

Regarding the concern that Tom summed up as: "You'll be exempt if you do x, y, z that has nothing to do with exemption criteria,"

Jim was correct about the regulations when he said that survey research is exempt from the regulations so long as "(i) Information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; AND (ii) any disclosure of the human

subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation." If the IRB's request is to improve procedures that protect the anonymity of the human subjects, or if the IRB's request is to drop sensitive questions, then it seems reasonable to say that this change would permit the survey to be exempted.

Jim's question, however, was "Can an IRB require a researcher to make modifications to informed consent language as the only condition required to make the research exempt from IRB review?" Informed consent language is clearly not part of the criteria in the regulations for determining which research activities are exempt from IRB review. But the simple answer is YES, researchers can be required by the IRB to make modifications to informed consent language in order for the research to pass muster, even if the research is exempt under the regulations.

The Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) in DHHS states that "some institutions choose to provide an additional measure of protection for human subjects by reviewing what would be exempt research under 46.101(b) in an expedited manner. This is acceptable, since expedited review of that which is exempt exceeds the minimum requirements for both in 45 CFR Part 46." Please remember that the regulations provide the minimum requirements; IRBs may impose additional requirements.

HOWEVER, "Institutions should have a clear policy in place on who shall determine what research is exempt under 46.101(b). Those persons who have authority to make a determination of what research is exempt are expected to be well-acquainted with interpretation of the regulations and the exemptions....An institution...should indicate in its Assurance if and how exempt research is reviewed. It is incumbent on the institution to advise investigators and others involved in the conduct and administration of research involving human subjects of the institutional policies for reviewing exempt research." (OHRP Guidance, May 5, 1995)

The Assurance is the written document signed by the institution and delivered to OHRP that states that the institution will comply with the regulations and that specifies how it intends to do so. The requirements for what needs to be in an Assurance is in 45 CFR 46.103. Feel free to ask for a copy of your institution's Assurance. It should state clearly how research that is otherwise exempt under the regulations will be reviewed, and you should be sure that the IRB is following those procedures.

If those written procedures are particularly onerous for survey research (perhaps because they were originally written by an administrator with no clear understanding of survey research procedures), I encourage you to work to get the Assurance modified. You may not be successful with your administrators, but you will at least be able to educate them about survey research and understand why your institution feels that the consent forms for anonymous or non-sensitive survey research should be reviewed.

--Stephen--

Stephen J. Blumberg, Ph.D.
Co-Chair, Institutional Review Board

National Center for Health Statistics

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

Date: Thu, 13 Nov 2003 13:44:32 -0500
Reply-To: jellis@saturn.vcu.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jim Ellis <jellis@SATURN.VCU.EDU>
Organization: SERL
Subject: Re: Harry Wilson's query about the formation of an IRB
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <LISTSERV%2003111311210366@LISTS.ASU.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dr. Blumberg,
Thanks again for taking time to respond to these questions. I think this information is quite helpful and constructive, and I really appreciate your thoughtful consideration, so I'll choose to post this to the group as a whole.
Jim Ellis

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

Date: Thu, 13 Nov 2003 17:10:37 -0500
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Organization: Bisconti Research, Inc.
Subject: Inquiry
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Which companies have an in-person OMNI survey with a nationally representative sample? mark

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: Thu, 13 Nov 2003 16:20:40 -0800
Reply-To: Holly Hoegh <holly@CCR.CA.GOV>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Holly Hoegh <holly@CCR.CA.GOV>

Subject: Re: Inquiry
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Comments: cc: Bonnie Davis <bonnie@CCR.CA.GOV>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The Survey Research Group of the Public Health Institute is hiring for a =
Research Associate IV position in Sacramento.
Below is the job description. If you or someone you know is interested =
please send a resume to:

Bonnie Davis, PhD
Chief, Survey Research Group
Survey Research Group
1700 Tribute Road, Suite 100
Sacramento, CA 95815
bdavis@ccr.ca.gov

Survey Research Group of the Public Health Institute =20
Research Associate IV

The Research Associate IV will participate in the routine phases of =
survey research using a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) =
system. Under the supervision of the Chief, this person will be =
responsible for cleaning data, coding text responses and developing SAS =
datasets. The Research Associate IV will assist in the development of =
research protocols, code and clean data, analyze survey research data, =
prepare reports; and may take responsibility for a limited phase of CATI =
projects. This person will perform some statistical analyses, and =
perform other duties as assigned. The ability to work under time =
constraints and the flexibility to work on a variety of projects =
required. Great attention to detail is a requirement of this position.

Minimum Qualifications

Education

Graduation from an accredited college or university with a major =
appropriate to health related surveys. =20

Preferred Qualifications

One year of research experience and experience working with a variety of =
word processing (WordPerfect or Word), spreadsheet (Lotus 123, Excel or =
Quattro Pro), and graphics computer packages required. Masters degree =
with a major appropriate to health related surveys preferred. Survey =
research experience, CATI experience, data analysis and SAS programming =
experience desirable.

=20

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

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

Date: Thu, 13 Nov 2003 20:47:29 -0600
Reply-To: "Norval D. Glenn" <ndglenn@MAIL.LA.UTEXAS.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Norval D. Glenn" <ndglenn@MAIL.LA.UTEXAS.EDU>
Subject: Re: Inquiry
Comments: To: Mark David Richards <mark@bisconti.com>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <002801c3aa32\$f92034b0\$6801a8c0@MARK>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I also would like to know the answer to Mark's question, so please reply to the list.

Norval Glenn

On Thu, 13 Nov 2003, Mark David Richards wrote:

> Which companies have an in-person OMNI survey with a nationally
> representative sample? mark
>
> -----
> Mark David Richards
>
> -----
> 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: Fri, 14 Nov 2003 11:45:40 -0500
Reply-To: Paul Braun <pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Paul Braun <pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Cell phone portability
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Good day to all:

May I ask what plans, or what modifications or changes are being made to current execution strategies by CATI research facilities regarding RDD calling now that cell phone portability is here?

Specifically, as I understand it I cannot call someone using an "automated dialing device" (whatever that really is, CATI, or predictive dialer?) to a cell phone. Of course as of November 24th I won't know

whether I am calling a cell phone or not.

My last correspondence with CMOR indicated that the FCC has dismissed any concerns about the impact of portability on survey research. When CMOR spoke with Commissioner Abernathy (a very wireless-savvy Commissioner), she indicated that no one yet knows exactly how number portability will work out and what impact it will ultimately have. She also felt that any concerns our industry posed regarding the impact of the cell phone restriction on the industry are a bit pre-mature. The FCC's main focus during their consideration of TCPA changes, was definitely on the telemarketing do-not-call registry and sales-fax provisions.

I appreciate advise with respect to telephone strategies in the coming months.

Regards,

Paul Braun
Braun Research Incorporated
=20
Phone 609-279-1600
Fax 609-279-1318
E-mail pbraun@braunresearch.com <mailto:pbraun@braunresearch.com>=20
URL www.braunresearch.com <http://www.braunresearch.com>=20

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

Date: Fri, 14 Nov 2003 20:32:41 -0700
Reply-To: oneil@oneilresearch.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike O'Neil <oneil@ONEILRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Opinion Research Internship, Spring 2004
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Opinion Research Internship, Spring 2004

O'Neil Associates Inc. is expanding a highly successful summer internship program it has offered since 1990 to include the opportunity for a full-year or academic semester appointment. The option would be ideal for an undergraduate or graduate student who wishes to take either a semester or a year off to explore career opportunities and grow professionally. It has also proven to be an appropriate vehicle for recent graduates who have a sincere interest in the field of opinion research, but who have not been able to obtain significant relevant applied research experience during the course of their studies. Full-time paid internships are available for the Spring 2004 academic semester or for a full year appointment beginning in January 2004. (A shorter, unpaid internship is available for the winter

recess.)

The internship program. Past interns have been among the most capable and dedicated of students (two have been Rhodes Scholarship finalists). This position is ideal for a highly committed individual with an interest in learning how social science and opinion/marketing research is actually conducted in industry. Interns will gain firsthand knowledge, practical experience and insight into the entire research process, as well as highly marketable research skills. The training acquired in this program will be extraordinarily useful for someone intending to pursue research as a profession after graduation. Past interns have also found the experience highly useful in obtaining high-level employment in allied fields.

The Company. Our firm, established in 1981, is a full service public opinion/ market research firm serving a highly diverse clientele ranging from Fortune 100 companies, to government agencies, and nonprofits. We are small enough to provide real "hands on" experience, and are entrepreneurial, nonbureaucratic and growing. Applications will be accepted from both undergraduate and graduate students interested in the field of public opinion research.

Duties. Our goal is to expose our interns to all phases of the research process. This includes study design, field operations, focus group research, a wide array of computer tabulation and data processing assignments, and, for those with exceptional abilities, writing analytical reports. Even though conducting professional level analysis is far beyond the competencies of most students, most of our previous interns have undertaken such analytical writing responsibilities. While we have never guaranteed this opportunity since it is dependent on the intern's ability, we welcome such opportunities and acknowledge that the frequency with which it has occurred is a tribute to the exceptional abilities of our past interns.

Computer skills. Increasingly, ours is a field that makes extensive use of computer skills. For this reason, the ideal candidate will possess much more than microcomputer literacy. In other words, to function fully in our work environment, this competency should extend well beyond basic proficiency with Microsoft Word. Other relevant competencies would include proficiency with SPSS, Access (or dBase), PowerPoint (or Harvard Graphics), Web page design, PC networks. Any linear programming experience will facilitate learning CATI programming. Guidance and opportunities will be provided to quick learners with some relevant background and capacity for directed self-teaching. The greater a candidate's computer skills, the faster he or she will progress and take on a wider array of tasks. A candidate who has a basic familiarity with the logic of social science data processing including such programs as SPSS or one of its many equivalents would be especially well qualified and would be in a position to become involved more quickly in many of our operations.

Candidate preferences. Candidates who have interest in the field of survey research or an allied field such as marketing, advertising, public relations, or applied social science as a career will be given preference. Computer skills, understanding of social science research methods and strong writing skills are pluses that will expedite progress.

Time commitment. In order to maximize the mutual value of the program, we will give first consideration to those willing to commit to work a full year, an entire semester or an entire summer. Interns working an entire semester or entire summer will be paid \$400 per week. (We also offer a shorter, unpaid, internship over the winter recess or other similar briefer periods of time).

Housing. Housing in the Tempe area is plentiful and reasonably priced. We are located less than two miles from a large student community (Arizona State University, student population 50,000+) with the concomitant massive summer vacancy. We can provide assistance with the logistics of locating housing.

To apply. Interested candidates should e-mail a letter outlining their interests with some specificity (i.e., tell us why you are interested) along with a resume to careers@oneilresearch.com or mail the information to: Internship Program, O'Neil Associates Inc., 412 East Southern Avenue, Tempe, Arizona 85282. Applications for Spring 2004 are due by December 15 at the latest; those applying by December 1 will be advantaged.

Applicants are encouraged to explore our website: www.oneilresearch.com. This site is rich in information about our company. If you click on the Employment tab, essays from former interns are also available for viewing on this site. We highly recommend reading them.

Mike O'Neil

www.oneilresearch.com

Note: The attachment is a formatted version of this document.

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

Date: Sat, 15 Nov 2003 23:08:29 -0700
Reply-To: Mike O'Neil <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike O'Neil <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>
Subject: Spanish Speaking Moderator Wanted
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

We need to hire an experienced Spanish-speaking focus group moderator for a project in Phoenix.

Prefer someone located in the Southwest.

Please call me personally, preferably on Monday 480.967.4441x221. Our need

is immediate.

Mike O'Neil
www.oneilresearch.com

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

Date: Mon, 17 Nov 2003 12:57:33 -0500
Reply-To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Jindal's loss in Louisiana
Comments: To: aapor <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Does anyone know if experiments or other kinds of relevant questions were included in pre-election surveys to test whether perceived race played a part in the outcome of the Louisiana election? h.s.

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

Date: Mon, 17 Nov 2003 15:22:45 -0500
Reply-To: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>
Subject: Fwd: Call - Social Science Methodology conference RC33
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu, methods@umontreal.ca,
SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU,
METHODS@linux08.UNM.EDU
Comments: cc: jgoyder@watarts.uwaterloo.ca
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

John Goyder and myself are organizing the session (s) on unit non response=
=20
in surveys in the next Social Science Methodology Conference that will be=20
held in Amsterdam, 17-20 August 2004. The deadline for submitting=20
abstracts is January 15. Please send us both your proposals if you would=20
like to present a paper on this topic. Information on the conference --=20
and on the other sessions-- follow.

Nonresponse

Organizer(s): Claire Durand, John Goyder

Department de Sociologie, Universite de Montreal

Email : <mailto:Claire.Durand@umontreal.ca>Claire.Durand@umontreal.ca

Department of Sociology, University of Waterloo

Email: <mailto:jgoyder@watarts.uwaterloo.ca>jgoyder@watarts.uwaterloo.ca

Abstract

Submissions are invited for papers on any aspect of survey nonresponse, for presentation at the RC33-2004 Conference in Amsterdam. Topics would include (but are not restricted to):

nonresponse on specific types of survey such as electoral surveys;

response maximization (e.g. call management in telephone surveys, training and selection of personnel, incentives,...);

theoretical approaches (e.g. leverage-salience exchange theory, social psychology of interaction and persuasion,...);

research on the consequences of nonresponse;

studies of panel attrition in longitudinal surveys;

cross-cultural and cross-national studies in nonresponse;

trends in non response in different settings and countries.

The organizers will take submissions and optimize placing them into sessions as homogeneous as possible.

Keywords: nonresponse, unit nonresponse

>Call for papers

>

>ISA Research Committee on Logic and Methodology in Sociology RC33

>Sixth International Conference on Social Science Methodology

>Recent Developments and Applications in Social Research Methodology@

>Amsterdam, The Netherlands

>17-20 August 2004

>

>
>RC33 invites researchers to participate in this conference about
>recent developments and applications in social science research
>methodology. The topic may be on methodological problems in
>social sciences such as sociology, psychology, anthropology,
>economy, ecology, medicine, but may also engage other
>disciplines, for instance statistics, mathematics and logic.
>Papers should focus on recent trends and developments in
>quantitative and qualitative methods. Papers, which combine
>methods and empirical results, are very welcome. See at
><http://www.siswo.uva.nl/rc33/> for more details on submitting
>papers.
>
>Deadline for submitting abstracts: 15 January 2004
>Accepted Papers will be published on a CD-ROM, available on the
>conference.
>
>Congress secretariat:
>Christel van der Moot, tel: 31- 20 5270650, email: moot@siswo.uva.nl
>Henk Kleijer, tel. 31 20- 5270647, email: kleijer@siswo.uva.nl
>SISWO
>Plantage Muidergracht 4
>1018 TV Amsterdam, The Netherlands
>fax: 31-20 6229430
>general e-mail: rc33@siswo.uva.nl
>
>

Claire Durand
Claire.Durand@umontreal.ca
<http://www.fas.umontreal.ca/socio/durandc>

Professeur,
Responsable des cycles sup=9rieurs,
d=9partement de sociologie,
Universit=9 de Montr=9al
C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,
Montr=9al, Qu=9bec, H3C 3J7

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

Date: Mon, 17 Nov 2003 13:46:12 -0700
Reply-To: John Fries <jfries@ANR.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: John Fries <jfries@ANR.COM>
Subject: Translating Scales

AAPORnetters,

A while back I posted a message about an international project I was undertaking and received several great responses. However, as often

happens, the project was delayed for a bit and just now is getting ready to field again.

The latest discussion with my client has focused on the most translatable response scales. The concern is that one can not faithfully translate a scale, such as 'Very Interested,' 'Somewhat Interested,' 'Not Very Interested,' and 'Not At All Interested,' into several languages and have all the different translations be analytically equivalent.

A related issue is whether a shorter (4-point), fully labeled scale, like the one above, is better (or easier to both translate and keep comparable) than an 11-point scale (0-10) with only the endpoints being labeled. One argument suggests different cultures may understand 0 - 10 differently and therefore indicate different meanings with the same numbers. The counter argument (or one of them) suggests using fewer words may allow for more comparable responses since the more words used in a response category label, the more likely it is the translation of the category label will result, unintentionally, in different labels across cultures (and therefore different meanings).

If anyone has had experience with these issues, I would appreciate hearing your thoughts/experiences. I will be happy to collect any responses I receive and provide them to others who are interested in this topic. [Also, anyone who would like some good information about introductions in other languages should contact me as well. I have several responses from my previous post that I would be happy to share.]

Thanks in advance for any and all help.

Best Wishes,

John

--

John C. Fries
Senior Project Director | Alan Newman Research
<http://www.anr.com> | Market Research Consultants
Phone: 804.272.6100 | FAX: 804.272.7145
Email: <mailto:jfries@anr.com>

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

=====
Date: Tue, 18 Nov 2003 08:44:26 -0800
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
Subject: Call for Panel Participants
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

(apologies for cross-postings...)

Folks,

In the 2004 annual meeting of the American Sociological Association in =
San Francisco, the
Sociological Practice section is going to be presenting several
professional workshops for sociologists interested in different ways to
work as sociologists. As Chair of the Sociological Practice section, I
am inviting panel participants to present their guidance, perspective =
and
experience at one of these workshops. The career workshops are =
well-attended (the last one we gave was standing room only).

The workshops are listed below. The words in brackets are suggested =
areas
to cover.

1. Professional Workshop

Writing for Larger Audiences (non-scholarly).

[journalism-magazines; business reports, politicians, government =
staff]

2. Career Workshop

Non-academic Career Search.

[Places, where to look, interviewing, resumes, 'soft skills' and
experience.]

3. Career Workshop

Career paths outside the Academy.

[Places and kinds of work: government, private consulting, =
non-profits,
industry, others?]

4. Professional Workshop

Public Policy: Methods and Applications.

[policy development, policy evaluation, case studies]

Workshops are 110 minutes long, typically with 3 to 4 panel =
participants. =20

Contact me for more information. Please forward this email to interested
colleagues. Contact me by November 24 at the latest.

Best,
Leora

Leora Lawton, Ph.D.
Chair, Sociological Practice Section, ASA

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

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

Date: Thu, 20 Nov 2003 08:44:40 -0600
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: FW: Polling Questions
Comments: To: AAPORNet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Please respond direct to this individual. =20

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

From: Jackie Lautenberger [<mailto:JLautenberger@flchamber.com>]
Sent: Thursday, November 20, 2003 8:14 AM
To: AAPOR-INFO
Subject: Polling Questions

Hello,

My name is Jackie Lautenberger and I am currently working as an intern in the not-for-profit organization Leadership Florida. This year we have been tasked to conduct an opinion poll. We will be specifically looking at what Floridians opinions are on certain issues in the state. I am looking for sample questions in polls. I want to know the number of questions usually asked and look at some of the questions. I am not interest with the results of any surveys, just how to construct them. Could you help with any information possible? It would be greatly appreciated.

Jackie Lautenberger
jlautenberger@flchamber.com
850-521-1226

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

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

Date: Thu, 20 Nov 2003 09:32:21 -0600
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Positions Available
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
Comments: cc: Peggy.Moss@maritz.com
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

=20
Please respond directly to mossmm@maritz.com =20
=20
Marketing Science Professionals<?xml:namespace prefix =3D o ns =3D =
"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />

=20
Maritz Research is a major national and international force in the =
marketing research industry. Our wide range of services paves the way to =
finding solutions to marketing problems and identifying marketing =
opportunities for some of the world's largest clients. We have exciting =
positions for a Director, Marketing Science and for Senior Research =
Analysts.

=20
We are looking to expand our already industry-leading Marketing Science =
group. We are looking for someone with demonstrated expertise in the =
field and the ability to communicate to and motivate a non-technical =
audience.

=20
Maritz Research delivers advanced insights to its clients through =
specialist, sector-based analytic teams and a core marketing science =
function. This position is with the central team, which is charged with =
continually advancing the state of the art for Maritz, our clients and =
our industry. The central team also serves as a critical resource for =
business development staff. As such there is some geographic =
flexibility; the Director may work from our St. Louis, Chicago, =
Minneapolis or Detroit locations.

=20
Successful Director candidate requires an advanced degree in a =
research-relevant field, at least 10 years' experience. Moreover, we =
seek demonstrated expertise and innovation in one or more areas of =
marketing sciences as evinced by publications or presentations at =
industry conferences. Ability to communicate in speech and writing is =

critical to the success of this position, as it involves extensive =
client contact, conference presentations and the ability to design and =
conduct internal training programs. =20

=20

The key skill set for Senior Research Analyst candidates is experience =
with marketing research design, psychological measurement, statistical =
programming/modeling, and knowledge of marketing. Familiarity with =
Factor Analysis, ANOVA, MANOVA, Multiple Regression, Logistic =
Regression, Cluster Analysis, and other advanced statistical procedures =
preferred. Minimum requirements: (1) 5+ years experience in marketing =
research analysis. (2) Advanced degree in marketing research, marketing, =
psychology, economics, statistics, or related field (3) Intermediate to =
advanced SAS programming skills (other programming skills a plus) (4) =
Successful client consulting record (5) Auto industry experience a plus =

=20

Working together as collaborators, our people are eager to share their =
expertise. Our competitive salaries are complemented by excellent =
benefits including tuition reimbursement, 401(k) with company match, =
paid retirement plan, paid life and short-and long-term disability =
insurance, and excellent medical and dental plans. For consideration, =
please paste your scanner-friendly resume (no bolds, highlights, =
italics) into your message and send by e-mail to =
<mailto:mossmm@maritz.com> mossmm@maritz.com Visit our Web site at =
<http://www.maritzresearch.com/> www.maritzresearch.com. EOE

=20

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

=====
Date: Thu, 20 Nov 2003 14:40:37 -0800
Reply-To: Douglas Strand <dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Douglas Strand <dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU>
Subject: Re: Jindal's loss in Louisiana
Comments: To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <3FB90C0D.5020009@umich.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

I just returned from a conference in New Orleans. Reading some of the
local press coverage led me to believe that Jindal lost white support for
just being nonwhite... I don't think it was a matter of the "perception"
of his race.

Outside of the New Orleans area (including its suburbs, which appeared to

go more for Jindal than Blanco), Blanco got more white support than the Republican Jindal. Meanwhile, Jindal's black support statewide (9%) was almost twice what the Times-Picayune said was the "normal" black vote for white statewide candidates. In sum, I bet that Jindal's attempts to appeal to black and other minority voters ended up winning fewer votes than the white votes he lost with that approach and with his (subcontinental) Indian ethnicity. Jindal lost in the northern parishes with relatively more conservative whites even though Jindal worked hard to appeal to the religious conservatives, with his positions and his frequent God-talk.

To quote a colleague of mine, maybe the Republicans in this case, with their crossracial appeal, were "too smart by half"?

However, among New Orleans pundits, the prevailing explanation for Jindal's loss was that he failed to answer Blanco's late ads attacking his record as head of the state's department of health and hospitals.

Of course, we have to avoid any monocausal explanation.

Cheers,
Doug Strand

Douglas Strand, Ph.D.
Project Director
Public Agendas and Citizen Engagement Survey (PACES)
Survey Research Center
UC Berkeley
354 Barrows Hall
Tel: 510-642-0508
Fax: 510-642-9665

At 12:57 PM Monday 11/17/03 -0500, Howard Schuman wrote:
>Does anyone know if experiments or other kinds of relevant questions
>were included in pre-election surveys to test whether perceived race
>played a part in the outcome of the Louisiana election? h.s.
>

>-----
>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: Fri, 21 Nov 2003 13:16:01 -0500
Reply-To: Yasamin Miller <yd17@CORNELL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Yasamin Miller <yd17@CORNELL.EDU>
Subject: surveying Asian populations in the US
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0

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

We're looking to understand methodologies used to conduct national surveys exclusively with the Asian population in the US. In particular, we're looking to interview people who are of Chinese, Korean, Indian, Vietnamese and Japanese origin or ethnicity. Excluding face-to-face interviews, does anyone have experience with conducting other types of interviews with these groups (phone, mail, web)? If so, what mode of data collection was used and how did you identify your groups?

Thank you in advance for sharing your experiences with us.

Yasamin

Yasamin Miller, Director
Survey Research Institute - SRI
168 Ives Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853
tel: 607-255-0148
fax: 607-255-7118
em: yd17@cornell.edu

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

=====
Date: Fri, 21 Nov 2003 17:09:47 -0500
Reply-To: Sid Groeneman <sid.grc@VERIZON.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Sid Groeneman <sid.grc@VERIZON.NET>
Subject: Classifying Religions/Denominations
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Follow AAPORNETers,

I am looking for help classifying churches and denominations (1) into broader categories, and (2) combining some responses which reference the same church/denomination but with different names. (For example, I believe that the GSS uses a broader coding of religious preference, but I haven't been able to find the documentation.) Please respond off-list unless your advice is of general interest.

Sid Groeneman

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

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

Date: Fri, 21 Nov 2003 20:32:21 -0500
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Organization: Rider University
Subject: Data sets on the US role in the world
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Fellow AAPORneters:

I am looking for any data sets that are available (either for downloading or for sale) regarding perceptions of the United States' role in the world from between 1983 and the present. If anyone knows of a good source for this data, please respond directly back to me (if other AAPORneters are interested, I'll post the results). I am interested mostly in domestic data, but also foreign data if available.

Thanks,

Frank Louis Rusciano, Professor and Chair
Department of Political Science
Rider University

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

Date: Fri, 21 Nov 2003 22:05:01 -0500
Reply-To: Richard Clark <clark@CVIOG.UGA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Richard Clark <clark@CVIOG.UGA.EDU>
Subject: focus group facility
Comments: To: AAPORnet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Is anyone familiar with any focus group facilities near Savannah or

Brunswick, Georgia? If so, please respond off line.

Richard L. Clark, Ph.D.
Manager of Survey Research & Data Services Unit
Director of Peach State Poll
Carl Vinson Institute of Government
University of Georgia
201 N. Milledge Avenue
Athens, GA 30602
(706) 542-2736

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

Date: Mon, 24 Nov 2003 18:37:03 -0500
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Subject: Question - Fifty Books That Significantly Shaped Public Opinion
Research, 1946-1995
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Hello!

Does anyone know how AAPOR's
"Fifty Books That Significantly Shaped Public Opinion Research, 1946-1995"
were selected?

I couldn't find the method info on this webpage:
http://www.aapor.org/default.asp?page=survey_methods/recommended_reading

(Students and others might also find a full bibliography, clustered by
subtopic, useful.)

best, mark

Mark David Richards

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

Date: Tue, 25 Nov 2003 10:04:03 -0500
Reply-To: Patricia Gallagher <Patricia.Gallagher@UMB.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Patricia Gallagher <Patricia.Gallagher@UMB.EDU>
Subject: Job posting: Survey research position in Boston
Comments: To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Senior Research Fellow at the Center for Survey Research (CSR), =
University of Massachusetts Boston. CSR is a full-service, academic =
survey research organization in its 32nd year of operation. We =
currently have an opening for a social science Ph.D. to join our group =
of 8 senior staff members and work as a collaborative, interdisciplinary =
team member. We conduct a wide variety of survey research projects, =
both as principal investigators and as sub-contractors to other =
researchers. Projects cover a wide range of timely subject areas such as =
health care delivery, tobacco control, and adolescent stress. We =
emphasize methodological research and integrating new knowledge into our =
survey efforts. Special consideration will be given to those applicants =
with particular interest in methodological aspects of survey research =
(e.g. sampling, question design and evaluation, web-based surveys, =
computer-assisted data collection), and/or new analytic techniques (e.g. =
multi-level statistical analysis, analysis of longitudinal data, =
nonresponse bias). Applicant must have demonstrated analytic skills and =
an ability to develop funding for her/his own research interests. =
Considerable experience with large-scale probability sample survey =
projects is essential. Competitive calendar-year salary commensurate =
with experience. Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. =
Application review will begin immediately and continue until the =
position is filled. Send vita to: Director, Center for Survey Research, =
University of Massachusetts Boston, 100 Morrissey Blvd. Boston, MA =
02125.

Patricia M. Gallagher, PhD
Senior Research Fellow
Center for Survey Research=20
University of Massachusetts Boston=20
100 Morrissey Boulevard=20
Boston, MA 02125=20
Tel: 617-287-7200; Fax: 617-287-7210
E-mail: patricia.gallagher@umb.edu; Website: www.csr.umb.edu=20

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

Date: Tue, 25 Nov 2003 11:08:53 -0500
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Organization: Bisconti Research, Inc.
Subject: FW: Answer - Fifty Books That Significantly Shaped Public
Opinion

Research, 1946-1995

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Thanks to those who responded; for those who asked that the information =
be
posted on AAPORNET, I am forwarding Dawn Nelson's response which is a
complete description of how the top fifty books were chosen. Al Gollin
chaired the project; Joan Black reminded me that Al liked projects that
honored people and while he was alive he wrote the citation for the =
AAPOR
Award for every President. Thanks everyone and happy holidays... mark

Mark David Richards

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

From: dawn.v.nelson@census.gov [mailto:dawn.v.nelson@census.gov]=20

Sent: Tuesday, November 25, 2003 8:28 AM

To: mark@BISCONTI.COM

Subject: RE: Question - Fifty Books That Significantly Shaped Public =
Opinion

Research, 1946-1995

Mark,
I saw your posting on aapornet and pulled out my old AAPOR programs to
answer your query.

In the 1995 AAPOR Program, there's a "50th Anniversary Books Committee"
identified.

Committee members include:

W. Phillips Davison

Albert E. Gollin, Chair

Stanley Presser

Howard Schuman

Eleanor Singer

David L. Sills

Seymour Sudman

Then, in the 1995 "Commemorative Book for the 50th Anniversary =
Celebration
of the AAPOR" (which was given to all conference attendees), there's the
description that you seek.

Fifty "Great Books in the Field of Public Opinion Research"
by Albert E. Gollin

"In planning for AAPOR's 50th Anniversary Celebration, I proposed that a
committee be chosen to create 'a display of significant books in public
opinion research published over the years.' From that small suggestion =
a

project emerged that eventually yielded a list of fifty of the most significant contributions to theoretical, methodological and substantive developments in the field during AAPOR's organizational life, 1946-1995.

"First, a committee was picked and approved by AAPOR's Council. It consisted of W. Phillips Davison, Stanley Presser, Howard Schuman, David = L.

Sills, Eleanor Singer and Seymour Sudman; I served as its chairman. Collectively, the panel comprised three long-term past editors of POQ as well as its current editor; six past AAPOR presidents; three AAPOR Award winners, and the editor of the International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. All seven judges had held elective office on AAPOR's Council. Thus, they were well qualified to speak for AAPOR in recognizing the highest scholarly achievements in the field over the years. But = arguably, a different panel might well have come up with a somewhat different = lists of selections.

"The selection process had three stages. First, the committee clarified terms of reference restricted to the selection of fifty of the most influential books published in the period from 1946 to 1995. This ruled out a number of acknowledged classics antedating 1946, as well as some seminal articles or book chapters that were published in the mandated period. And, by settling on "Fifty great books for AAPORs fiftieth" as = our rallying cry, an arbitrary numerical constraint was added that made selection more difficult.

"Second, committee members were rejoined to search POQ's indexes and = their bookshelves and nominate up to 75 eligible books, which would then be consolidated and compiled into a list for balloting by the committee as = a whole. No judge nominated any of his or her own works. In all, 152 eligible books were nominated, a few of which were unanimously cited by = the judges. As a "Delphi-type" add-on, I fed back the results of this first round to the committee by noting how many people had nominated each = work.

"Finally, balloting by mail was carried out, with each judge asked to = vote for fifty books. A qualifying criterion of at least four judges' votes = was established as a cutoff. As one indicator of a strong group consensus, = 16 books - almost one-third of the total - were unanimous selections. ... = Most of the others received five or six votes. A shift of a few votes could have altered the selection of no more than four or five books - but in almost all cases the works that might have gained recognition were by people already represented by a selection. These are, therefore, significant books in a dual sense, i.e., highly influential works by =

most
of the leading figures in the field of public opinion research over the
past 50 years.

"Of course, the passage of time makes it easier to identify "classics" =
in
any field, to the evident disadvantage of works appearing more recently.
Yet, six books published in the 1980's and one in 1992 made the cutoff,
showing that hallmarks of quality and enduring significance in =
scholarship
are (sometimes) easily readable. If not "THE top fifty" (a debatable
concept, given the limits cited above), they are surely fifty of the =
most
significant books, which was our charter as a committee to identify.

"If this exercise in the recognition of excellence is repeated in =
another
fifty years of AAPOR's existence, a comparison of two lists should prove
highly instructive. My hunch is that the results are likely to show =
little
overlap, if the field of public opinion research follows the pattern of
'obliteration by incorporation' that Robert K. Merton (listed here for =
his
'Mass Persuasion') has elsewhere identified as common to progress in =
many
fields of science., Thus, it is all the more important that we honor =
these
works and the pioneers in the field who wrote them."

----- Message from Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM> on Mon, 24 =
Nov
2003 18:37:03 -0500 -----
=20

Subject: Question - Fifty Books That Significantly Shaped Public =
Opinion

Research, 1946-1995

=20

Hello!

Does anyone know how AAPOR's
"Fifty Books That Significantly Shaped Public Opinion Research, =
1946-1995"
were selected?

I couldn't find the method info on this webpage:
[http://www.aapor.org/default.asp?page=3Dsurvey_methods/recommended_readin=
g](http://www.aapor.org/default.asp?page=3Dsurvey_methods/recommended_reading)

(Students and others might also find a full bibliography, clustered by
subtopic, useful.)

best, mark

Mark David Richards

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

Date: Tue, 25 Nov 2003 13:03:22 -0800
Reply-To: Craig New <Craig@TSONGAS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Craig New <Craig@TSONGAS.COM>
Subject: Survey Call Center near Seattle/Portland
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

Greetings:

I am searching for a reputable, high quality survey call center in the Portland/Seattle area. I have tried several and have been dissatisfied, for the most part, with the results. If anyone has any suggestions, please respond to me off-line.

Thanks,

Craig C. New, Ph.D.
Director of Research

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

TSONGAS LITIGATION CONSULTING, INC
One SW Columbia Street, Suite 600
Portland, Oregon 97258
Phone 503-225-0321 Fax 503-225-0382
<<http://www.tsongas.com/>> www.tsongas.com

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

Date: Tue, 25 Nov 2003 21:06:42 -0500
Reply-To: "Knott, Charles E" <knott@BATTELLE.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Knott, Charles E" <knott@BATTELLE.ORG>
Subject: Position Announcement: Director, Information Technology
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Battelle/CPHRE Information Technology Leader Opening=20

Battelle, a world leader in research, seeks an Information Technology Leader to plan, develop, deploy and maintain IT systems for its' contracts research organization Centers for Public Health Research and Evaluation (CPHRE). CPHRE is a multi-centered organization with full service offices located in Arlington, VA, Atlanta, GA, Baltimore, MD, Durham, NC, Seattle, WA, and St. Louis, MO. Depending upon candidate qualifications, the position may be located in Baltimore, Durham, Seattle or St. Louis. CPHRE is a major component in Battelle's Health and Life Sciences Division and conducts grant and contracts health related research with most NIH agencies, CDC, numerous non-profit foundations and private industry. CPHRE's multi-disciplinary professionals conduct and solve epidemiologic, occupational health, health promotion, prevention, social and behavioral public health research while conducting full service computer-aided and assisted data collection methodologies appropriate to clients' needs.

This position will lead and coordinate CPHRE's IT department, providing strategic and tactical oversight for the planning, creation and operations of the organization's technology infrastructure while managing teams located in six geographic offices. The IT Leader is primarily responsible for optimizing CPHRE's technical ability to create tailored custom applications for numerous clients while introducing new technologies and approaches for collecting high quality, valid and reliable data in an environment that routinely involves multi-mode data collection and reduction strategies. This includes responsibility to integrate growth within both CPHRE and broader Battelle strategic initiatives in the IT area. This position is also responsible for the management and continuous delivery of CPHRE IT services, and, as needed, serving as senior project director on complex public health research projects.=20

Specifically, the position will:=20

- * Participate in strategic and operational management of CPHRE as a member of the senior management team.=20
- * Lead IT strategic and operational planning activities by fostering innovation, standardization, prioritization of IT initiatives, and coordination of the development cycle, e.g. evaluation; design; deployment; and management of IT systems across CPHRE.=20
- * Establish IT departmental goals, objectives, and operating procedures.
- * Foster the introduction and integration of new types of software systems that expand the range of services we provide to clients.=20
- * Identify opportunities to use technology to improve business processes and create a competitive advantage through cost-effective

investment of financial resources in IT systems, including staffing, sourcing, purchasing, and in-house development.=20

* Develop business case justifications and cost/benefit analyses for IT initiatives, assess and communicate to management risk and benefits associated with IT investments.=20

* Develop, monitor and control CPHRE's IT annual operating and capital budgets.=20

* Coordinate and facilitate consultation with CPHRE and Battelle Information Management stakeholders to define business systems requirements for new technology implementations.=20

* Ensure continuous delivery of IT services through oversight and monitoring of IT systems performance while improving the quality, functionality and deliverability of the organization's technology infrastructure.=20

Qualified candidates should be degreed in computer science, with a minimum of ten years experience directing and leading successful IT development activities in a health or survey research or CRO setting, five or more years experience in software development and IT process improvement. Demonstrated leadership experience required in information technology development and deployment, fiscal management, and sustained performance in an IT environment.=20

Special emphasis will be placed on IT development and deployment activities within a survey research or health research environment, including planning, deployment, and management of research IT initiatives with successful experience in delivering highly effective enterprise systems and a scalable infrastructure. Established knowledge of leading edge computer-assisted or directed technologies, relational databases, multiple software platforms and products, technology languages and application development is required.=20

Must have demonstrated proven leadership skills, the ability to effectively work with senior management and all staff levels, excellent technical, organizational and analytical skills, and strong verbal, written, and interpersonal communications skills.

Interested qualified candidates can submit their interest for Director, CPHRE Information Technology (job reference no. 7794) via Battelle's career web page located at www.battelle.org/careers. Battelle is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer and supports diversity in the workplace. Applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, veteran status, marital status, or sexual orientation.

Charles Knott, MPA
Site Director, Durham
Battelle/Centers for Public Health Research and Evaluation
100 Capitola Drive, Suite 301
Durham, North Carolina 27713-4411
Phone: 919.544.3717 ext. 105
Fax: 919.544.0830

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

Date: Tue, 25 Nov 2003 22:34:13 -0500
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Subject: NEW DC Jan. 13 Primary Preference Poll -- WTOP Radio and WJLA TV
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu, MPOP <Media-PublicOpinion-Polls-l@usc.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

At last, a poll of DC Democrats. see information below.

=20

One point. the question about whether the primary should be moved later =
in
the season so that the five who took their names off the DC ballot =
because
it is first (Jan. 13) could put their names back on seems loaded. It =
did
not tell the reason that the primary was moved first-nowhere did the
question mention that this is all about DC raising awareness about =
voting
rights so its citizens can win political equality. And nowhere did it =
tell
that the primary is within the rules of the Democratic Party because it =
is
non-binding and that the five candidates voluntarily removed their =
names.

=20

Also today, the Chair of the Democratic National Committee - who has =
fought
DC since Jan. 13, 2003 when DC decided to move its primary first - =
announced
that U.S. Democrats will highlight the need for DC voting rights at the
national convention and will hold an event with a major Democratic =
figure at
the MCI Center (Clinton/Gore?). AP reported.

=20

mark

=20

=20

<http://www.wtop.com/?sid=3D146197>
<<http://www.wtop.com/index.php?sid=3D146197&nid=3D213&template=3Dprint>> =
&nid=3D213
(news article)

http://www.wtopnews.com/pdf/wtop_abc7poll.pdf (link to poll questions/results)

WTOP-ABC 7 Poll: Dean Leads D.C.=20
Tuesday, Nov. 25, 2003 - 4:45 PM=20

WTOP Radio and ABC-7 WJLA TV conducted a poll of likely Democratic =
voters in
the D.C. Primary.=20

Among the findings:=20

Howard Dean Holds a Substantial Lead in the D.C. Democratic Primary=20

In a hypothetical 9-way race, Dr. Howard Dean leads his nearest =
competitor
by more than two-to-one. He polls 27% of the primary electorate, =
compared to
11% for his closest rival, Gen. Wesley Clark.=20

Trailing are Rep. Richard Gephardt (7%), Sen. Joseph Lieberman (5%), =
Rev. Al
Sharpton (5%), Ambassador Carol Moseley-Braun (4%), Sen. John Kerry =
(4%),
Rep. Dennis Kucinich (1%), and Sen. John Edwards (1%). One-third (33%) =
of
the voters are undecided.=20

Among those who say they are "absolutely certain" to vote on January 13,
Dean's lead over Clark grows to 30% to 10%. Sharpton is in third place =
at
6%, tied with Gephardt.=20

In a trial heat among the four candidates who will actually appear on =
the
ballot in D.C. on January 13, Dean pulls out to a commanding 45% to 11% =
lead
over Sharpton. Moseley-Braun draws 8%, while Kucinich is far back at 4%. =

Among those absolutely certain to vote, Dean leads Sharpton 47% to 12%.=20

Dean leads with an eye-popping 77% in Wards 2 and 3, with all other
candidates in single digits. In fact, Dean wins every ward in the city,
including Wards 7 and 8, where he attracts 29% of voters compared to 17% =
for

Sharpton and 14% for Moseley-Braun.=20

Among African-Americans in the four-way race, Dean leads with 29%, = compared to 18% for Sharpton and 11% for Moseley-Braun. Dean attracts 70% of = Whites.=20

Dean's greatest strength lies with younger voters - he attracts a = majority of all those under age 50 - and those with the highest levels of = education and who have moved to D.C. more recently.=20

Right now, Dean is in command, winning every demographic group and every ward.=20

Dean is seen as the most electable=20

Nearly one voter in three (30%) sees Dean as best able to beat President Bush among the nine contenders. Clark is next, viewed as most electable = by 13%.=20

Among their own supporters, both Clark and Dean are viewed as the most electable candidate by two-thirds. No other candidates come close to = that level among their own supporters.=20

But a substantial minority of voters would like someone else to run=20

More than one voter in four (29%) wishes someone else would get into the Democratic contest for president. A majority (53%) are satisfied with = the current choices, while 18% are just not sure.=20

Satisfaction with the candidates is much higher among Whites (65%) than among African-American voters (47%).=20

When asked about Hillary Clinton specifically, 37% say she "would have a better chance to beat George Bush than any of the candidates currently = in the race," while 18% volunteer that she is actually less electable than = the current alternatives.=20

While women are not much more likely than men to prefer Hillary as a candidate (40% vs. 34%), it is African-Americans who would most like to = see her run, with 48% wishing for that opportunity.=20

A majority of primary voters do not support moving the contest to = January=20

When asked if D.C. should go ahead with its first in the nation primary =

at
the cost of five of the nine candidates dropping out, or move it back to =
the
old spot on the calendar, a majority of likely voting Democrats would =
move
the primary back (52% to 35%, with 13% unsure).=20

Women, younger voters, and those with lower levels of education are less
likely to want to go ahead with the early primary.=20

=20

Mark David Richards=20

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

Date: Wed, 26 Nov 2003 10:19:58 -0500
Reply-To: Steve Raabe <sraabe@POTOMACINC.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Steve Raabe <sraabe@POTOMACINC.COM>
Subject: Re: NEW DC Jan. 13 Primary Preference Poll -- WTOP Radio and
WJLA

TV

Comments: To: mark@bisconti.com, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Mark --

Thanks for your feedback. As the author of the question, I can assure you
there was no intention to load it. Our clients are news organizations who
are always seeking balanced questions.

In fact, this was an extremely refined sample of registered likely primary
voters in a contest that only drew a turnout of 9% of registered Democrats
in 2000. The presumption was that these highly engaged voters were well
familiar with the rationale for moving the primary up -- to give D.C. more
attention and sway over the process, etc. The new development is the
dropping out of the five candidates, which occurred just in the last two
weeks. That made the question newsworthy, interesting, and timely.

As you undoubtedly know, there has been intense pressure behind the scenes
from the DNC to move the contest back to its original date, and that is
coming to a head now in November. I hope you found the rest of the survey
more to your liking.

Steve Raabe
----- Original Message -----

From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 25, 2003 10:34 PM
Subject: NEW DC Jan. 13 Primary Preference Poll -- WTOP Radio and WJLA TV

At last, a poll of DC Democrats. see information below.

One point. the question about whether the primary should be moved later in the season so that the five who took their names off the DC ballot because it is first (Jan. 13) could put their names back on seems loaded. It did not tell the reason that the primary was moved first-nowhere did the question mention that this is all about DC raising awareness about voting rights so its citizens can win political equality. And nowhere did it tell that the primary is within the rules of the Democratic Party because it is non-binding and that the five candidates voluntarily removed their names.

Also today, the Chair of the Democratic National Committee - who has fought DC since Jan. 13, 2003 when DC decided to move its primary first - announced that U.S. Democrats will highlight the need for DC voting rights at the national convention and will hold an event with a major Democratic figure at the MCI Center (Clinton/Gore?). AP reported.

mark

<http://www.wtop.com/?sid=146197>
<<http://www.wtop.com/index.php?sid=146197&nid=213&template=print>> &nid=213
(news article)

http://www.wtopnews.com/pdf/wtop_abc7poll.pdf (link to poll questions/results)

WTOP-ABC 7 Poll: Dean Leads D.C.
Tuesday, Nov. 25, 2003 - 4:45 PM

WTOP Radio and ABC-7 WJLA TV conducted a poll of likely Democratic voters in the D.C. Primary.

Among the findings:

Howard Dean Holds a Substantial Lead in the D.C. Democratic Primary

In a hypothetical 9-way race, Dr. Howard Dean leads his nearest competitor by more than two-to-one. He polls 27% of the primary electorate, compared to 11% for his closest rival, Gen. Wesley Clark.

Trailing are Rep. Richard Gephardt (7%), Sen. Joseph Lieberman (5%), Rev. Al Sharpton (5%), Ambassador Carol Moseley-Braun (4%), Sen. John Kerry (4%), Rep. Dennis Kucinich (1%), and Sen. John Edwards (1%). One-third (33%) of the voters are undecided.

Among those who say they are "absolutely certain" to vote on January 13, Dean's lead over Clark grows to 30% to 10%. Sharpton is in third place at 6%, tied with Gephardt.

In a trial heat among the four candidates who will actually appear on the ballot in D.C. on January 13, Dean pulls out to a commanding 45% to 11% lead over Sharpton. Moseley-Braun draws 8%, while Kucinich is far back at 4%.

Among those absolutely certain to vote, Dean leads Sharpton 47% to 12%.

Dean leads with an eye-popping 77% in Wards 2 and 3, with all other candidates in single digits. In fact, Dean wins every ward in the city, including Wards 7 and 8, where he attracts 29% of voters compared to 17% for Sharpton and 14% for Moseley-Braun.

Among African-Americans in the four-way race, Dean leads with 29%, compared to 18% for Sharpton and 11% for Moseley-Braun. Dean attracts 70% of Whites.

Dean's greatest strength lies with younger voters - he attracts a majority of all those under age 50 - and those with the highest levels of education and who have moved to D.C. more recently.

Right now, Dean is in command, winning every demographic group and every ward.

Dean is seen as the most electable

Nearly one voter in three (30%) sees Dean as best able to beat President Bush among the nine contenders. Clark is next, viewed as most electable by 13%.

Among their own supporters, both Clark and Dean are viewed as the most electable candidate by two-thirds. No other candidates come close to that level among their own supporters.

But a substantial minority of voters would like someone else to run

More than one voter in four (29%) wishes someone else would get into the Democratic contest for president. A majority (53%) are satisfied with the current choices, while 18% are just not sure.

Satisfaction with the candidates is much higher among Whites (65%) than among African-American voters (47%).

When asked about Hillary Clinton specifically, 37% say she "would have a

better chance to beat George Bush than any of the candidates currently in the race," while 18% volunteer that she is actually less electable than the current alternatives.

While women are not much more likely than men to prefer Hillary as a candidate (40% vs. 34%), it is African-Americans who would most like to see her run, with 48% wishing for that opportunity.

A majority of primary voters do not support moving the contest to January

When asked if D.C. should go ahead with its first in the nation primary at the cost of five of the nine candidates dropping out, or move it back to the old spot on the calendar, a majority of likely voting Democrats would move the primary back (52% to 35%, with 13% unsure).

Women, younger voters, and those with lower levels of education are less likely to want to go ahead with the early primary.

Mark David Richards

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: Fri, 28 Nov 2003 08:45:16 -0500
Reply-To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Of considerable methodological significance
Comments: To: [aapor <aapor@asu.edu>](mailto:aapor@asu.edu)
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A17485-2003Nov27.html>

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

Date: Fri, 28 Nov 2003 14:30:23 -0500
Reply-To: Christopher Mann <christopher.mann@YALE.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Christopher Mann <christopher.mann@YALE.EDU>

Subject: Generic Ballot Question for State Legislatures
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
In-Reply-To: <0HOZ00KGOV81BH@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I am looking for publicly available polls that have asked a generic ballot question for state legislatures (e.g. "Are you more likely to vote for a Democrat or a Republic for state legislature in the upcoming election) over a series of election cycles. After looking at a number of sources, I have only been able to find the Rutgers Eagleton-Star Ledger Poll in New Jersey. Does anyone know of others? Or is anyone willing to share this info from polls that are otherwise not public? I want to use the data for a research note I am working on.

Thanks for your help!

Christopher Mann

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