

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 LOG0312"

---

Date: Mon, 1 Dec 2003 10:47:44 -0800  
Reply-To: "Dr. Thomas Lamatsch" <lamatsch@UNLV.NEVADA.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Dr. Thomas Lamatsch" <lamatsch@UNLV.NEVADA.EDU>  
Subject: AAPOR proposal: adding author  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <3F848AF8.3010405@latte.harvard.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Hi everybody:

I was trying to add a co-author to one of my AAPOR proposals but I was unable to do so. I was just wondering if anybody else had the same problem?

--tom

\*\*\*\*\*

Thomas Lamatsch, Ph.D.  
Director - Cannon Center for Survey Research  
Ast. Professor in Residence - Dept of Political Science  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
4505 Maryland Pkwy - Box 455008  
Las Vegas, NV 89154-5008  
phone: (702)895-0167  
fax (702)895-0165  
lamatsch@unlv.edu

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jennifer Hochschild  
Sent: Wednesday, October 08, 2003 3:09 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: [Fwd: Re: CA Prop 54 - Racial Privacy Initiative]

p.s. to Ken's request: and how about breakdowns of the Prop. 54 vote by race/ethnicity, recency of immigration, class or education, urbanicity, etc. (or even any of the above???) thanks, Jennifer Hochschild

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

Subject: Re: CA Prop 54 - Racial Privacy Initiative  
Date: Wed, 08 Oct 2003 17:53:59 -0400  
From: Ken Sherrill <Ken@KENSHERILL.COM>

Reply-To: Ken Sherrill <Ken@KENSHERILL.COM>  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

A friend on staff at the NGLTF Policy Institute asks for the breakdown of the vote on Prop. 54 by sexual orientation. Has anyone seen that?

Ken Sherrill

--

Jennifer L. Hochschild  
Harvard University  
Henry LeBarre Jayne Professor of Government  
Member, Dept. of African and African American Studies

phone: 617-496-0181  
fax: 617-495-0438  
hochschild@latte.harvard.edu

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

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

=====  
Date: Mon, 1 Dec 2003 14:12:14 -0500  
Reply-To: "Featherston, Fran A." <[ffeather@NSF.GOV](mailto:ffeather@NSF.GOV)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Featherston, Fran A." <[ffeather@NSF.GOV](mailto:ffeather@NSF.GOV)>  
Subject: Re: AAPOR proposal: adding author  
Comments: To: "Dr. Thomas Lamatsch" <[lamatsch@UNLV.NEVADA.EDU](mailto:lamatsch@UNLV.NEVADA.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

There is some strange co-author subroutine that requires you to set up a PIN for each co-author. I found it entirely too confusing, so I just added a line to the text of my abstract showing my co-author. I hope to be able to straighten this out later if we are accepted for the conference.  
(fran)

Fran Featherston  
National Science Foundation  
4201 Wilson Blvd.  
Arlington, VA 22230  
703-292-4221  
[ffeather@nsf.gov](mailto:ffeather@nsf.gov)

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

From: Dr. Thomas Lamatsch [<mailto:lamatsch@UNLV.NEVADA.EDU>]

Sent: Monday, December 01, 2003 1:48 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: AAPOR proposal: adding author

Hi everybody:

I was trying to add a co-author to one of my AAPOR proposals but I was unable to do so. I was just wondering if anybody else had the same problem?

--tom

\*\*\*\*\*

Thomas Lamatsch, Ph.D.  
Director - Cannon Center for Survey Research  
Ast. Professor in Residence - Dept of Political Science  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
4505 Maryland Pkwy - Box 455008  
Las Vegas, NV 89154-5008  
phone: (702)895-0167  
fax (702)895-0165  
lamatsch@unlv.edu

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jennifer Hochschild  
Sent: Wednesday, October 08, 2003 3:09 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: [Fwd: Re: CA Prop 54 - Racial Privacy Initiative]

p.s. to Ken's request: and how about breakdowns of the Prop. 54 vote by race/ethnicity, recency of immigration, class or education, urbanicity, etc. (or even any of the above???) thanks, Jennifer Hochschild

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

Subject: Re: CA Prop 54 - Racial Privacy Initiative  
Date: Wed, 08 Oct 2003 17:53:59 -0400  
From: Ken Sherrill <Ken@KENSHERILL.COM>  
Reply-To: Ken Sherrill <Ken@KENSHERILL.COM>  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

A friend on staff at the NGLTF Policy Institute asks for the breakdown of the vote on Prop. 54 by sexual orientation. Has anyone seen that?

Ken Sherrill

--

Jennifer L. Hochschild  
Harvard University  
Henry LeBarre Jayne Professor of Government

Member, Dept. of African and African American Studies

phone: 617-496-0181

fax: 617-495-0438

hochschild@latte.harvard.edu

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

=====  
Date: Mon, 1 Dec 2003 13:20:38 -0600

Reply-To: [Mary.Losch@uni.edu](mailto:Mary.Losch@uni.edu)

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

From: Mary Losch <[mary.losch@UNI.EDU](mailto:mary.losch@UNI.EDU)>

Subject: Re: Different conference submission problem

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Aapornet,

I have not attempted to add a co-author since original submission (was able to do so at that time) but am trying to get info on confirmations. The conference call for papers on the AAPOR website (.pdf file) indicates that if an email confirmation is not received within 24 hours of submission, then the paper/poster should be resubmitted. I never received an email confirmation after submitting about 10 days ago. However, the web submission form clearly indicates that information should not be entered more than once.

I sent an email a week ago (one to Mike Flanagan and another to Monica Frihart) asking for clarification and have heard nothing back. Any information would be greatly appreciated since today is the submission deadline. Thanks. Mary Losch

~~~~~  
Mary E. Losch, Ph.D.

Assistant Director/Associate Professor

Center for Social and Behavioral Research

Department of Psychology

University of Northern Iowa

221 Sabin Hall

Cedar Falls, IA 50614

[mary.losch@uni.edu](mailto:mary.losch@uni.edu)

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

Date: Tue, 2 Dec 2003 14:31:44 -0500  
Reply-To: "Ronald E. Langley" <[langley@UKY.EDU](mailto:langley@UKY.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Ronald E. Langley" <[langley@UKY.EDU](mailto:langley@UKY.EDU)>  
Subject: Listed Business samples with e-commerce info  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Greetings!

A colleague is putting together a grant proposal to look at various aspects of businesses that significantly use e-commerce (either B2B or B2C). We are trying to find a national data base we can access/purchase that would have information on the degree a business uses e-commerce. My colleague said he heard a company out of San Francisco called 'Namefinders' may provide this information.

- 1) Has anyone had experience with Namefinders?
- 2) Does anyone have any other ideas about where we can get a sample that would include this information?

Please reply directly to me.

Thanks in advance!

Ron Langley

Ronald E. Langley, Ph.D.                      Phone: (859) 257-4684  
Director, Survey Research Center              FAX: (859) 323-1972  
University of Kentucky                      [langley@uky.edu](mailto:langley@uky.edu)  
Chairman, National Network of State Polls  
302 Breckinridge Hall  
Lexington, KY 40506-0056                      <http://survey.rgs.uky.edu>

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

Date: Tue, 2 Dec 2003 15:16:17 -0500  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Crosstab packages  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

We are in the market for a software product that will allow to do relatively complicated crosstabbing (preferably from SPSS files).

I went and searched the AAPOR archives for a previous discussion on this and found one from 1997 that mentioned (among others):

MicroTab

WinCross

SPSS Tables (which I was not terribly impressed with when I used it back in the mid-1990s)

These appear to be available still and as I start to evaluate them I am wondering if I am missing any new entrants into the field?

--

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

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 2 Dec 2003 12:29:47 -0800  
Reply-To: Jerold Pearson <[jpearson@STANFORD.EDU](mailto:jpearson@STANFORD.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jerold Pearson <[jpearson@STANFORD.EDU](mailto:jpearson@STANFORD.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Crosstab packages  
Comments: To: [por@vance.irss.unc.edu](mailto:por@vance.irss.unc.edu), [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[004301c3b911\\$2472c5f0\\$0c0a010a@LEO](mailto:004301c3b911$2472c5f0$0c0a010a@LEO)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

>We are in the market for a software product that will allow to do relatively  
>complicated crosstabbing (preferably from SPSS files).

I've been VERY happy with StatPac. I've used it for years. It's easy to use, powerful, does tabs as well as all the more sophisticated analyses, and produces beautiful easy to read tabs that you can customize to get the appearance you want. The customer support is also terrific: It's handled by the head of the company, who wrote the software. (Can't beat that.) His site is at [www.statpac.com](http://www.statpac.com)

Good luck. And mention my name. You never know when brownie points will come in handy.

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](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet  
=====

Date: Tue, 2 Dec 2003 16:11:53 -0500  
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "James P. Murphy" <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Crosstab packages  
Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

A package available from Jan Werner DP was very favorably reviewed by a knowledgeable associate of mine who uses it.

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

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

From: Leo G. Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu) <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
Date: Tuesday, December 02, 2003 3:31 PM  
Subject: Crosstab packages

We are in the market for a software product that will allow to do relatively complicated crosstabbing (preferably from SPSS files).

I went and searched the AAPOR archives for a previous discussion on this and found one from 1997 that mentioned (among others):

MicroTab

WinCross

SPSS Tables (which I was not terribly impressed with when I used it back in the mid-1990s)

These appear to be available still and as I start to evaluate them I am wondering if I am missing any new entrants into the field?

--

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

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

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 2 Dec 2003 17:05:26 -0500  
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "James P. Murphy" <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Subject: Recent Medicare Changes  
Comments: To: [AAPORnet@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORnet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

On behalf of a non-profit serving 1+ million retirement-age members, I =  
am looking for public opinion data on the recently legislated changes in =  
Medicare and its new Rx drug benefit with emphasis on support =  
for/opposition to the law and confidence in delivery of future benefits. =  
Any references would be appreciated.

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

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 2 Dec 2003 19:45:43 -0500  
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <[cporter@HP.UFL.EDU](mailto:cporter@HP.UFL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Colleen Porter <[cporter@HP.UFL.EDU](mailto:cporter@HP.UFL.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Recent Medicare Changes  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu), [jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit



Content-disposition: inline

As it happens, AAPOR member Robert Blendon of Harvard was on National Public Radio over the weekend discussing this issue. When I got into the office on Monday, the first thing I did was pull the transcript and make copies for colleagues, because it was a very insightful interview.

One of the comments that interested me was this: "A poll by the Annenberg, the University of Pennsylvania group, right before the vote showed something quite unusual, that most people under age 65 were divided on this, but most people over age 65 actually were against the enactment of the bill. They had gotten sufficiently nervous about what they heard that they actually were opposed to it. So this is a legislation which in principle--all polls have showed people's support help seniors get a drug benefit, but when they heard about this legislation, a lot of retirees really are very worried about how this would affect their current health care."

So I'd definitely check with him, since he seems to current on this issue.

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. 4148  
US Mail: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

>>> "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM> 12/2/2003 5:05:26 PM >>>

On behalf of a non-profit serving 1+ million retirement-age members, I am looking for public opinion data on the recently legislated changes in Medicare and its new Rx drug benefit with emphasis on support for/opposition to the law and confidence in delivery of future benefits. Any references would be appreciated.

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

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

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

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

---

Date: Tue, 2 Dec 2003 22:51:12 -0500  
Reply-To: Josh Klein <[jklein@IGC.ORG](mailto:jklein@IGC.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Josh Klein <[jklein@IGC.ORG](mailto:jklein@IGC.ORG)>  
Subject: Updated Resume  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="Windows-1252"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Hi, I am completing a three-month consulting assignment as a Senior Group Manager, Custom Research at Conde Nast Publications. They love my work and are keeping me on for a fourth month, until mid-December. I have been working with fashion, lifestyle, and technology books including GQ, Allure, Conde Nast Traveler, Wired, and Vogue.

As you may know I have conducted and managed research for TV, film, and print. I am a market research manager with expertise in quantitative and qualitative research. I have conducted survey research in other areas including for unions and training and community organizations. I have successfully planned, conducted and reported on tracking, media, ad-testing, image and customer satisfaction surveys.

I apply strong analysis and a broad sociological perspective, connecting actionable market intelligence to client needs. I find that a broad view is particularly helpful in the current environment of consumer and audience concern and economic uncertainty.

I have attached my resume, and I will try to follow up with a phone call to pick your brain as I develop my job search. Thank you.

Josh Klein  
Home:  
(914) 576 5285

Work:  
(212) 790 1948  
[josh\\_klein@condenast.com](mailto:josh_klein@condenast.com)

---

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

---

Date: Wed, 3 Dec 2003 07:05:42 -0500  
Reply-To: Linda Young <[young@PIRE.ORG](mailto:young@PIRE.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Linda Young <[young@PIRE.ORG](mailto:young@PIRE.ORG)>  
Subject: surveys of teachers  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

Greetings colleagues,

One of our research scientists needs to conduct a rather lengthy national survey of teachers and school administrators. In the past, they mailed the survey to the sample but for the current project, they are considering using a web based survey (with P & P follow up questionnaires for non-responders or those indicating a mail survey preference). Does anyone have any experience using web based surveys with teachers? It seems many teachers have Internet access from their schools now but some members of the team suspect that teachers would still prefer a hard copy of the questionnaire. We would very much appreciate any insight on this topic. Please respond directly to me. Thanks very much.

Linda Young  
Center Director  
Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation  
(502) 634-3694, ext. 11  
FAX: (502) 634-5690  
Email: Young@PIRE.org

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

=====

Date: Wed, 3 Dec 2003 12:22:43 -0500  
Reply-To: DivaleBill@AOL.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: William Divale <DivaleBill@AOL.COM>  
Subject: Re: surveys of teachers  
Comments: To: young@PIRE.ORG, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Linda

I have used web survey with faculty and students at my college. I was able to get response rates of about 45% but with several pesterings. One thing, it is certainly easier to remind people to take the questionnaire via email over mailings or the phone. I suggest trying what you planned - web first, then mail and phone for the non-replies.  
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>  
Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Wed, 3 Dec 2003 12:41:14 -0500  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after Thanksgiving  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I found this from the Annenberg Public Policy Center of the University of Pennsylvania quite interesting.

Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after Thanksgiving  
[http://www.appcpenn.org/naes/2003\\_03\\_Bush-surge-after-thanksgiving\\_pr.pdf](http://www.appcpenn.org/naes/2003_03_Bush-surge-after-thanksgiving_pr.pdf)

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

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 3 Dec 2003 12:13:08 -0600  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject: Position Available  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Comments: cc: [Dgabriel@harrisinteractive.com](mailto:Dgabriel@harrisinteractive.com)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

=20  
Please respond directly to: Danielle Gabriel at =  
[Dgabriel@harrisinteractive.com](mailto:Dgabriel@harrisinteractive.com) =20

=20  
=20

Job Title: Research Manager<?xml:namespace prefix =3D o =  
ns =3D "urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />

Location: New York City =20

Department: Health Care Research

Primary Group: =20

Secondary Group: =20

Post Date: December 1, 2003

=20

Overview:

=20

Design, manage, analyze data and report findings from a broad range of =  
custom research projects involving quantitative research methods. Will =  
develop trade-off (choice models) studies, concept testing, tracking, =  
pricing, attitudes and usage and other quantitative custom studies. =  
Will serve as liaison between clients and internal research and support =  
staff.

=20

Responsibilities:

=20

=B7 Manage complex projects from concept through final =  
presentation.

=B7 Analyze data and present findings to clients.

=B7 Advise clients on the appropriateness of survey design and =  
use of survey data.

=B7 Provides "value add" consultative advice to clients.

=B7 Act as main liaison between client and internal research and =  
support staff.

=B7 Design and field questionnaires.

- =B7 Develop proposals (response to RFP's).
- =B7 Create budget and project schedules; manage resources to meet = commitments to clients.
- =B7 Trouble shoot and quality check initial and final survey = data.
- =B7 Write reports of findings, including conclusions and = recommendations.
- =B7 Understand and communicate the business implications of = research findings.
- =B7 Utilize various data analysis programs.
- =B7 Work with survey/questionnaire programmers and samplers to = ensure the quality and quantity of survey data is accurate.
- =B7 Potentially manage 1-2 direct reports.
- =B7 Train new employees.

Requirements:

- =20
- =B7 MA, MS, PhD (preferred) or related advanced degree in market = research, social sciences, economics, statistics or business.
- =B7 3-5 years of Research experience.
- =B7 Proven ability to manage several projects simultaneously.
- =B7 Previous project management experience preferred.
- =B7 Strong quantitative abilities.
- =B7 Statistical background, including applications experience, = decision modeling and multivariate analysis.
- =B7 Customized Research experience preferred.
- =B7 Supplier-side experience desired.
- =B7 Excellent communication skills.
- =B7 Working knowledge of statistical software (SPSS/SAS) highly = desired.=20
- =B7 Solid client management and project management skills.

=B7 PC/Windows skills required.

=20

=20

=20

Additional Information:

=20

We prefer to receive your resume in an electronic format. Please =  
indicate your name and the Research Manager title in the subject line.

=20

We regret that we can only contact those candidates that we are =  
considering inviting for an interview.

=20

To Apply:

=20

Please send resume, cover letter and salary requirements to:

=20

Danielle Gabriel

Sr. Human Resources Manager

E-mail: <mailto:Dgabriel@harrisinteractive.com> =  
Dgabriel@harrisinteractive.com

=20

An Equal Opportunity Employer M/F/D/V

=20

=20

=20

=20

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

Date: Wed, 3 Dec 2003 13:08:26 -0500  
Reply-To: Phillip Downs <[pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM](mailto:pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Phillip Downs <[pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM](mailto:pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM)>  
Subject: XTABs  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

After using SPSS for 30 years, I switched to Survey Systems this past year. While we still use both, we've found the transition to be smooth and we like the banners Survey Systems generates. We've also been able to integrate our CATI and web-based interviewing through Survey Systems.

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

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

Date: Wed, 3 Dec 2003 13:38:38 -0500  
Reply-To: "Scott, Leslie" <[Lscott@AIR.ORG](mailto:Lscott@AIR.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Scott, Leslie" <[Lscott@AIR.ORG](mailto:Lscott@AIR.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: Crosstab packages  
Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Comments: cc: "Cohen, Jon" <[JCohen@air.org](mailto:JCohen@air.org)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Another (new) package is AM software recently developed by AIR. It is available free on the AIR web site. Below is a summary description of the package. =20

<http://am.air.org>

AM is a statistical software package for analyzing data from complex =



samples, especially largescale assessments such as the National =  
Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and the Third International =  
Mathematics and Science Studies (TIMSS).

From its origin as a specialized tool for analyzing large-scale =  
assessment data, AM has evolved into a more generalized and growing tool =  
for analyzing data from complex samples in general. Originally, AM was =  
developed to estimate regression models through marginal maximum =  
likelihood (MML). Because large-scale assessments are often low-stakes =  
assessments for students, students are usually asked to respond to only =  
a few items; each student sees only part of the whole test. Otherwise, =  
they would be unlikely to expend real effort on any items. As a result, =  
individual test scores are subject to substantial measurement error, =  
which would bias many statistical estimates. Rather than assign each =  
student an error-filled score, MML procedures represent each student's =  
proficiency as a probability distribution over all possible scores. MML =  
procedures use these probability distributions in the estimation =  
process.=20

Another characteristic of large-scale assessments has led to a wider =  
applicability of AM-they almost always draw a sample from a complex =  
design. AM automatically provides appropriate standard errors for =  
complex samples using a Taylor-series approximation. This happens =  
automatically even when new procedures are added to the software. Over =  
time, the software has grown to offer a set of non-MML statistics, =  
including regression, probit, logit, cross-tabs, and other statistics =  
that are useful for survey data in general.=20

The American Institutes for Research is committed to keeping AM =  
available as a free and growing tool for the research community. Visit =  
this web site for further information, updates, and technical support.

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

From: Leo G. Simonetta [mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM]  
Sent: Tuesday, December 02, 2003 3:16 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Crosstab packages

We are in the market for a software product that will allow to do =  
relatively  
complicated crosstabbing (preferably from SPSS files).

I went and searched the AAPOR archives for a previous discussion on this =  
and  
found one from 1997 that mentioned (among others):

MicroTab

WinCross

SPSS Tables (which I was not terribly impressed with when I used it back =  
in  
the mid-1990s)

These appear to be available still and as I start to evaluate them I am wondering if I am missing any new entrants into the field?

--

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

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

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 3 Dec 2003 15:33:39 -0500  
Reply-To: [elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Betsy Martin <[elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV)>  
Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after  
Thanksgiving  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

These results are very interesting.

I do wonder, though, whether the results of the two polls are fully comparable--esp. whether their response rates are similar. I would think that a poll conducted immediately after Thanksgiving (11/28-12/1) might have higher nonresponse (due to noncontact) than one conducted immediately before (11/23-26), and that this might influence the comparison. The press release and web site do not address the comparability of the samples, nor do they report response rates. More information is needed to interpret the meaning of these results.

Betsy Martin

Shapard Wolf  
<[shap.wolf@asu.ed](mailto:shap.wolf@asu.ed)> To:  
[elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov](mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov)  
u> cc:  
Subject: FW: Bush Popularity  
Surges on Several Levels after Thanksgiving

12/03/2003 12:33  
PM

----- Message from "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM> on Wed, 3 Dec 2003 10:41:14 -0700 -----

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Subject: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after  
Thanksgiving

I found this from the Annenberg Public Policy Center of the University of Pennsylvania quite interesting.

Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after Thanksgiving  
[http://www.appcpenn.org/naes/2003\\_03\\_Bush-surge-after-thanksgiving\\_pr.pdf](http://www.appcpenn.org/naes/2003_03_Bush-surge-after-thanksgiving_pr.pdf)

--

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

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

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

---

Date: Wed, 3 Dec 2003 14:59:54 -0600  
Reply-To: Lydia\_Saad@GALLUP.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Lydia Saad <Lydia\_Saad@GALLUP.COM>  
Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after  
Thanksgivi  
ng

Comments: To: [elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

I would be more inclined to quibble with the characterization of a 5-point

increase in approval and a 7-point jump in favorability as a "surge." But I think it is more reasonable to believe that Bush's ratings did bump up due to events surrounding the Thanksgiving holiday than to think this was the artifact of variation in response rates between the two polls -- which would require a tremendous gap in the politics of respondents vs. non-contacts, something the research on that subject has not demonstrated heretofore.

Lydia Saad

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

From: Betsy Martin [mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV]

Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 2003 3:34 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after Thanksgiving

These results are very interesting.

I do wonder, though, whether the results of the two polls are fully comparable--esp. whether their response rates are similar. I would think that a poll conducted immediately after Thanksgiving (11/28-12/1) might have higher nonresponse (due to noncontact) than one conducted immediately before (11/23-26), and that this might influence the comparison. The press release and web site do not address the comparability of the samples, nor do they report response rates. More information is needed to interpret the meaning of these results.

Betsy Martin

Shapard Wolf

<shap.wolf@asu.ed To:

elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov

u> cc:

Subject: FW: Bush Popularity

Surges on Several Levels after Thanksgiving

12/03/2003 12:33

PM

----- Message from "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM> on Wed, 3 Dec 2003 10:41:14 -0700 -----

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Subject: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after

## Thanksgiving

I found this from the Annenberg Public Policy Center of the University of Pennsylvania quite interesting.

Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after Thanksgiving  
[http://www.appcpenn.org/naes/2003\\_03\\_Bush-surge-after-thanksgiving\\_pr.pdf](http://www.appcpenn.org/naes/2003_03_Bush-surge-after-thanksgiving_pr.pdf)

--

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

---

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

---

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

---

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

---

---

Date: Wed, 3 Dec 2003 16:26:24 -0500  
Reply-To: Howard Schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Howard Schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after Thanksgiving

Comments: To: aapor <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[OFEBD9C841.6237528B-ON85256DF1.0070D77E-85256DF1.0070F1C7@tco.census.gov](mailto:OFEBD9C841.6237528B-ON85256DF1.0070D77E-85256DF1.0070F1C7@tco.census.gov)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

It doesn't seem like a large increase, given the recent upbeat economic reports, the Medicare bill, and Bush's Thanksgiving trip, and can just as easily go back down the same amount or a little more when there is bad news or simply a lapse of time or a strong opponent. These kinds of changes at this point do not tell us much. H.S..

Betsy Martin wrote:

>These results are very interesting.

>

>I do wonder, though, whether the results of the two polls are fully  
>comparable--esp. whether their response rates are similar. I would think  
>that a poll conducted immediately after Thanksgiving (11/28-12/1) might  
>have higher nonresponse (due to noncontact) than one conducted immediately  
>before (11/23-26), and that this might influence the comparison. The press  
>release and web site do not address the comparability of the samples, nor  
>do they report response rates. More information is needed to interpret the  
>meaning of these results.

>

>Betsy Martin

>

>

>

>

>

Shapard Wolf

> <shap.wolf@asu.ed To:

elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov

> u> cc:

> Subject: FW: Bush Popularity

Surges on Several Levels after Thanksgiving

> 12/03/2003 12:33

> PM

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>----- Message from "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM> on Wed, 3 Dec

>2003 10:41:14 -0700 -----

>

> To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

>

> Subject: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after

> Thanksgiving

>

>

>I found this from the Annenberg Public Policy Center of the University of

>Pennsylvania quite interesting.

>

>Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after Thanksgiving

>[http://www.appcpenn.org/naes/2003\\_03\\_Bush-surge-after-thanksgiving\\_pr.pdf](http://www.appcpenn.org/naes/2003_03_Bush-surge-after-thanksgiving_pr.pdf)

>

>

>--

>Leo G. Simonetta

>Art & Science Group, LLC

>6115 Falls Road Suite 101

>Baltimore, MD 21209

>410-377-7880 ext. 14

>410-377-7955 fax

>

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

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

>  
>

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

---

Date: Wed, 3 Dec 2003 17:08:22 -0500  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after  
Thanksgiving  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[16D7ABF1B1E58D4CB432013854C338F902CC6168@exchng11.gallup.com](mailto:16D7ABF1B1E58D4CB432013854C338F902CC6168@exchng11.gallup.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Once again let me wave my hands without access to any data to back me up . .  
..

It's not quite the same thing, but back in 1995 we were in the field with a state-wide study in Georgia when the Murrow building in Oklahoma City was bombed. One of the questions we were asking was the generic presidential approval question and we found that the approval rating was significantly higher after the bombing than it was before the bombing.

I am sure that others with wider and more survey experience than I have had similar experiences.

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

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: AAPORNET [[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Lydia Saad  
> Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 2003 4:00 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after Thanksgivi  
> ng  
>  
> I would be more inclined to quibble with the characterization of a 5-point  
> increase in approval and a 7-point jump in favorability as a "surge." But  
> I  
> think it is more reasonable to believe that Bush's ratings did bump up due  
> to events surrounding the Thanksgiving holiday than to think this was the  
> artifact of variation in response rates between the two polls -- which  
> would  
> require a tremendous gap in the politics of respondents vs. non-contacts,  
> something the research on that subject has not demonstrated heretofore.

> Lydia Saad

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

> From: Betsy Martin [mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV]

> Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 2003 3:34 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after  
> Thanksgiving

> These results are very interesting.

> I do wonder, though, whether the results of the two polls are fully  
> comparable--esp. whether their response rates are similar. I would think  
> that a poll conducted immediately after Thanksgiving (11/28-12/1) might  
> have higher nonresponse (due to noncontact) than one conducted  
> immediately  
> before (11/23-26), and that this might influence the comparison. The  
> press  
> release and web site do not address the comparability of the samples, nor  
> do they report response rates. More information is needed to interpret  
> the  
> meaning of these results.

> Betsy Martin

> Shapard Wolf  
> <shap.wolf@asu.ed To:  
> elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov  
> u> cc:  
> Subject: FW: Bush

> Popularity  
> Surges on Several Levels after Thanksgiving  
> 12/03/2003 12:33  
> PM



>  
>  
>  
>  
> ----- Message from "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM> on Wed, 3 Dec  
> 2003 10:41:14 -0700 -----

>  
> To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

>  
> Subject: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after  
> Thanksgiving

>  
> I found this from the Annenberg Public Policy Center of the University of  
> Pennsylvania quite interesting.

>  
> Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after Thanksgiving  
> [http://www.appcpenn.org/naes/2003\\_03\\_Bush-surge-after-thanksgiving\\_pr.pdf](http://www.appcpenn.org/naes/2003_03_Bush-surge-after-thanksgiving_pr.pdf)

> --

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

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

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

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

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

---

Date: Wed, 3 Dec 2003 23:16:16 -0600  
Reply-To: Glenn Roberts <[ghroberts@WORLDNET.ATT.NET](mailto:ghroberts@WORLDNET.ATT.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Glenn Roberts <[ghroberts@WORLDNET.ATT.NET](mailto:ghroberts@WORLDNET.ATT.NET)>  
Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after  
Thanksgiving

Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I couldn't retrieve the Annenberg Public Policy study on Bush's surge in popularity, but based on the the numbers reported in the emails from Saad, Martin, Leo, etc., I'd say you are a tad negative when Bush numbers go up 5 to 7 points. Yet when they go down 3 or 4 points, you guys rush to put the negative spin on them in spades.

Give the Bushies a break!! After all, tis the season!!

Glenn

Glenn H. Roberts  
6519 Washington Ave., Des Moines, IA 50322  
515-276-7002 FAX: 515-276-0014  
Email: ghroberts@att.net

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 07:26:06 -0500  
Reply-To: Glenn Roberts <ghroberts@WORLDNET.ATT.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>  
Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after  
Thanksgivi  
ng

Comments: To: Glenn Roberts <ghroberts@WORLDNET.ATT.NET>,  
"AAPORNET@asu.edu" <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

I agree that there a general reluctance to accept seemingly positive Bush results that isn't there when negative Bush results are reported. However, I believe Dr. Schuman original posts finding the results 'interesting' opened the discussion on this sort of result REPORTING.

My interest has certainly been piqued because I have been reviewing the responses to the State of the State Survey [SOSS] conducted by Michigan State University almost continuously since 1994. At least as regards their evaluation of their financial situation, self-identified Democratic [42.6%] and Independent [9.8%] respondents are identical, and polar opposites to self-identified Republicans. I wonder if any other of you out there have come up with similar results.

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

From: Glenn Roberts  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Sent: 12/4/03 12:16 AM  
Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after Thanksgiving

I couldn't retrieve the Annenberg Public Policy study on Bush's surge in popularity, but based on the the numbers reported in the emails from Saad, Martin, Leo, etc., I'd say you are a tad negative when Bush numbers go up 5 to 7 points. Yet when they go down 3 or 4 points, you guys rush to put the negative spin on them in spades.

Give the Bushies a break!! After all, tis the season!!

Glenn

Glenn H. Roberts  
6519 Washington Ave., Des Moines, IA 50322  
515-276-7002 FAX: 515-276-0014  
Email: ghroberts@att.net

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

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 08:44:16 -0500  
Reply-To: Josh Klein <[jklein@IGC.ORG](mailto:jklein@IGC.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Josh Klein <[jklein@IGC.ORG](mailto:jklein@IGC.ORG)>  
Subject: Apologies for posting my job search  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=Windows-1252  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Though it may be one of my smarter mistakes, excuse me for sending my job search materials on AAPORNET. Hope to see a goodly percentage of you at dinner!

Josh Klein  
92 Brookdale Ave.  
New Rochelle, NY 10801  
914 576 5285

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 10:14:23 -0500  
Reply-To: [elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV)

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Betsy Martin <elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV>  
Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after  
Thanksgiving  
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Let's see--for raising a question about the comparability of response rates between two polls, one conducted before and one during the Thanksgiving holiday, I've been called a nitpicker (by a person from Annenberg), and now you imply that my query is a partisan comment intended "to put a negative spin" on positive results for Bush.

Since when is asking for methodological details about how polls are conducted either nitpicking or partisan? Is this the usual way AAPOR members respond to queries about how their polls were conducted? If this is how you respond to a query from your president, I pity the poor reporter or layperson trying to get information to help him/her understand and interpret your results.

I'm glad to hear from Lydia that the research shows that presidential popularity is not sensitive to fluctuations in response rates. I'd be very grateful for citations to the research she mentioned.

Betsy

Shapard Wolf  
<shap.wolf@asu.ed To:  
elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov  
u> cc:  
Subject: FW: Bush Popularity  
Surges on Several Levels after Thanksgiving  
12/04/2003 12:17  
AM

----- Message from "Glenn Roberts" <ghroberts@WORLDNET.ATT.NET> on Wed, 3  
Dec 2003 22:16:16 -0700 -----

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels  
after Thanksgiving

I couldn't retrieve the Annenberg Public Policy study on Bush's surge in popularity, but based on the the numbers reported in the emails from Saad, Martin, Leo, etc., I'd say you are a tad negative when Bush numbers go up 5 to 7 points. Yet when they go down 3 or 4 points, you guys rush to put the negative spin on them in spades.

Give the Bushies a break!! After all, tis the season!!

Glenn

Glenn H. Roberts  
6519 Washington Ave., Des Moines, IA 50322  
515-276-7002 FAX: 515-276-0014  
Email: ghroberts@att.net

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

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

Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 09:43:14 -0600  
Reply-To: [Lydia\\_Saad@GALLUP.COM](mailto:Lydia_Saad@GALLUP.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Lydia Saad <[Lydia\\_Saad@GALLUP.COM](mailto:Lydia_Saad@GALLUP.COM)>  
Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after

Thanksgivi  
ng

Comments: To: [elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

Betsy, et al:

Here is one excellent one from 1998, from the Pew Center.  
<http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?ReportID=94>

I have another one in mind that I will dig up if I can.

Lydia

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

From: Betsy Martin [<mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV>]  
Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 10:14 AM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after  
Thanksgiving

Let's see--for raising a question about the comparability of response rates between two polls, one conducted before and one during the Thanksgiving holiday, I've been called a nitpicker (by a person from Annenberg), and now you imply that my query is a partisan comment intended "to put a negative spin" on positive results for Bush.

Since when is asking for methodological details about how polls are conducted either nitpicking or partisan? Is this the usual way AAPOR members respond to queries about how their polls were conducted? If this is how you respond to a query from your president, I pity the poor reporter or layperson trying to get information to help him/her understand and interpret your results.

I'm glad to hear from Lydia that the research shows that presidential popularity is not sensitive to fluctuations in response rates. I'd be very grateful for citations to the research she mentioned.

Betsy

Shapard Wolf  
<shap.wolf@asu.ed To:  
elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov  
u> cc:  
Subject: FW: Bush Popularity  
Surges on Several Levels after Thanksgiving  
12/04/2003 12:17  
AM

----- Message from "Glenn Roberts" <ghroberts@WORLDNET.ATT.NET> on Wed, 3  
Dec 2003 22:16:16 -0700 -----

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels  
after Thanksgiving

I couldn't retrieve the Annenberg Public Policy study on Bush's surge in popularity, but based on the the numbers reported in the emails from Saad, Martin, Leo, etc., I'd say you are a tad negative when Bush numbers go up 5 to 7 points. Yet when they go down 3 or 4 points, you guys rush to put the negative spin on them in spades.

Give the Bushies a break!! After all, tis the season!!

Glenn

Glenn H. Roberts  
6519 Washington Ave., Des Moines, IA 50322  
515-276-7002 FAX: 515-276-0014  
Email: ghroberts@att.net

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

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

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 10:41:33 -0600  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after  
Thanksgiving  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <000001c3b9e9\$7a0b990\$0c0a010a@LEO>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The effect that Leo is describing below is probably a rally effect. Just one example of this is the spike in Bush job approval ratings evident last April after the Iraq invasion.

The Thanksgiving visit does not qualify as a rallying event - but it could be one source for the spike. Another could be the favorable economic reports that came out that week- although not favorable enough for everyone since jobs have not yet recovered.

The 5-point increase in job approval (and 5-point decline in disapproval) was, however, not significant at the conventional standard for samples of about 800. Neither were the 5-point increases in approval on handling the economy on handling the economy and the situation in Iraq. This is not to say that increases did not, in fact occur, or if they did that they will last.

We will have to wait and see. Here is the place to check.

<http://pollingreport.com/BushJob.htm>

Nick

Leo G. Simonetta wrote:

>Once again let me wave my hands without access to any data to back me up . .

> . .

>

>It's not quite the same thing, but back in 1995 we were in the field with a  
>state-wide study in Georgia when the Murrow building in Oklahoma City was  
>bombed. One of the questions we were asking was the generic presidential  
>approval question and we found that the approval rating was significantly  
>higher after the bombing than it was before the bombing.

>

>I am sure that others with wider and more survey experience than I have had  
>similar experiences.

>

>--

>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 Lydia Saad

>>Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 2003 4:00 PM

>>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>>Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after Thanksgivi

>>ng

>>

>>I would be more inclined to quibble with the characterization of a 5-point  
>>increase in approval and a 7-point jump in favorability as a "surge." But  
>>I

>>think it is more reasonable to believe that Bush's ratings did bump up due  
>>to events surrounding the Thanksgiving holiday than to think this was the  
>>artifact of variation in response rates between the two polls -- which  
>>would

>>require a tremendous gap in the politics of respondents vs. non-contacts,  
>>something the research on that subject has not demonstrated heretofore.

>>

>>Lydia Saad

>>

>>

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

>>From: Betsy Martin [mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV]

>>Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 2003 3:34 PM

>>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>>Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after

>>Thanksgiving



>>  
>>  
>>These results are very interesting.  
>>  
>>I do wonder, though, whether the results of the two polls are fully  
>>comparable--esp. whether their response rates are similar. I would think  
>>that a poll conducted immediately after Thanksgiving (11/28-12/1) might  
>>have higher nonresponse (due to noncontact) than one conducted  
>>immediately  
>>before (11/23-26), and that this might influence the comparison. The  
>>press  
>>release and web site do not address the comparability of the samples, nor  
>>do they report response rates. More information is needed to interpret  
>>the  
>>meaning of these results.

>>Betsy Martin

>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> Shapard Wolf  
>> <shap.wolf@asu.ed To:  
>>elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov  
>> u> cc:  
>> Subject: FW: Bush

>>Popularity  
>>Surges on Several Levels after Thanksgiving  
>> 12/03/2003 12:33  
>> PM

>>----- Message from "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM> on Wed, 3 Dec  
>>2003 10:41:14 -0700 -----

>> To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

>> Subject: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after  
>> Thanksgiving

>>I found this from the Annenberg Public Policy Center of the University of  
>>Pennsylvania quite interesting.

>>Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after Thanksgiving  
>>[http://www.appcpenn.org/naes/2003\\_03\\_Bush-surge-after-thanksgiving\\_pr.pdf](http://www.appcpenn.org/naes/2003_03_Bush-surge-after-thanksgiving_pr.pdf)

>>--  
>>Leo G. Simonetta

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

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

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

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

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

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 11:57:08 -0500  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after  
Thanksgiving  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <002701c3ba25\$f12e5e50\$a670490c@hppav>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I can, of course, speak only for myself. That being said when I said I found these findings interesting I was talking purely from a methodological stand point.

Was it the holiday itself that made these rating go up? (After all it is a warm and fuzzy patriotic sort of holiday.)  
The improving economic numbers?

The trip to Baghdad?  
Or some combination of these factors?  
Or was there something else? Like a difference in response rates?

My subsequent posting pointed out that I had seen a similar result for Bill Clinton (a president clearly on the other side of the ideological divide) when the Murrow building was bombed.

--  
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 Glenn Roberts  
> Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 12:16 AM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after  
> Thanksgiving  
>  
> I couldn't retrieve the Annenberg Public Policy study on Bush's surge in  
> popularity, but based on the the numbers reported in the emails from Saad,  
> Martin, Leo, etc., I'd say you are a tad negative when Bush numbers go up  
> 5  
> to 7 points. Yet when they go down 3 or 4 points, you guys rush to put  
> the  
> negative spin on them in spades.  
>  
> Give the Bushies a break!! After all, tis the season!!  
>  
> Glenn  
>  
> Glenn H. Roberts  
> 6519 Washington Ave., Des Moines, IA 50322  
> 515-276-7002 FAX: 515-276-0014  
> Email: ghroberts@att.net  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet

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

Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 12:44:24 -0600  
Reply-To: Frank\_Newport@GALLUP.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Frank Newport <Frank\_Newport@GALLUP.COM>  
Subject: Re: Recent Medicare Changes  
Comments: To: cporter@HP.UFL.EDU, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1

A follow-up to this discussion re the Annenberg National Election Study result on Medicare legislation.

I do not believe it's correct to characterize the single Annenberg question as a basic measure of public reaction to "the legislation", nor that it necessarily represents a reaction to what people have heard about the recently enacted law per se.

The Annenberg question is instead a measure of reaction to a complicated paragraph that presents various characterizations of such a law.

Here is the exact wording of the Annenberg question:

"Republicans in Congress have agreed on a Medicare bill intended to provide a prescription drug benefit for seniors and to enable private companies like HMO's to provide Medicare coverage. Supporters say the drug benefit is an important first step and private companies will reduce the cost of Medicare. Opponents say the drug benefit won't help many seniors very much and letting HMO's in will eventually destroy Medicare. What do you think? Should Congress pass this bill or not?"

This question, among other things, reminded respondents that this was a Republican bill, implied that it would benefit HMOs, and then presented two sentences which the authors of the question assumed summarized pro and con arguments for the bill. But it's not clear that these sentences summarize fairly and completely the very complicated legislation.

Perhaps most importantly, it is not clear to me that the word "HMO" will appear in the actual legislation as Bush will sign it into law, yet "HMO" is included twice in the Annenberg summary. "HMO" is one of the more negatively charged words in the English language at this point.

There's nothing wrong with this type of question in general. The results are valuable in the sense that they tell us how Americans will respond to arguments for and against the bill presented in this particular way. But in no way do the results stand as a basic referendum on "the legislation", as some of the comments (and an article in last Sunday's New York Times Week in Review) imply.

Frank Newport  
Editor in Chief  
The Gallup Poll  
Princeton, New Jersey

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

From: Colleen Porter [mailto:cporter@HP.UFL.EDU]  
Sent: Tuesday, December 02, 2003 7:46 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Recent Medicare Changes

As it happens, AAPOR member Robert Blendon of Harvard was on National Public Radio over the weekend discussing this issue. When I got into the office on Monday, the first thing I did was pull the transcript and make copies for colleagues, because it was a very insightful interview.

One of the comments that interested me was this: "A poll by the Annenberg, the University of Pennsylvania group, right before the vote showed something quite unusual, that most people under age 65 were divided on this, but most people over age 65 actually were against the enactment of the bill. They had gotten sufficiently nervous about what they heard that they actually were opposed to it. So this is a legislation which in principle--all polls have showed people's support help seniors get a drug benefit, but when they heard about this legislation, a lot of retirees really are very worried about how this would affect their current health care."

So I'd definitely check with him, since he seems to current on this issue.

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. 4148  
US Mail: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

>>> "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM> 12/2/2003 5:05:26 PM >>>

On behalf of a non-profit serving 1+ million retirement-age members, I am looking for public opinion data on the recently legislated changes in Medicare and its new Rx drug benefit with emphasis on support for/opposition to the law and confidence in delivery of future benefits. Any references would be appreciated.

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 13:59:57 -0500

Reply-To: "Langer, Gary E" <[Gary.E.Langer@ABC.COM](mailto:Gary.E.Langer@ABC.COM)>

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

From: "Langer, Gary E" <[Gary.E.Langer@ABC.COM](mailto:Gary.E.Langer@ABC.COM)>

Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after

Thanksgivi  
ng

Comments: To: [Lydia\\_Saad@GALLUP.COM](mailto:Lydia_Saad@GALLUP.COM), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

See Dan Merkle and Murray Edelman's chapter on nonresponse in exit polls, in "Survey Nonresponse," Groves et. al., 2001. It finds no relationship between response rates and exit poll accuracy. Relevant given the correlation between presidential approval and vote.  
<http://www.wileyurope.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-0471396273,descCd-tableOfContents.html>

Note also Howard Schuman in "Questions & Answers in Attitude Surveys," in long-ago 1981, describing two samples with different response rates but similar results: "Apparently the answers and associations we investigate are largely unrelated to factors affecting these response rate differences." (p332.)=20

For a summary of some of the studies finding no impact of response rate on data integrity, see my 5/03 Public Perspective piece at [http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/pubper/pdf/pp14\\_3c.pdf](http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/pubper/pdf/pp14_3c.pdf). I'd appreciate being directed to any studies that have found otherwise.

Lastly, the proceedings of the 2003 AAPOR conference in Nashville were pretty informative on this subject.

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

From: Lydia Saad [[mailto:Lydia\\_Saad@GALLUP.COM](mailto:Lydia_Saad@GALLUP.COM)]=20

Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 10:43 AM

To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after  
Thanksgivi ng

Betsy, et al:

Here is one excellent one from 1998, from the Pew Center.  
<http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?ReportID=3D94>

I have another one in mind that I will dig up if I can.

Lydia

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

From: Betsy Martin [mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV]  
Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2003 10:14 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after Thanksgiving

Let's see--for raising a question about the comparability of response rates between two polls, one conducted before and one during the Thanksgiving holiday, I've been called a nitpicker (by a person from Annenberg), and now you imply that my query is a partisan comment intended "to put a negative spin" on positive results for Bush.

Since when is asking for methodological details about how polls are conducted either nitpicking or partisan? Is this the usual way AAPOR members respond to queries about how their polls were conducted? If this is how you respond to a query from your president, I pity the poor reporter or layperson trying to get information to help him/her understand and interpret your results.

I'm glad to hear from Lydia that the research shows that presidential popularity is not sensitive to fluctuations in response rates. I'd be very grateful for citations to the research she mentioned.

Betsy

Shapard Wolf  
<shap.wolf@asu.ed To:  
elizabeth.ann.martin@census.gov  
u> cc:  
Subject: FW: Bush  
Popularity Surges on Several Levels after Thanksgiving  
12/04/2003 12:17  
AM

----- Message from "Glenn Roberts" <ghroberts@WORLDNET.ATT.NET> on Wed,  
3 Dec 2003 22:16:16 -0700 -----

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels  
after Thanksgiving

I couldn't retrieve the Annenberg Public Policy study on Bush's surge in popularity, but based on the the numbers reported in the emails from Saad, Martin, Leo, etc., I'd say you are a tad negative when Bush numbers go up 5 to 7 points. Yet when they go down 3 or 4 points, you guys rush to put the negative spin on them in spades.

Give the Bushies a break!! After all, tis the season!!

Glenn

Glenn H. Roberts  
6519 Washington Ave., Des Moines, IA 50322  
515-276-7002 FAX: 515-276-0014  
Email: ghroberts@att.net

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

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

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

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

Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 16:08:22 -0500  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: A tale of two surveys  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

How far back is Kerry?

Two surveys of likely NH voters -one has Kerry at 30% and the other at 13%!



At first I thought it might be the undecideds but that is not enough to account for these differences (Zogby - 19% undecideds and ARG 15% - from their website).

Dean grabs a commanding lead in New Hampshire polls

Washington-AP --

SNIP

In a Zogby poll of likely voters, the former Vermont governor pulls in 42 percent, 30 points ahead of Massachusetts Senator John Kerry. Nineteen percent of voters were undecided.

Another poll, released today by the American Research Group, shows Dean garnering 45 percent of the support. Kerry has 13 percent, and retired General Wesley Clark has eleven percent. The other candidates are in low single digits.

SNIP

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

--

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

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

Date: Thu, 4 Dec 2003 22:22:40 -0500  
Reply-To: Allen Barton <[allenbarton@mindspring.com](mailto:allenbarton@mindspring.com)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Allen Barton <[allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Subject: Re: A tale of two surveys  
Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Actually if you subtract Dean's 30 point lead over Kerry from his 42%, that poll gives Kerry 12% and the other one 13% - Pretty good correspondence.  
Allen Barton, Chapel Hill

-Original Message-----

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

Sent: Dec 4, 2003 4:08 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: A tale of two surveys

How far back is Kerry?

Two surveys of likely NH voters -one has Kerry at 30% and the other at 13%!

At first I thought it might be the undecideds but that is not enough to account for these differences (Zogby - 19% undecideds and ARG 15% - from their website).

Dean grabs a commanding lead in New Hampshire polls

Washington-AP --

SNIP

In a Zogby poll of likely voters, the former Vermont governor pulls in 42 percent, 30 points ahead of Massachusetts Senator John Kerry. Nineteen percent of voters were undecided.

Another poll, released today by the American Research Group, shows Dean garnering 45 percent of the support. Kerry has 13 percent, and retired General Wesley Clark has eleven percent. The other candidates are in low single digits.

SNIP

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

--

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

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

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

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

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

Date: Fri, 5 Dec 2003 03:58:01 -0600  
Reply-To: Glenn Roberts <ghroberts@WORLDNET.ATT.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Glenn Roberts <ghroberts@WORLDNET.ATT.NET>  
Subject: Re: FW: Bush Popularity Surges on Several Levels after  
Thanksgiving  
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: 7bit

Dec. 5, 2003

Betsy....

Sorry, to strike a nerve, but I don't recall any outcry for methodology inquiry on polls showing Bush numbers declining. As for negative spin on Bush, I've come to expect it from our contributors. This is my mild retort, not intended for you personally.

But don't think I need your pity for dealing with local and national reporters and both political parties, since I've dealt with them successfully during 40 years as Director of the Des Moines Register's Iowa Poll (ret).

I have read the full poll data from the Annenberg survey (which was not available to me earlier) and would conclude it's likely due to the "Thanksgiving bounce" from Iraq and the Prescription drug passage. but we'll have to wait for another poll.

Appreciate the response of others citing these reasons for the change (surge) in Bush numbers. These exchanges have been healthy and helpful in this discussion.

Let's hope we can all deal fairly with our President in these trying times.

As I said originally, 'tis the season!!!

Regards, Glenn

Glenn H. Roberts  
6519 Washington Ave., Des Moines, IA 50322  
515-276-7002 FAX: 515-276-0014  
Email: ghroberts@att.net

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 5 Dec 2003 10:17:59 -0500  
Reply-To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>

Subject: effects of response rate variation  
Comments: To: aapor <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Perhaps there is a way of reconciling Gary Langer's message about lack evidence for the impact of response rate variation on survey results and Betsy Martin's concern that non-response may be an important factor in apparent changes in differences from one survey to another. Most academic and commercial surveys are based on samples of a few thousand at most, often less, and look for differences that are substantively as well as statistically significant in terms of such goals. Betsy's career has been largely in a government setting where the samples are far larger and the precision demanded from surveys is far greater.

Today's news is of a "fall" in the unemployment rate from 6% to 5.9%, based presumably on a sample of around 50,000, with other steps also taken to increase precision. Most of us cannot imagine reporting a difference of .1 or .2 percent, no matter how "significant," though of course we would never expect such a difference to be reliable. But where a .1 (although usually I believe .2 percent) difference is to be treated as meaningful, it is hard to believe that a noticeable change in response rates would not be worth considering as important. But who among us would care to learn that Bush's (or Dean's) standing had risen or dropped by one or two tenths of one percent?

Most of are "saved" because we work with data that are so full of error and where only broad findings are of interest that the specific contribution from variations in response rates may simply be too minor to be perceptible. It's a little like that fact that our senses are nicely adapted to everyday objects and we are not bothered that we can't see either atoms or distant suns. h.s.

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 5 Dec 2003 10:50:47 -0500  
Reply-To: Sid Groeneman <sid.grc@VERIZON.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Sid Groeneman <sid.grc@VERIZON.NET>  
Subject: Re: effects of response rate variation  
Comments: To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <3FD0A1A7.2080606@umich.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Professor Schuman's "reconciliation" is nicely formulated. I would add another distinction: In presidential rating polls and other surveys which essentially measure opinions - as opposed to Census Bureau work, which tends to concentrate more on "factual" information - other factors

(besides non-response), especially question wording and related forms of measurement error, can have a much greater relative impact on the estimates. In my experience, this source of variation can often dominate non-response error. If correct, that is another reason why response rate differences are less important (usually) in helping understand variations in results in the kinds of "non-factual" research that many of us do.

Sid Groeneman

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

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Howard Schuman  
Sent: Friday, December 05, 2003 10:18 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: effects of response rate variation

Perhaps there is a way of reconciling Gary Langer's message about lack evidence for the impact of response rate variation on survey results and Betsy Martin's concern that non-response may be an important factor in apparent changes in differences from one survey to another. Most academic and commercial surveys are based on samples of a few thousand at most, often less, and look for differences that are substantively as well as statistically significant in terms of such goals. Betsy's career has been largely in a government setting where the samples are far larger and the precision demanded from surveys is far greater.

Today's news is of a "fall" in the unemployment rate from 6% to 5.9%, based presumably on a sample of around 50,000, with other steps also taken to increase precision. Most of us cannot imagine reporting a difference of .1 or .2 percent, no matter how "significant," though of course we would never expect such a difference to be reliable. But where a .1 (although usually I believe .2 percent) difference is to be treated as meaningful, it is hard to believe that a noticeable change in response rates would not be worth considering as important. But who among us would care to learn that Bush's (or Dean's) standing had risen or dropped by one or two tenths of one percent?

Most of are "saved" because we work with data that are so full of error and where only broad findings are of interest that the specific contribution from variations in response rates may simply be too minor to be perceptible. It's a little like that fact that our senses are nicely adapted to everyday objects and we are not bothered that we can't see either atoms or distant suns. h.s.

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

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

signoff aapornet

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

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

signoff aapornet

---

Date: Fri, 5 Dec 2003 13:45:35 -0500  
Reply-To: [MMokrzycki@AP.ORG](mailto:MMokrzycki@AP.ORG)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: [MMokrzycki@AP.ORG](mailto:MMokrzycki@AP.ORG)  
Subject: Job openings  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Comments: cc: [Sandy\\_Johnson@ap.org](mailto:Sandy_Johnson@ap.org)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

The Associated Press has openings for the positions below. Applicants please send cover letter and resume by Dec. 17 to Sandy Johnson, Washington chief of bureau, by email to [sjohnson@ap.org](mailto:sjohnson@ap.org) or snail mail to The Associated Press, 2021 K St. NW, Washington DC 20006.

#### DIRECTOR OF POLLING

Location: To be determined

Responsibilities: Directs AP involvement in state, national and international polling ventures. Manages AP relationships with survey research vendors, including oversight of exit polls. Supervises survey question development. Sets and maintains AP standards for reporting on polls. Oversees collection and analysis of poll data. Trains AP staff on poll writing and analysis.

Qualifications: Demonstrated excellence as a reporter, editor and/or supervisor. Strong creative skills. Should be able to effectively manage time, priorities and resources. Should have leadership skills to work smoothly with managers across the AP. Strong experience in survey research field. Must have thorough understanding of statistics and methodological issues, including sampling and questionnaire design. Experience planning, developing and managing premium AP services a plus.

#### MANAGER OF NEWS SURVEYS

Location: Washington, D.C.

Responsibilities: Works with the director of polling in commissioning AP survey research in states, nationally and internationally. Designs research projects and works with polling vendors. Analyzes developments in the field of survey methodology and helps AP implement new approaches to polling as warranted. Assists reporters with polling data and analysis.

Qualifications: At least five years experience in the survey research field, with demonstrated ability to develop innovative, independent polling. Experience with research project design and survey questionnaire development. Experience with Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) and statistical software packages such as SPSS or SAS. Advanced degree in survey research or related field is a plus.

## POLLING WRITER

Location: Washington, D.C.

Responsibilities: After orientation to the bureau and the city, joins the AP's reporting staff in the nation's capitol. Covers the public opinion beat in the United States and internationally to deepen AP reporting of politics, the economy and other issues. Works closely with AP's polling partner on developing and writing poll stories. Spots trends in polling and writes news stories on those trends. Provides public opinion data for context in other AP reporters' stories.

Qualifications: Must have broad experience in reporting, with demonstrated excellent journalism skills. Should be versatile, aggressive, productive and enterprising. Should have solid ability to accurately analyze complex and voluminous data under tight deadlines. Strong writing skills and careful attention to detail are musts. Knowledge of statistics and survey methodology is a plus.

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

Date: Fri, 5 Dec 2003 14:31:02 -0600  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject: information on rules/best practices regarding an on-line survey  
of high school students  
Comments: To: [AAPORNet@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNet@asu.edu)  
Comments: cc: [jdonner@accdpel.org](mailto:jdonner@accdpel.org)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Would anyone have information for this individual who is in the process =  
of joining AAPOR, but needs this information now? Please respond to him =  
direct. Thanks. =20

From: Joshua Donner [<mailto:jdonner@accdpel.org>]

My organization is supporting the public engagement component of a  
countywide planning process in our area of Pennsylvania, and would like =  
to  
implement an on-line survey of high school students to get the "youth =

input"  
that we missed in our public meetings. We have a mechanism for =  
delivering  
the survey in place (a network of student government representatives who  
will work in their schools to get students to visit the website and take =  
the  
survey), but are concerned about any legal issues (or industry ethics  
standards) that may apply. Although we do not intend on collecting =  
personal  
or much demographic information (just grade and school) and won't report =  
the  
data by school, we would still rather be safe than sorry. Any guidance =  
on  
this matter would be most appreciated. Please direct your comments to:  
jdonner@accdpel.org thanks!

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 5 Dec 2003 16:32:43 -0500  
Reply-To: [elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Betsy Martin <[elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV)>  
Subject: More on the possible effects of response rate differences  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Thanks to Howard Schuman for his gentle reminder that various of us are  
working in different parts of the survey world, which may influence our  
perspectives on this issue--and thanks to others who've offered thoughtful  
comments and useful citations.

But I'm not sure the differences Howard and Sid suggest exist between  
opinion vs. government/factual surveys hold up on close examination.  
Howard notes government surveys have greater requirements for precision  
than opinion surveys. That may often be true, but it's not always the  
case. The last election was characterized by a nearly infinitesimal  
difference in the fractions of voters preferring the two major presidential  
candidates. That situation--which may continue-- seems to demand a level  
of precision for pre-election forecasting surveys that rivals or exceeds  
the CPS.

And Sid suggests that, in contrast to factual surveys, question wording  
effects and other measurement problems are likely to dominate nonresponse  
bias as a source of error in opinion surveys. The same is often true in  
government surveys. For example, race reporting by Hispanics is highly  
vulnerable to context effects resulting from the order of the race and  
Hispanic origin questions in the census, and in the last census reporting  
of detailed Hispanic origin was affected by deletion of examples from the  
question.



I'm not sure I draw quite the same conclusions from existing research that Gary Langer and others do. I went back and reread the excellent and careful Pew experimental study, and the 2000 Keeter et al. POQ article based on it. Here is what I infer from it, and some questions I'm left with. I'm curious how others read this and other evidence.

1. The basic result is that two surveys--one conducted over 5 days, with a 36% response rate, and the other conducted over two months, with a 60.6% response rate--for the most part obtained similar results for the same questions; no difference exceeded 9 percentage points. Of 91 questions analyzed by Keeter et al., 14 or 15% showed significant differences at the .05 level.

Assuming that chance alone might result in 5% of the item distributions being significantly different at the .05 level, then the finding that 15% of the questions showed significant differences suggests to me that nonresponse (or other) differences between the surveys did affect some results.

2. The types of items affected were rather diverse, and did not suggest (to me, anyway) a single, simple explanation of the sources of differences. Items measuring hostility toward minorities appeared to show more hostility in the rigorous (61% response rate) than in the standard (36% response rate) survey. (This turned out to be due in part to more interviews being conducted by white males in the rigorous survey.)

3. There were some marked differences in the characteristics of households interviewed in the two surveys, including the fraction with listed telephone numbers, the fraction of single person households, the number of adults per household, the fraction owning their homes, etc. As the authors note, these characteristics are correlated with attitudes; they adjusted for their effects with special weighting controls for number of phone lines and number of adults. The implication is that special weights may well be required to obtain comparable results from telephone surveys with different response rates. Surveys which do not employ similar special weights should not rely on this study to argue that the effects of response rate differences are negligible.

4. I would not infer from this study that measurements of presidential popularity are unaffected by differences in response rates. There were slight (nonsignificant) differences between the two surveys of about 3 percentage points in Clinton's approval rating, in the fraction who'd voted for Clinton 1996, and in the fraction of Independents.

As Lydia points out, any significant effects of nonresponse differences would require a tremendous gap in the attitudes of respondents and non-respondents. That means that any effects are likely to be fairly small--but still potentially important as sources of bias. The Pew study found that about 36% of the items showed (nonsignificant) differences of 3 or 4 percentage points. One question I am left with is, are these just differences due to sampling error, or are they perhaps indicative of small but systematic nonresponse biases? If the latter, it may take larger samples to detect biases due to nonresponse.

5. As the authors point out, but many who cite this study do not, the results do not permit general inferences about the effects of response rate differences--for example, between surveys with response rates of 20% and 30%, or 80% and 90%. This study also raises questions about the mechanisms by which nonresponse differences may give rise to differences in substantive findings. I do not think it supports the conclusion some seem to draw from it, that lower response rates, or differences in response rates, have a negligible effect on measurements of opinions. It suggests to me there is alot we don't know, but need to, about the sources and possible effects of nonresponse bias.

Betsy

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

=====  
Date: Mon, 8 Dec 2003 04:52:37 -0500  
Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: More on the possible effects of response rate differences  
Comments: To: "elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV"  
<[elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

Ms. Martin,

Perhaps you should take a long look at Curtin et al. [ Public Opinion Quarterly Volume 64:413-428.] They analyzed 17 years worth of continuous telephone surveying, conducted a retrospective analysis to use actual data to simulate the changes that might have occurred had they not gone to the heroic extremes to maintain a 70% response rate, and concluded "We assess the impact of excluding respondents who required refusal conversion (which reduces the response rate five to ten percentage points), respondents who required more than five calls to complete the interview (reducing the response rate about twenty-five percentage points), and those who required more than two calls (a reduction of about fifty percentage points). WE FOUND NO EFFECT OF EXCLUDING ANY OF THESE RESPONDENT GROUPS ON CROSS-SECTIONAL ESTIMATES OF THE ICS USING MONTHLY SAMPLES OF HUNDREDS OF CASES."  
[Emphasis added].

I must confess a bias here: my training in statistics was emphatic in emphasizing that the null hypothesis, the notion that there is no difference between two randomly selected groups, is never disproven: we can state, with a measurable level of confidence, that we believe there is sufficient evidence that a true difference exists, and by convention we state that the .05 level is statistically significant. In survey research, the majority of practitioners accept the alternative hypothesis as a given: non-respondents are assumed to be different from respondents, and high response rates are therefore necessary to counteract 'nonresponse bias.'

This quasi-religious belief in the difference between non-respondents and respondents persists in the face not only of evidence such as that presented by Curtin et al -- in which actual respondents are retrospectively made into

non-respondents by eliminating those who gave in to refusal conversion or required more than 5 call attempts -- but the logical absurdity of denying the null hypothesis as a starting point.

But perhaps the problem is a basic lack of understanding. In your most recent response, you state:

" That means that any effects are likely to be fairly small--but still potentially important as sources of bias. The Pew study found that about 36% of the items showed (nonsignificant) differences of 3 or 4 percentage points. One question I am left with is, are these just differences due to sampling error, or are they perhaps indicative of small but systematic nonresponse biases? If the latter, it may take larger samples to detect biases due to nonresponse."

Here is the problem: you refer to nonsignificant differences and ask what they are 'due to'! If a difference is non-significant, it means that it isn't large enough to be considered a difference -- the null hypothesis has not been proven, and if the data were collected again, we might find the same difference in the opposite direction. In plain English, the true difference between the two groups is zero. You might think of it this way: two women are standing at the north end of a football field. 100 other women are standing at the south end. We take a survey and ask each of the 100 women at the south end which of the two women at the other end is taller. 51 say the woman standing on the left, 48 say the woman standing on the right, and one says "I can't tell". All we can say at this point is that we do not have the measuring capability to determine a difference in height, so we MUST accept the fact that they are not significantly different in height: the meaningful difference in their height is zero.

The fact that our measurement doesn't mean the two women are exactly the same height. The results could have been because the difference in height was one millimeter, or because the 100 women at the south end were all blind and judging height by sense of smell. The reason that we get results that are not significantly different are imponderable. Your question, " are these just differences due to sampling error, or are they perhaps indicative of small but systematic nonresponse biases? If the latter, it may take larger samples to detect biases due to nonresponse" is unanswerable.

Finally, in my humble opinion, we have issues to address that are far more important than non-response bias: we invest tremendous resources to insure purity in the sample, and then naively accept as fact whatever a respondent utters; we assume that all respondents are equally credible without testing that null hypothesis [i.e., do the opinions given by persons who have been subjected to refusal conversion differ from those given by more willing respondents?]; we do not explore interesting questions -- for example, what are the implications of the 'neutral' response to a survey question.

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.

Research Specialist

Michigan State University

Institute for Public Policy and Social Research

517-355-6672

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

From: Betsy Martin [mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV]

Sent: Friday, December 05, 2003 4:33 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: More on the possible effects of response rate differences

Thanks to Howard Schuman for his gentle reminder that various of us are working in different parts of the survey world, which may influence our perspectives on this issue--and thanks to others who've offered thoughtful comments and useful citations.

But I'm not sure the differences Howard and Sid suggest exist between opinion vs. government/factual surveys hold up on close examination. Howard notes government surveys have greater requirements for precision than opinion surveys. That may often be true, but it's not always the case. The last election was characterized by a nearly infinitesimal difference in the fractions of voters preferring the two major presidential candidates. That situation--which may continue-- seems to demand a level of precision for pre-election forecasting surveys that rivals or exceeds the CPS.

And Sid suggests that, in contrast to factual surveys, question wording effects and other measurement problems are likely to dominate nonresponse bias as a source of error in opinion surveys. The same is often true in government surveys. For example, race reporting by Hispanics is highly vulnerable to context effects resulting from the order of the race and Hispanic origin questions in the census, and in the last census reporting of detailed Hispanic origin was affected by deletion of examples from the question.

I'm not sure I draw quite the same conclusions from existing research that Gary Langer and others do. I went back and reread the excellent and careful Pew experimental study, and the 2000 Keeter et al. POQ article based on it. Here is what I infer from it, and some questions I'm left with. I'm curious how others read this and other evidence.

1. The basic result is that two surveys--one conducted over 5 days, with a 36% response rate, and the other conducted over two months, with a 60.6% response rate--for the most part obtained similar results for the same questions; no difference exceeded 9 percentage points. Of 91 questions analyzed by Keeter et al., 14 or 15% showed significant differences at the .05 level.

Assuming that chance alone might result in 5% of the item distributions being significantly different at the .05 level, then the finding that 15% of the questions showed significant differences suggests to me that nonresponse (or other) differences between the surveys did affect some results.

2. The types of items affected were rather diverse, and did not suggest (to me, anyway) a single, simple explanation of the sources of differences. Items measuring hostility toward minorities appeared to show more hostility in the rigorous (61% response rate) than in the standard (36% response rate) survey. (This turned out to be due in part to more interviews being conducted by white males in the rigorous survey.)

3. There were some marked differences in the characteristics of households interviewed in the two surveys, including the fraction with listed telephone numbers, the fraction of single person households, the number of

adults per household, the fraction owning their homes, etc. As the authors note, these characteristics are correlated with attitudes; they adjusted for their effects with special weighting controls for number of phone lines and number of adults. The implication is that special weights may well be required to obtain comparable results from telephone surveys with different response rates. Surveys which do not employ similar special weights should not rely on this study to argue that the effects of response rate differences are negligible.

4. I would not infer from this study that measurements of presidential popularity are unaffected by differences in response rates. There were slight (nonsignificant) differences between the two surveys of about 3 percentage points in Clinton's approval rating, in the fraction who'd voted for Clinton 1996, and in the fraction of Independents.

As Lydia points out, any significant effects of nonresponse differences would require a tremendous gap in the attitudes of respondents and non-respondents. That means that any effects are likely to be fairly small--but still potentially important as sources of bias. The Pew study found that about 36% of the items showed (nonsignificant) differences of 3 or 4 percentage points. One question I am left with is, are these just differences due to sampling error, or are they perhaps indicative of small but systematic nonresponse biases? If the latter, it may take larger samples to detect biases due to nonresponse.

5. As the authors point out, but many who cite this study do not, the results do not permit general inferences about the effects of response rate differences--for example, between surveys with response rates of 20% and 30%, or 80% and 90%. This study also raises questions about the mechanisms by which nonresponse differences may give rise to differences in substantive findings. I do not think it supports the conclusion some seem to draw from it, that lower response rates, or differences in response rates, have a negligible effect on measurements of opinions. It suggests to me there is a lot we don't know, but need to, about the sources and possible effects of nonresponse bias.

Betsy

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

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

-----  
Date: Mon, 8 Dec 2003 08:46:45 -0500  
Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: More on the possible effects of response rate differences  
Comments: To: "Michael P. Massagli" <[mikemassagli@comcast.net](mailto:mikemassagli@comcast.net)>,  
-----

AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

That's what weighting is about, an attempt to correct for the differences between sample and population characteristics. And, technically, there is no way to ever establish what responses non-responders might have given had they been contacted. Even the best attempts, like Curtin et al., can only take responses that were obtained with more difficulty and eliminate them. My point is still, simply, that we cannot logically begin with the assumption of any systematic difference between people who agree to be surveyed and those who don't, other than the fact that attempts to survey them were unsuccessful. Whether or not one chooses to answer a question always comes down to a decision on the part of the respondent: if a cop pulls me over and asks if I know how fast I was driving, it is my choice whether or not, or for that matter, how, I choose to respond, and my decision is based on momentary and idiosyncratic factors. Similarly, if I get a questionnaire in the mail, or am asked to fill out a survey on the Internet or one delivered to my home addressed to 'occupant', I choose whether or not I will respond. We can be certain only some people choose to respond and others do not; we can not be certain for the reasons for either decision.

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
Research Specialist  
Michigan State University  
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research  
517-355-6672

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

From: Michael P. Massagli [mailto:mikemassagli@comcast.net]  
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2003 8:39 AM  
To: Ehrlich, Nathaniel; AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: More on the possible effects of response rate differences

Rather than studying the difference between early and later responders (or retrospective non-responders) has anyone reviewed studies focused on the difference between the population and responders? For example, there are many studies of Medicare recipients, providing administrative data on all subjects. With less than 100% response rates in such studies, there would be an opportunity to determine whether the subset of respondents allowed an estimate of parameters (for attributes captured by the administrative system) that was not substantially different from the population value. Or do such studies only report on the contrast between the characteristics of responders and non-responders?

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

From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>  
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2003 4:52 AM  
Subject: Re: More on the possible effects of response rate differences

> Ms. Martin,

> Perhaps you should take a long look at Curtin et al. [ Public Opinion  
 > Quarterly Volume 64:413-428.] They analyzed 17 years worth of continuous  
 > telephone surveying, conducted a retrospective analysis to use actual data  
 > to simulate the changes that might have occurred had they not gone to the  
 > heroic extremes to maintain a 70% response rate, and concluded "We assess  
 > the impact of excluding respondents who required refusal conversion (which  
 > reduces the response rate five to ten percentage points), respondents who  
 > required more than five calls to complete the interview (reducing the  
 > response rate about twenty-five percentage points), and those who required  
 > more than two calls (a reduction of about fifty percentage points). WE  
 FOUND  
 > NO EFFECT OF EXCLUDING ANY OF THESE RESPONDENT GROUPS ON CROSS-SECTIONAL  
 > ESTIMATES OF THE ICS USING MONTHLY SAMPLES OF HUNDREDS OF CASES."  
 > [Emphasis added].  
 > I must confess a bias here: my training in statistics was emphatic in  
 > emphasizing that the null hypothesis, the notion that there is no  
 difference  
 > between two randomly selected groups, is never disproven: we can state,  
 with  
 > a measurable level of confidence, that we believe there is sufficient  
 > evidence that a true difference exists, and by convention we state that  
 the  
 > .05 level is statistically significant. In survey research, the majority  
 of  
 > practitioners accept the alternative hypothesis as a given:  
 non-respondents  
 > are assumed to be different from respondents, and high response rates are  
 > therefore necessary to counteract 'nonresponse bias.'  
 > This quasi-religious belief in the difference between non-respondents and  
 > respondents persists in the face not only of evidence such as that  
 presented  
 > by Curtin et al -- in which actual respondents are retrospectively made  
 into  
 > non-respondents by eliminating those who gave in to refusal conversion or  
 > required more than 5 call attempts -- but the logical absurdity of denying  
 > the null hypothesis as a starting point.  
 > But perhaps the problem is a basic lack of understanding. In your most  
 > recent response, you state:  
 > " That means that any effects are likely to be fairly small--but still  
 > potentially important as sources of bias. The Pew study found that about  
 > 36% of the items showed (nonsignificant) differences of 3 or 4 percentage  
 > points. One question I am left with is, are these just differences due to  
 > sampling error, or are they perhaps indicative of small but systematic  
 > nonresponse biases? If the latter, it may take larger samples to detect  
 > biases due to nonresponse."  
 > Here is the problem: you refer to nonsignificant differences and ask what  
 > they are 'due to'! If a difference is non-significant, it means that it  
 > isn't large enough to be considered a difference -- the null hypothesis  
 has  
 > not been proven, and if the data were collected again, we might find the  
 > same difference in the opposite direction. In plain English, the true  
 > difference between the two groups is zero. You might think of it this way:  
 > two women are standing at the north end of a football field. 100 other  
 women

> are standing at the south end. We take a survey and ask each of the 100  
> women at the south end which of the two women at the other end is taller.  
51  
> say the woman standing on the left, 48 say the woman standing on the  
right,  
> and one says "I can't tell". All we can say at this point is that we do  
not  
> have the measuring capability to determine a difference in height, so we  
> MUST accept the fact that they are not significantly different in height:  
> the meaningful difference in their height is zero.  
> The fact that our measurement doesn't mean the two women are exactly the  
> same height. The results could have been because the difference in height  
> was one millimeter, or because the 100 women at the south end were all  
blind  
> and judging height by sense of smell. The reason that we get results that  
> are not significantly different are imponderable. Your question, " are  
these  
> just differences due to sampling error, or are they perhaps indicative of  
> small but systematic nonresponse biases? If the latter, it may take  
larger  
> samples to detect biases due to nonresponse" is unanswerable.  
> Finally, in my humble opinion, we have issues to address that are far more  
> important than non-response bias: we invest tremendous resources to insure  
> purity in the sample, and then naively accept as fact whatever a  
respondent  
> utters; we assume that all respondents are equally credible without  
testing  
> that null hypothesis [i.e., do the opinions given by persons who have been  
> subjected to refusal conversion differ from those given by more willing  
> respondents?]; we do not explore interesting questions -- for example,  
what  
> are the implications of the 'neutral' response to a survey question.  
> Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
> Research Specialist  
> Michigan State University  
> Institute for Public Policy and Social Research  
> 517-355-6672

>  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Betsy Martin [mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV]  
> Sent: Friday, December 05, 2003 4:33 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: More on the possible effects of response rate differences

>  
> Thanks to Howard Schuman for his gentle reminder that various of us are  
> working in different parts of the survey world, which may influence our  
> perspectives on this issue--and thanks to others who've offered thoughtful  
> comments and useful citations.

>  
> But I'm not sure the differences Howard and Sid suggest exist between  
> opinion vs. government/factual surveys hold up on close examination.  
> Howard notes government surveys have greater requirements for precision  
> than opinion surveys. That may often be true, but it's not always the



> case. The last election was characterized by a nearly infinitesimal  
> difference in the fractions of voters preferring the two major  
presidential  
> candidates. That situation--which may continue-- seems to demand a level  
> of precision for pre-election forecasting surveys that rivals or exceeds  
> the CPS.  
>  
> And Sid suggests that, in contrast to factual surveys, question wording  
> effects and other measurement problems are likely to dominate nonresponse  
> bias as a source of error in opinion surveys. The same is often true in  
> government surveys. For example, race reporting by Hispanics is highly  
> vulnerable to context effects resulting from the order of the race and  
> Hispanic origin questions in the census, and in the last census reporting  
> of detailed Hispanic origin was affected by deletion of examples from the  
> question.  
>  
> I'm not sure I draw quite the same conclusions from existing research that  
> Gary Langer and others do. I went back and reread the excellent and  
> careful Pew experimental study, and the 2000 Keeter et al. POQ article  
> based on it. Here is what I infer from it, and some questions I'm left  
> with. I'm curious how others read this and other evidence.  
>  
> 1. The basic result is that two surveys--one conducted over 5 days, with  
a  
> 36% response rate, and the other conducted over two months, with a 60.6%  
> response rate--for the most part obtained similar results for the same  
> questions; no difference exceeded 9 percentage points. Of 91 questions  
> analyzed by Keeter et al., 14 or 15% showed significant differences at the  
> .05 level.  
>  
> Assuming that chance alone might result in 5% of the item distributions  
> being significantly different at the .05 level, then the finding that 15%  
> of the questions showed significant differences suggests to me that  
> nonresponse (or other) differences between the surveys did affect some  
> results.  
>  
> 2. The types of items affected were rather diverse, and did not suggest  
> (to me, anyway) a single, simple explanation of the sources of  
differences.  
> Items measuring hostility toward minorities appeared to show more  
hostility  
> in the rigorous (61% response rate) than in the standard (36% response  
> rate) survey. (This turned out to be due in part to more interviews being  
> conducted by white males in the rigorous survey.)  
>  
> 3. There were some marked differences in the characteristics of  
households  
> interviewed in the two surveys, including the fraction with listed  
> telephone numbers, the fraction of single person households, the number of  
> adults per household, the fraction owning their homes, etc. As the  
authors  
> note, these characteristics are correlated with attitudes; they adjusted  
> for their effects with special weighting controls for number of phone  
lines

> and number of adults. The implication is that special weights may well be  
> required to obtain comparable results from telephone surveys with  
different  
> response rates. Surveys which do not employ similar special weights  
should  
> not rely on this study to argue that the effects of response rate  
> differences are negligible.

>  
> 4. I would not infer from this study that measurements of presidential  
> popularity are unaffected by differences in response rates. There were  
> slight (nonsignificant) differences between the two surveys of about 3  
> percentage points in Clinton's approval rating, in the fraction who'd  
voted  
> for Clinton 1996, and in the fraction of Independents.

>  
> As Lydia points out, any significant effects of nonresponse differences  
> would require a tremendous gap in the attitudes of respondents and  
> non-respondents. That means that any effects are likely to be fairly  
> small--but still potentially important as sources of bias. The Pew study  
> found that about 36% of the items showed (nonsignificant) differences of 3  
> or 4 percentage points. One question I am left with is, are these just  
> differences due to sampling error, or are they perhaps indicative of small  
> but systematic nonresponse biases? If the latter, it may take larger  
> samples to detect biases due to nonresponse.

>  
> 5. As the authors point out, but many who cite this study do not, the  
> results do not permit general inferences about the effects of response  
rate  
> differences--for example, between surveys with response rates of 20% and  
> 30%, or 80% and 90%. This study also raises questions about the  
mechanisms  
> by which nonresponse differences may give rise to differences in  
> substantive findings. I do not think it supports the conclusion some seem  
> to draw from it, that lower response rates, or differences in response  
> rates, have a negligible effect on measurements of opinions. It suggests  
> to me there is alot we don't know, but need to, about the sources and  
> possible effects of nonresponse bias.

> Betsy

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

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

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

signoff aapornet

---

Date: Mon, 8 Dec 2003 13:37:34 -0500  
Reply-To: Donald Green <donald.green@YALE.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Donald Green <donald.green@YALE.EDU>  
Subject: time series on email/internet use?  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Can anyone point me to survey data tracking the percentage of Americans who report using the internet and/or email? I'd like to get the most recent numbers possible and compare them to benchmarks from a few years back.

Many thanks,  
Don

---

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

---

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

---

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

---

Date: Tue, 9 Dec 2003 10:15:57 -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: More on the possible effects of response rate differences  
Comments: To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>,  
AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Thanks to all - Betsy, Lydia, Howard, Nat and others - for your contributions to this discussion. I suspect we'll never all agree on this issue, but it's refreshing and valuable to hash it out.=20

Unlike Betsy's, my takeaway from the Pew study comes from its own

conclusion: "The standard and rigorous surveys produced strikingly similar results. Despite the differences in the way the surveys were administered, the findings of the two polls barely differed."=20

This echoes the numerous other studies cited in previous postings, as well as several presentations in Nashville last spring.

There are many fronts on which to fight the good fight for valid and reliable data. We are confronted daily by the results of street intercepts, blast faxes, call-ins, internet click-ins and e-mail scattershots, all masquerading as meaningful, representative data; by huge noncoverage in listed samples; and by manufactured results obtained by biased question wording and ordering, produced to promote a sponsor's product or a point of view. Some of us will continue to hammer on the issue of response rates; have at it, and please share your results. Others will find other fires to fight.

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

From: Ehrlich, Nathaniel [mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU]=20  
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2003 8:47 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: More on the possible effects of response rate differences

That's what weighting is about, an attempt to correct for the differences between sample and population characteristics. And, technically, there is no way to ever establish what responses non-responders might have given had they been contacted. Even the best attempts, like Curtin et al., can only take responses that were obtained with more difficulty and eliminate them. My point is still, simply, that we cannot logically begin with the assumption of any systematic difference between people who agree to be surveyed and those who don't, other than the fact that attempts to survey them were unsuccessful. Whether or not one chooses to answer a question always comes down to a decision on the part of the respondent: if a cop pulls me over and asks if I know how fast I was driving, it is my choice whether or not, or for that matter, how, I choose to respond, and my decision is based on momentary and idiosyncratic factors. Similarly, if I get a questionnaire in the mail, or am asked to fill out a survey on the Internet or one delivered to my home addressed to 'occupant', I choose whether or not I will respond. We can be certain only some people choose to respond and others do not; we can not be certain for the reasons for either decision.

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
Research Specialist  
Michigan State University  
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research  
517-355-6672

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

From: Michael P. Massagli [mailto:mikemassagli@comcast.net]

Sent: Monday, December 08, 2003 8:39 AM  
To: Ehrlich, Nathaniel; AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: More on the possible effects of response rate differences

Rather than studying the difference between early and later responders (or retrospective non-responders) has anyone reviewed studies focused on the difference between the population and responders? For example, there are many studies of Medicare recipients, providing administrative data on all subjects. With less than 100% response rates in such studies, there would be an opportunity to determine whether the subset of respondents allowed an estimate of parameters (for attributes captured by the administrative system) that was not substantially different from the population value. Or do such studies only report on the contrast between the characteristics of responders and non-responders?

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

From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>  
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
Sent: Monday, December 08, 2003 4:52 AM  
Subject: Re: More on the possible effects of response rate differences

> Ms. Martin,

> Perhaps you should take a long look at Curtin et al. [ Public Opinion

> Quarterly Volume 64:413-428.] They analyzed 17 years worth of=20  
> continuous telephone surveying, conducted a retrospective analysis to=20  
> use actual data to simulate the changes that might have occurred had=20  
> they not gone to the heroic extremes to maintain a 70% response rate,=20  
> and concluded "We assess the impact of excluding respondents who=20  
> required refusal conversion (which reduces the response rate five to=20  
> ten percentage points), respondents who required more than five calls=20  
> to complete the interview (reducing the response rate about=20  
> twenty-five percentage points), and those who required more than two=20  
> calls (a reduction of about fifty percentage points). WE

FOUND

> NO EFFECT OF EXCLUDING ANY OF THESE RESPONDENT GROUPS ON  
CROSS-SECTIONAL

> ESTIMATES OF THE ICS USING MONTHLY SAMPLES OF HUNDREDS OF CASES."

> [Emphasis added].

> I must confess a bias here: my training in statistics was emphatic in=20

> emphasizing that the null hypothesis, the notion that there is no  
difference

> between two randomly selected groups, is never disproven: we can=20

> state,

with

> a measurable level of confidence, that we believe there is sufficient=20

> evidence that a true difference exists, and by convention we state=20

> that

the

> .05 level is statistically significant. In survey research, the=20

> majority

of

> practitioners accept the alternative hypothesis as a given:

non-respondents

- > are assumed to be different from respondents, and high response rates=20
- > are therefore necessary to counteract 'nonresponse bias.' This=20
- > quasi-religious belief in the difference between non-respondents and=20
- > respondents persists in the face not only of evidence such as that presented

- > by Curtin et al -- in which actual respondents are retrospectively=20

- > made

- into

- > non-respondents by eliminating those who gave in to refusal conversion

- > or required more than 5 call attempts -- but the logical absurdity of=20

- > denying the null hypothesis as a starting point. But perhaps the=20

- > problem is a basic lack of understanding. In your most recent=20

- > response, you state: " That means that any effects are likely to be=20

- > fairly small--but still potentially important as sources of bias. The

- > Pew study found that about 36% of the items showed (nonsignificant)=20

- > differences of 3 or 4 percentage points. One question I am left with=20

- > is, are these just differences due to sampling error, or are they=20

- > perhaps indicative of small but systematic nonresponse biases? If the

- > latter, it may take larger samples to detect biases due to=20

- > nonresponse." Here is the problem: you refer to nonsignificant=20

- > differences and ask what they are 'due to!' If a difference is=20

- > non-significant, it means that it isn't large enough to be considered=20

- > a difference -- the null hypothesis

- has

- > not been proven, and if the data were collected again, we might find=20

- > the same difference in the opposite direction. In plain English, the=20

- > true difference between the two groups is zero. You might think of it=20

- > this way: two women are standing at the north end of a football field.

- > 100 other

- women

- > are standing at the south end. We take a survey and ask each of the=20

- > 100 women at the south end which of the two women at the other end is=20

- > taller.

- 51

- > say the woman standing on the left, 48 say the woman standing on the

- right,

- > and one says "I can't tell". All we can say at this point is that we=20

- > do

- not

- > have the measuring capability to determine a difference in height, so=20

- > we MUST accept the fact that they are not significantly different in=20

- > height: the meaningful difference in their height is zero. The fact=20

- > that our measurement doesn't mean the two women are exactly the same=20

- > height. The results could have been because the difference in height=20

- > was one millimeter, or because the 100 women at the south end were all

- blind

- > and judging height by sense of smell. The reason that we get results=20

- > that are not significantly different are imponderable. Your question,=20

- > " are

these

> just differences due to sampling error, or are they perhaps indicative

> of small but systematic nonresponse biases? If the latter, it may=20

> take

larger

> samples to detect biases due to nonresponse" is unanswerable. Finally,

> in my humble opinion, we have issues to address that are far more=20

> important than non-response bias: we invest tremendous resources to=20

> insure purity in the sample, and then naively accept as fact whatever=20

> a

respondent

> utters; we assume that all respondents are equally credible without

testing

> that null hypothesis [i.e., do the opinions given by persons who have=20

> been subjected to refusal conversion differ from those given by more=20

> willing respondents?]; we do not explore interesting questions -- for=20

> example,

what

> are the implications of the 'neutral' response to a survey question.=20

> Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D. Research Specialist

> Michigan State University

> Institute for Public Policy and Social Research

> 517-355-6672

>

>

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

> From: Betsy Martin [mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV]

> Sent: Friday, December 05, 2003 4:33 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: More on the possible effects of response rate differences

>

> Thanks to Howard Schuman for his gentle reminder that various of us=20

> are working in different parts of the survey world, which may=20

> influence our perspectives on this issue--and thanks to others who've=20

> offered thoughtful comments and useful citations.

>

> But I'm not sure the differences Howard and Sid suggest exist between=20

> opinion vs. government/factual surveys hold up on close examination.=20

> Howard notes government surveys have greater requirements for=20

> precision than opinion surveys. That may often be true, but it's not=20

> always the case. The last election was characterized by a nearly=20

> infinitesimal difference in the fractions of voters preferring the two

> major

presidential

> candidates. That situation--which may continue-- seems to demand a=20

> level of precision for pre-election forecasting surveys that rivals or

> exceeds the CPS.

>

> And Sid suggests that, in contrast to factual surveys, question=20

> wording effects and other measurement problems are likely to dominate=20

- > nonresponse bias as a source of error in opinion surveys. The same is often true in
- > government surveys. For example, race reporting by Hispanics is highly
- > vulnerable to context effects resulting from the order of the race and
  
- > Hispanic origin questions in the census, and in the last census=20
- > reporting of detailed Hispanic origin was affected by deletion of=20
- > examples from the question.
- >
- > I'm not sure I draw quite the same conclusions from existing research=20
- > that Gary Langer and others do. I went back and reread the excellent=20
- > and careful Pew experimental study, and the 2000 Keeter et al. POQ=20
- > article based on it. Here is what I infer from it, and some questions
  
- > I'm left with. I'm curious how others read this and other evidence.
- >
- > 1. The basic result is that two surveys--one conducted over 5 days,=20
- > with
- a
- > 36% response rate, and the other conducted over two months, with a=20
- > 60.6% response rate--for the most part obtained similar results for=20
- > the same questions; no difference exceeded 9 percentage points. Of 91
  
- > questions analyzed by Keeter et al., 14 or 15% showed significant=20
- > differences at the .05 level.
- >
- > Assuming that chance alone might result in 5% of the item=20
- > distributions being significantly different at the .05 level, then the
  
- > finding that 15% of the questions showed significant differences=20
- > suggests to me that nonresponse (or other) differences between the=20
- > surveys did affect some results.
- >
- > 2. The types of items affected were rather diverse, and did not=20
- > suggest (to me, anyway) a single, simple explanation of the sources of
- differences.
- > Items measuring hostility toward minorities appeared to show more
- hostility
- > in the rigorous (61% response rate) than in the standard (36% response
- > rate) survey. (This turned out to be due in part to more interviews=20
- > being conducted by white males in the rigorous survey.)
- >
- > 3. There were some marked differences in the characteristics of
- households
- > interviewed in the two surveys, including the fraction with listed=20
- > telephone numbers, the fraction of single person households, the=20
- > number of adults per household, the fraction owning their homes, etc.
  
- > As the
- authors
- > note, these characteristics are correlated with attitudes; they=20
- > adjusted for their effects with special weighting controls for number=20
- > of phone



lines

> and number of adults. The implication is that special weights may=20  
> well be required to obtain comparable results from telephone surveys=20  
> with  
> different

> response rates. Surveys which do not employ similar special weights  
should

> not rely on this study to argue that the effects of response rate=20  
> differences are negligible.

>  
> 4. I would not infer from this study that measurements of=20  
> presidential popularity are unaffected by differences in response=20  
> rates. There were slight (nonsignificant) differences between the two

> surveys of about 3 percentage points in Clinton's approval rating, in=20  
> the fraction who'd

voted  
> for Clinton 1996, and in the fraction of Independents.

>  
> As Lydia points out, any significant effects of nonresponse=20  
> differences would require a tremendous gap in the attitudes of=20  
> respondents and non-respondents. That means that any effects are=20  
> likely to be fairly small--but still potentially important as sources=20  
> of bias. The Pew study found that about 36% of the items showed=20  
> (nonsignificant) differences of 3 or 4 percentage points. One=20  
> question I am left with is, are these just differences due to sampling

> error, or are they perhaps indicative of small but systematic=20  
> nonresponse biases? If the latter, it may take larger samples to=20  
> detect biases due to nonresponse.

>  
> 5. As the authors point out, but many who cite this study do not, the

> results do not permit general inferences about the effects of response  
rate

> differences--for example, between surveys with response rates of 20%=20  
> and 30%, or 80% and 90%. This study also raises questions about the  
mechanisms

> by which nonresponse differences may give rise to differences in=20  
> substantive findings. I do not think it supports the conclusion some=20  
> seem to draw from it, that lower response rates, or differences in=20  
> response rates, have a negligible effect on measurements of opinions.

> It suggests to me there is alot we don't know, but need to, about the=20  
> sources and possible effects of nonresponse bias.

>  
> Betsy

>  
> -----

> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text: signoff=20  
> aapornet

>  
> -----

> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text: signoff=20  
> aapornet  
>

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

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

---

Date: Tue, 9 Dec 2003 12:28:20 -0500  
Reply-To: [elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Betsy Martin <[elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV)>  
Subject: Re: More on possible effects of response rate differences  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Thanks for your comment Gary--but I would like to point out that the conclusion you quote below is different from the published study, which reports slightly different results than are reported on the PEW website.

According to Keeter et al., 14 of 91 comparisons (15%) showed significant differences (see p. 129 and Table 2).

The PEW study on the website states that 5 of 85 comparisons (6%) showed significant differences.

I think the results and conclusions presented in the published article should be given more weight because they have been peer-reviewed.

Like you and others, I've found our interchange refreshing and useful to discuss. It's also convinced me that we need a comprehensive and critical review of the evidence on this subject!

Betsy

----- Message from "Langer, Gary E" <[Gary.E.Langer@ABC.COM](mailto:Gary.E.Langer@ABC.COM)> on Tue, 9 Dec 2003 08:15:57 -0700 -----

To: <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>

Subject: Re: More on the possible effects of response rate differences

....

Unlike Betsy's, my takeaway from the Pew study comes from its own conclusion: "The standard and rigorous surveys produced strikingly similar results. Despite the differences in the way the surveys were administered, the findings of the two polls barely differed."

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

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

---

Date: Tue, 9 Dec 2003 16:21:59 -0600  
Reply-To: "Copeland, Gary W" <[copeland@OU.EDU](mailto:copeland@OU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Copeland, Gary W" <[copeland@OU.EDU](mailto:copeland@OU.EDU)>  
Subject: Position Available for Public Opinion Lab Coordinator  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Comments: cc: "Russell, Greg" <[grussell@ou.edu](mailto:grussell@ou.edu)>, "Rowden, Geri" <[growden@ou.edu](mailto:growden@ou.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Hello All,

Please see the position announcement below. If you are interested follow the direction in the ad and/or email me directly for more information at [copeland@ou.edu](mailto:copeland@ou.edu).

Thank you,  
Gary Copeland  
Faculty Advisor, OU POLL

The University of Oklahoma

The Department of Political Science seeks to hire a full-time Coordinator for the University of Oklahoma's Public Opinion Learning Laboratory (OUPOLL). The POLL is an affiliate unit of the department, and the Coordinator reports to the Chair in Political Science. The Coordinator will be responsible for the daily administration of a survey lab, hiring and training employees, maintaining hardware and software, managing a budget, developing survey instruments, analyzing data and writing reports, as well as engaging in fund raising and client development. Depending on qualifications, and departmental needs, the Coordinator may teach an undergraduate course in survey research. The salary is negotiable. Candidates should have either an MA or PhD in Social Sciences, management/supervisory experience, and computer networking experience. Preference may be given to those candidates who have experience with academic surveys and techniques of survey research.

The POLL's mission is twofold: (1) to provide a educational environment for teaching survey design, public opinion research, and data analysis for students; and (2) to conduct research on public opinion, foster knowledge about public affairs, and to conduct research on policy issues of import to

local governments, media organizations, and other public/private sector entities. OUPOLL's twenty Dell workstations is a comprehensive computer-assisted interviewing system that can be used in all stages of data collection and manipulation.

Applicants should submit a resume, cover letter, and an OU job application to the Office of Human Resources, 905 Asp Avenue, Room 205, Norman, OK 73019, by January 2, 2004. Refer to job requisition number 12014N on all correspondence. For further information on this or other OU job opportunities, please call (405) 325-1826, TDD (405) 325-5529, or access our web site at [www.ou.edu/ohr](http://www.ou.edu/ohr). OU is an equal opportunity, affirmative action employer. We encourage women and minorities to apply.

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

---

Date: Wed, 10 Dec 2003 13:07:47 -0500  
Reply-To: [DivaleBill@AOL.COM](mailto:DivaleBill@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: William Divale <[DivaleBill@AOL.COM](mailto:DivaleBill@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Opening for Director of Institutional Research  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="UTF-8"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Dear Colleagues:

My college has an opening for a director of institutional research. The person can have an MA and six years of experience or a Ph.D. and less experience. The pay range is up to \$87K and the job description is below and also attached.

I am on the search committee and would love to see someone skilled in survey research get the job. The person can also work closely with the Social Sciences Survey Research Lab.  
Bill Divale

Higher Education Officer/Director of Institutional Research  
Location: York College of The City University of New York in Jamaica, Queens  
Division/Department: Academic Affairs/Institutional Research  
CUNY Personnel Vacancy Notice No.: MP-8669 (Reissued with revised qualifications)  
Closing Date: 12/30/03

Duties: The Director of Institutional Research is responsible for providing for the collection and analysis of data on a wide range of institutional activities for internal and external constituents and for the preparation of annual reports, special reports and topical studies. The Director compiles

the=20  
annual College fact book; reports and studies pertaining to enrollments, fac=  
ulty=20  
and staff workload, and administrative productivity; documents pertaining to=  
=20  
institutional and programmatic accreditations and reviews; and initiates and=  
=20  
conducts studies pertaining to the effects of College and University policie=  
s=20  
and administrative decisions. The Director will collaborate with faculty=20  
members, professional staff and administrators on the development of assessm=  
ent=20  
instruments and information management systems for programmatic and institut=  
ional=20  
planning. In collaboration with other College and University offices, the=20  
Director will develop and maintain a central data repository to be assessabl=  
e for=20  
appropriate analyses.=20

Qualifications: This position requires a minimum of a master's degree and=20  
six (6) years of progressively responsible experience in institutional resea=  
rch=20  
or similar environment. An appropriate combination of education above the=20  
master's degree and demonstrable skills and/or years of experience may be=20  
substituted for the six years of experience. A doctorate in a quantitative,=  
=20  
research-oriented field is a plus. Experiences must include analytical stud=  
y=20  
utilizing large, multi-dimensional databases and applications of SPSS and ot=  
her=20  
statistical software. Demonstrated experience with statistical analysis and=  
=20  
research design and strong writing and communication skills also required.

Salary (commensurate with salary history and experience): \$61,111 - \$87,757=  
=20

To apply, send, by mail, e-mail or fax (e-mail preferred), cover letter wit=  
h=20  
resume and the name, address and telephone number of three (3) references by=  
=20  
above closing date to:

Code: IR

Mrs. Anne Marone Balkcon

Faculty and Staff Relations =E2=80=93 2H05

York College =E2=80=93 The City University of New York

94-20 Guy R. Brewer Blvd.

Jamaica, NY 11451

E-mail: AROYC@CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU.

Fax: 718-262-2717

Additional information available at [www.york.cuny.edu](http://www.york.cuny.edu)=20

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

Date: Wed, 10 Dec 2003 13:25:57 -0500  
Reply-To: Phillip Downs <[pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM](mailto:pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Phillip Downs <[pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM](mailto:pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM)>  
Subject: Testing Photos  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

We have typically used mini focus groups, normal focus groups and slightly larger groups (20 to 25 in a small theater setting) to test consumers' reactions to a portfolio of photos for potential use in an advertising campaign. While this approach works, I'm always interested in how others do it. Does anyone have experience with or knowlede of an alternative methodology for testing consumers' reactions to a set of photos? Thanks

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

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

Date: Wed, 10 Dec 2003 14:15:05 -0500  
Reply-To: Jing Zhou <[jzhou@SYMMETRICSMARKETING.COM](mailto:jzhou@SYMMETRICSMARKETING.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jing Zhou <[jzhou@SYMMETRICSMARKETING.COM](mailto:jzhou@SYMMETRICSMARKETING.COM)>  
Subject: Job Openings  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

=20

Symmetrics Marketing Corporation is a strategic Marketing Science and consulting firm focused on customer relationship marketing and management. Symmetrics was founded in 1996, by a core of highly experienced professionals. Since then our unique approach-combining the

sophistication of leading edge marketing research and science with extensive business-based interpretation and implementation-has had proven impact on the market and financial outcomes of our clients. Some of our senior executives have been leaders in the evolution of this industry since its beginnings in the 1970s. Today we are an internationally recognized leader in this complex and vitally important strategic arena. We have U.S. offices in Scottsdale, Indianapolis, Austin and San Francisco, and a European representative in Switzerland.

=20

The Indianapolis office is seeking qualified candidates for three positions. These are challenging positions with tremendous opportunity for advancement within a growing company:

=20

1. The Indianapolis office is seeking qualified candidates for Senior Methodologist. This is a senior-level Marketing Sciences position with primary responsibility for providing advanced consultation on all aspects of research methods and statistics to internal client service providers, as well as directly to client contacts, and for managing analytic services, for the global customer loyalty (CL) measurement and management activities of a large Symmetrics client. =20

=20

Responsibilities will include:=20

=20

- \* Provide thought leadership for all aspects of the client's research program, including all methodological aspects of survey research (complex study design, sampling design and management, weighting, advanced statistics, and interpretation of results), quasi-experiments, and other research related to the CL program

- \* Serve as statistical and methodological advisor to the entire team, providing a full-range of methodological advice, standards and solutions, as well as guidance to the research operations staff to successfully execute these solutions

- \* Day-to-day leadership of all data management and analytics in support of this key client

=20

Critical Success Factors include:

=20

- \* Ability to apply social science rigor to the complexities of real-world research

- \* Ability to articulate research problems and identify

new statistical solutions

- \* Ability to provide consultative services, with the relationship management that entails=20
  - \* Ability to coach and train
  - \* Ability to manage an analytic team
  - \* Understanding Customer Loyalty as a corporate strategy
- =20

=09

Required: A Ph.D. in a social science discipline with a research focus, with a minimum of 5-7 years of successful experience in advanced multivariate analysis, complex study design and execution, and all other aspects of applied survey research methodology, is required.=20  
=20

2. Senior Global Program Manager (SGPM) to manage all aspects of complex and high profile international research projects, including qualitative and quantitative research, directing and coordinating the activities of support staff and suppliers involved with study design, data collection, analysis and reporting of research data. Candidates should have experience managing survey research projects, a Master's degree or equivalent experience, and strong verbal, written and interpersonal communication skills. An ability to manage complex research studies and coordinate team members is required; the ability to spec basic statistical operations for research questions is highly desired.=20

3.=09

Statistician/Research Scientist (RS) to focus on advanced multivariate analyses of survey data in SPSS (including regressions and factor analysis. Candidates should have experience managing and/or analyzing survey data, a Master's Degree, and good verbal, written and interpersonal communication skills. Experience with SAS or SPSS and a passion for working with survey data are required. Candidates should also have a minimum of 2-4 years experience analyzing complex survey data.

Symmetrics provides an excellent salary with full benefits, extensive training & career development opportunities. If you have a passion for your work & desire a professional challenge, please forward your resume & salary requirements to Cheryl Rieger [crieger@symmetricmarketing.com](mailto:crieger@symmetricmarketing.com).

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

Date: Wed, 10 Dec 2003 17:25:15 -0500  
Reply-To: Jay Mattlin <[JMattlin@MEDIAMARK.NOPWORLD.COM](mailto:JMattlin@MEDIAMARK.NOPWORLD.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>



From: Jay Mattlin <JMattlin@MEDIAMARK.NOPWORLD.COM>  
Subject: Social Desirability Scales for Health Surveys?  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

A colleague of ours would like to know if anybody on AAPORnet is aware of any scales that have been used to measure social desirability in health surveys, and can provide or point to information on how the data from these scales have been used to interpret the results for health questions.

Please reply to me directly rather than to the entire list, and I will pass along your suggestions to this colleague.

Thank you very much.

Jay Mattlin

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 10 Dec 2003 17:38:46 -0500  
Reply-To: "Roe, David" <[droe@RTI.ORG](mailto:droe@RTI.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Roe, David" <[droe@RTI.ORG](mailto:droe@RTI.ORG)>  
Subject: Respondent burden in longitudinal surveys...when is enough  
enough

??

Comments: To: "[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)" <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

A co-worker and I are looking for any literature or data on respondent burden and/or loss of accuracy over time in longitudinal surveys, and perhaps solid evidence on why its good to stop this type of research after a given period of time.

Please reply to me directly rather than to the entire list.

Thanks in advance.

David J. Roe, M.A.  
Survey Research Division  
Call Center Operations and Methodology Program Area  
RTI International  
3040 Cornwallis Rd. PO Box 12194  
RTP, NC 27709-2194  
Phone: 919-316-3598  
Fax: 919-316-3866  
[droe@rti.org](mailto:droe@rti.org) <<mailto:droe@rti.org>>  
[www.rti.org](http://www.rti.org) <<http://www.rti.org>>

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

Date: Thu, 11 Dec 2003 11:20:37 -0600  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject: AAPORNet Over the Holidays  
Comments: To: [AAPORNet@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

=20  
If you're going to be away from your email over the holidays and would =  
like to temporarily suspend your AAPORNET subscription, the instructions =  
are below.

=20  
This will allow you to keep your AAPORNET subscription, but not have any =  
email delivered to your mailbox. You can restart delivery when you get =  
back, and catch up on any messages you missed by browsing the archives.

=20  
Here's how:

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

```
set aapornet nomail
```

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

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

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

```
set aapornet mail
```

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

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

Happy Holidays,  
Shap Wolf  
AAPORNET volunteer administrator

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

---

Date: Thu, 11 Dec 2003 13:00:05 -0500  
Reply-To: "Butterworth, Michael" <[MXB@CBSNEWS.COM](mailto:MXB@CBSNEWS.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Butterworth, Michael" <[MXB@CBSNEWS.COM](mailto:MXB@CBSNEWS.COM)>  
Subject: elections & censuses  
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

Can anyone tell me why Iraq needs a census before they can have an election?

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

---

Date: Thu, 11 Dec 2003 14:09:07 -0500  
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Organization: Rider University  
Subject: Re: elections & censuses  
Comments: To: "Butterworth, Michael" <[MXB@CBSNEWS.COM](mailto:MXB@CBSNEWS.COM)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I don't know how it will work in Iraq, but the reason for a biennial census in the US is to make sure that different states have correct representation vis-a-vis their populations. Whether this applies in Iraq depends, of course, on what the ultimate state structures will be.

Frank Rusciano

"Butterworth, Michael" wrote:

> Can anyone tell me why Iraq needs a census before they can have an election?

>

> -----

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

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

---

Date: Thu, 11 Dec 2003 16:43:18 -0500  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Subject: Re: elections & censuses  
Comments: To: "Butterworth, Michael" <MXB@CBSNEWS.COM>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <DBAE93A0ADFAF74AB3E23DD92A580D5C081427@NYCCNDX5>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Michael,  
The Census is for two things. First to apportion representatives to a given population. One person, one vote. Second, they will likely use it to create a registration roll. Those are my guesses.  
warren

At 01:00 PM 12/11/2003, you wrote:  
>Can anyone tell me why Iraq needs a census before they can have an election?  
>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>signoff aapornet

MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL  
1776 Broadway, Suite 1708  
New York, NY 10019

212 980-3031  
212 980-3107 Fax

[www.mitofskyinternational.com](http://www.mitofskyinternational.com)  
[mitofsky@mindspring.com](mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com)

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

---

Date: Thu, 11 Dec 2003 21:01:09 -0500  
Reply-To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>  
Subject: Iraq poll  
Comments: To: aapor <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I just received a copy of the following article, which I don't think has been on aapornet as yet, though my apologies if it has.

I know virtually nothing about the two organizations referred to as having conducted the poll, though would be glad to hear from someone who does. I didn't find the date of the poll itself, but assume it was mid-October. Howard

The Washington Times October 24, 2003, Friday, Final Edition

Correction Appended

HEADLINE: Thin majority favors coalition;  
Large number fear for safety

BYLINE: By Paul Martin, THE WASHINGTON TIMES

DATELINE: BAGHDAD

BODY:

A poll conducted in seven Iraqi cities has found that a narrow majority of Iraqi citizens support the presence of coalition forces in their country, but that two-thirds now feel occupied rather than liberated.

The survey by an Iraqi group, undertaken in cooperation with the Washington-based International Republican Institute [IRI], was by far the widest yet conducted in postwar Iraq, involving face-to-face interviews with 1,620 persons in Sunni, Shi'ite and Kurdish population centers.

The samples were accurately weighted for the cities' size, ethnic and sex composition, said Stephen Moore, an IRI official who worked with the Iraq Center for Research and Strategic Studies to develop the survey.

Just under half those polled [47.2 percent] told interviewers they had considered the coalition forces to be either liberation forces or peacekeepers when they first arrived, but only 19 percent said they still hold that view.

About 46 percent said they felt less safe personally than they did three months ago, while only 23 percent said personal safety was getting better.

Coalition experts said the survey result contradicts all practical indicators in the country, such as the crime rate and the presence of newly trained Iraqi police.

Only 3 percent cited coalition military patrols as the best guarantee of personal safety, compared with 12 percent who listed the Iraqi police. Most said they relied more on their neighbors, friends and family members to give them a feeling of security.

The poll showed that only a small fraction of the population, 9.8 percent, "strongly opposed" the coalition's presence. Mr. Moore said that suggests the continuing attacks on coalition forces - now averaging about 35 a day - are being conducted by a tiny minority of Iraqis.

Mr. Moore also said he was "deeply encouraged" by the support for a future democratic Iraq that emerged from the poll. Choosing their political leader through fair and regular elections was identified as a priority by 95.5 percent of those polled.

"This backs up our own experience here in Iraq, as we hold democracy-building sessions with enthusiastic local people," Mr. Moore said.

The pollsters declined to break down the results between Sunni and Shi'ite respondents. Most resistance to the coalition has been focused in areas populated by Sunnis, who held a privileged position under ousted leader Saddam Hussein.

However, the rising perception of coalition forces as occupiers was strongest in the two Shi'ite cities polled - Basra and Najaf - where the coalition forces were originally most welcome. The trend was also seen in Irbil and Suleimaniya, two predominantly Kurdish cities in the north. Polling was also done in Baghdad and the mainly Sunni cities of Ramadi and Fallujah.

Coalition officials are somewhat baffled by the statistics, saying they have noticed a substantial improvement in public attitudes toward their forces.

"When we're out in the streets the children and parents typically wave at us and give us the thumbs-up, before we've even had a chance to say hello," said Hilary White, the public affairs officer for the Coalition Provisional Authority in the south-central provinces.

"I call it the wave test. Even in Fallujah and Ramadi they're increasingly waving back, which gives us the confidence that things are turning round," she said in an interview.

#### CORRECTION:

An article in Friday's editions inaccurately characterized the role of the International Republican Institute in a survey of Iraqis about domestic security and their wishes for democracy. The IRI worked with the pollster, the Iraq Center for Research and Strategic Studies, only on the questions pertaining to democracy.

-----

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

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

signoff aapornet

---

Date: Fri, 12 Dec 2003 08:49:14 -0600  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject: Job Announcement  
Comments: To: [AAPORNet@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNet@asu.edu)  
Comments: cc: [Pam.Crabill@arbitron.com](mailto:Pam.Crabill@arbitron.com)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

=20

Please respond directly to: [Opsjobs@Arbitron.com](mailto:Opsjobs@Arbitron.com) =20

=20

Arbitron is a leading media information services company providing = software solutions that will shape the future of the broadcasting = industry. Our organization is constantly growing and changing to meet = the needs of the media industry, and are always on the lookout for = talented individuals like you to join our team.<?xml:namespace prefix = =3D o ns =3D "urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />

=20

We are looking for a Senior Project Leader to join our PPM Methods & = Analysis Department in Columbia, MD.

=20

### Responsibilities

Designs, manages and documents research methods tests and statistical = data analyses required to evaluate and improve quality, effectiveness = and efficiency of PPM and PPM-related measurement methods. Also leads = development and testing of other research methods as needed to support = Arbitron's new business objectives. Requires 8+ years relevant applied = professional experience plus specific academic training in survey and/or = panel research design issues, plus a strong interest in media and/or = consumer research issues; Four-year degree or higher in a related social = sciences field (Advanced degree preferred); excellent written and verbal = communication skills; in-depth knowledge of statistical analysis and = data reduction techniques; working knowledge of SAS, SPSS or equivalent = analysis tools, plus Word, Excel, Access and other PC-based tools; = demonstrated project management and organizational skills; flexible = working hours and ability to travel.=20

=20

=B7 Evaluating research methodologies to determine consistency = with sound research practices, customer requirements and company = business objectives. =20

=B7 Designing and managing pilot studies, methods experiments, = detailed secondary analyses and related activities to support the = development of new research services. Including primary data analysis = activities.

=B7 Participation in cross-functional project teams. Performing = leadership role in project management and defining research = requirements.

=B7 Preparing detailed project plans, written reports and = statistical analyses describing findings from research tests and = secondary analyses. This includes reports for internal documentation = purposes as well as reports for clients and other external uses.

=B7 Supporting Arbitron marketing and business expansion = objectives by participating in the development of detailed written = technical proposals for new research services.

=B7 Preparing and delivering oral presentations internally and = to clients and industry groups on topics pertaining to Arbitron research = activities and findings.

=B7 Leading/directing project teams of other assigned staff on a = daily basis to ensure that project timelines and goals are met in an = effective and efficient manner.

=B7 Position requires availability for occasional travel as = needed.

=20

#### Skills/Experience Requirements:

=B7 Four-year degree in a related field required. Advanced = degree preferred. Specific academic training in survey research methods = and statistical analysis strongly preferred.

=B7 A minimum of 8 years of progressively more responsible = experience in an applied research setting.

=B7 Experience in project management and/or in a supervisory = role.=20

=B7 Experience with survey design, including data collection = processes (e.g. questionnaire design, sampling, data preparation and = processing, and performance calculations).

=B7 Strong computer skills, including expertise in SAS and/or = SPSS and/or Access. Excel, Word, and PowerPoint skills also necessary.=20

=B7 Excellent written and oral communication skills, with = demonstrated performance in both areas.



=B7 Strong analytic and problem-solving skills, including an =  
advanced knowledge of statistical tools and principles.

=20

Arbitron offers a comprehensive employment package, including =  
competitive compensation, excellent dental, medical and vision care =  
plans, 401(k) matching, tuition assistance, stock purchase and a series =  
of work/family resources. Check us out at [www.arbitron.com](http://www.arbitron.com). =20

=20

Send resumes to: [Opsjobs@Arbitron.com](mailto:Opsjobs@Arbitron.com) FAX 410-312-8607, or mail OE =  
Recruiter, 9705 Patuxent Woods Drive, Columbia, MD 21046 =20

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 12 Dec 2003 16:06:46 -0500  
Reply-To: Claire Durand <[Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA](mailto:Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Claire Durand <[Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA](mailto:Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA)>  
Subject: reminder Call for papers  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

>Hi,  
>  
>John Goyder and myself are organizing the session (s) on unit non response=  
>in surveys in the next Social Science Methodology Conference that will be=  
>held in Amsterdam, 17-20 August 2004. The deadline for submitting=  
>abstracts is January 15. Please send us both your proposals if you would=  
>like to present a paper on this topic.  
>  
>CALL FOR PAPERS  
>  
>RC33 Sixth International Conference on Social Science Methodology  
>  
>Recent Developments and Applications in Social Research Methodology  
>  
> Amsterdam, The Netherlands, August 16-20, 2004  
>  
>Website: <http://www.siswo.uva.nl/rc33/>  
>  
>  
>

>Session on 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,=20

>for presentation at the RC33-2004 Conference in Amsterdam. Topics would=

=20

>include (but are not restricted to):

>

> nonresponse on specific types of survey such as electoral=20

> surveys;

>

>response maximization (e.g. call management in telephone surveys, training=

=20

>and selection of personnel, incentives,...);

>

>theoretical approaches (e.g. leverage-salience exchange theory, social=20

>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=20

> sessions as homogeneous as possible.

>

>Keywords: nonresponse, unit nonresponse

>

>

>

>Persons wishing to submit a paper for this session should email a=20

>proposal in which is formulated:

>

>- the title of the proposed paper

>

>- an abstract of approximately 400 words

>

>- name(s) and affiliation(s) of author(s)

>

>- key-words

>

>

>

>to <your email> and the Executive Scientific Committee of the conference=20

>(mentioning this session ) (email:=20

><mailto:%20%20rc33-conf@siswo.uva.nl>rc33-conf@siswo.uva.nl ).

>

>

>

>THE DEADLINE for abstracts for papers is March 15, 2004.

>

>A message of acceptance or rejection will be send by the chair of the=20

>session and the Executive Scientific Committee before April 15, 2004.

>

>THE DEADLINE FOR SUBMITTING FULL PAPERS (in pdf format) is June 15, 2004.

>

>

>

>Accepted papers of registrated participants will be published on a CD-ROM,=

=20

>available on the conference.

>

>

>

>

>

>FEES AND REGISTRATION:

> \* Fees: Euro 150.- for RC33 members (Euro 180.- for non-members);=20

> students and members from countries in monetary transition will have a=20

> reduced fee of 100 Euro.

> \* Subscriptions after May 1, 2004 will have to add 30 Euro to the fee.

> \* For registration , see website.

>

>

>

>

>

>

>Claire Durand

>Claire.Durand@umontreal.ca

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

>

>Professeur,

>Responsable des cycles sup=E9rieurs,

>d=E9partement de sociologie,

>Universit=E9 de Montr=E9al

>C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,  
>Montr=E9al, Qu=E9bec, H3C 3J7

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

Professeur,  
Responsable des cycles sup=E9rieurs,  
d=E9partement de sociologie,  
Universit=E9 de Montr=E9al  
C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,  
Montr=E9al, Qu=E9bec, H3C 3J7

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

=====  
Date: Sun, 14 Dec 2003 14:14:02 -0700  
Reply-To: John Fries <[jfries@ANR.COM](mailto:jfries@ANR.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: John Fries <[jfries@ANR.COM](mailto:jfries@ANR.COM)>  
Subject: Comparing RDD Sample Sources

AAPORNetters,

Recently I found myself in a discussion with a client regarding our use of one particular sampling company instead of another. While I was able to discuss the general criteria of cost, coverage, and efficiency, I found I could not provide specific details about how the various sampling companies compare to one another on these important factors.

I have done a search of the AAPORNet archives and found various comments and/or endorsements of some of the more well known companies such as Survey Sampling and Genesys, but have not yet found any first hand comparisons from those who have used more than one.

I am sure representatives from these companies are list members, and while I welcome any comments they may have, I am most interested in hearing the personal experiences of those who have used more than one such company, including why you have elected to use one company over another. Even better would be the results of any in the field comparisons people may have done.

Thanks in advance for any information you can offer. I will be happy to summarize the responses and share them with anyone who is interested.

Best Wishes,

John

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

signoff aapornet

---

Date: Mon, 15 Dec 2003 12:30:57 +0100  
Reply-To: harkness@zuma-mannheim.de  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Janet Harkness <harkness@ZUMA-MANNHEIM.DE>  
Organization: ZUMA  
Subject: call for papers on cross-cultural survey research  
Comments: cc: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@xs4all.nl>, aapornet@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Dear colleagues,

Edith de Leeuw and I are organizing a session (or sessions) on=20  
cross-cultural/cross-national survey research (as indicated in the=20  
abstract below) at the RC33 Sixth International Conference on Social=20  
Science Methodology  
Recent Developments and Applications in Social Research Methodology

The conference will be held in Amsterdam, The Netherlands, August 16-20, =  
2004. For more details look at the website  
<http://www.siswo.uva.nl/rc33/>

Abstract for session on Methodological Issues in Designing and=20  
Implementing Cross-Cultural Surveys

Cross-Cultural Surveys have become increasingly important both from a=20  
theoretical and an applied policy view. Understanding complex realities =

and generating and testing social theories is one of the main issues in=20  
social science. Going from the limitations of one culture, nation, or=20  
group to comparing groups, cultures and countries, enables researchers=20  
to distinguish between =91local conditions=92 and =91universal regulariti=  
es.=92=20

As our world grows from a local to a global one, policy makers and=20  
economists have an urgent need for comparative high quality=20  
international data.

Key-words: Cross-cultural methodology, multi-cultural survey design and=20  
implementation, multi-population sampling, multi-cultural survey=20  
instruments, quality control, nonresponse and survey errors

If you would like to submit a paper for our session(s) here is what to do=  
=2E

Email a proposal with:

- the title of the proposed paper
- an abstract of approximately 400 words

- name(s) and affiliation(s) of author(s)
- key-words

to <harkness@zuma-mannheim.de> and <edithl@xs4all.nl> and also to the Executive Scientific Committee of the conference, mentioning the session =

name,(email: rc33-conf@siswo.uva.nl ).

THE DEADLINE for abstracts for papers is March 15, 2004.

A message of acceptance or rejection will be send by the chair of the session and the Executive Scientific Committee before April 15, 2004.

THE DEADLINE FOR SUBMITTING FULL PAPERS (in pdf format) is June 15, 2004.=

Accepted papers of registrated participants will be published on a CD-ROM, available on the conference.

Note that the total number of papers a contributor is allowed to PRESENT is two. The conference language is English.

#### FEES AND REGISTRATION:

1. Fees: Euro 150.- for RC33 members (Euro 180.- for non-members); students and members from countries in monetary transition will have a reduced fee of 100 Euro.
2. Those registering after May 1, 2004 pay 30 Euros more.
3. For registration , see website.

Session Co-ordinators: Janet Harkness & Edith de Leeuw

- (1) Janet Harkness, ZUMA Postfach 12 21 55, D-68072 Mannheim, Germany=  
,  
e-mail harkness@zuma-mannheim.de
- (2) Edith de Leeuw, MethodikA, Plantage Doklaan 40, NI-1018 CN=  
Amsterdam, The Netherlands,  
e-mail edithL@xs4aLL.nL

-----  
Dr. Janet A. Harkness  
Centre for Survey Research and Methodology (ZUMA)  
B 2,1  
P.O. Box 12 21 55  
D-68072 Mannheim  
Tel: int+49-(0)621-1246-284  
Fax: int+49-(0)621-1246-100

Email:  
Harkness@zuma-mannheim.de  
-----

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

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

---

Date: Wed, 17 Dec 2003 13:21:20 -0500  
Reply-To: "Kotler-Berkowitz, Laurence" <[Laurence.Kotler-Berkowitz@UJC.ORG](mailto:Laurence.Kotler-Berkowitz@UJC.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Kotler-Berkowitz, Laurence" <[Laurence.Kotler-Berkowitz@UJC.ORG](mailto:Laurence.Kotler-Berkowitz@UJC.ORG)>  
Subject: job listing  
Comments: To: [AAPORNet@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

United Jewish Communities, a non-profit agency in New York City, seeks =  
to hire a Research Associate in its Planning and Research Division. =  
Send cover letter and resume via email to [research@ujc.org](mailto:research@ujc.org) with subject =  
line: Research Associate position.

The Research Associate has the following responsibilities:

1. Assist in the utilization and implementation of data from the =  
National Jewish Population Survey 2000-01, sponsored by UJC.
2. Analyze data, write reports, construct tables and charts, and make =  
presentations about NJPS for UJC, Jewish federations, other Jewish =  
communal organizations and the wider Jewish community.
3. Provide assistance to UJC professional staff, departments and =  
committees regarding NJPS and other research issues.
4. Respond to requests about NJPS from the Jewish communal field and =  
wider Jewish community.
5. Answer inquiries about NJPS received on the NJPS information line and =  
email address.
6. Work on additional, non-NJPS research projects and respond to =  
additional UJC staff and Jewish federation research requests, as =  
periodically assigned.

Qualifications:

1. M.A. degree in the social sciences (sociology, political science, =  
economics, public policy, public or non-profit administration, or =  
planning).
2. Knowledge of statistics and understanding of principles of survey =  
research
3. Proficient in SPSS, Excel, PowerPoint, Word and navigating the =  
Internet. HTML skills a plus.

4. Excellent writing, communication and interpersonal skills.
5. Knowledge of the Jewish community and Jewish federation system = desirable.
6. Previous organizational experience preferred.

For additional information on United Jewish Communities, visit =  
www.ujc.org.

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

Date: Wed, 17 Dec 2003 14:46:53 -0500  
Reply-To: Claire Durand <[Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA](mailto:Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Claire Durand <[Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA](mailto:Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA)>  
Subject: Deadlines: Social Science Methodology- Call for papers  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu), [SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU](mailto:SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU),  
[METHODS@linux08.UNM.EDU](mailto:METHODS@linux08.UNM.EDU), [metho@uquebec.ca](mailto:metho@uquebec.ca)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

To all interested in submitting a paper to a session organizer. Please note=  
=20  
that the organizer sent this message regarding changes in deadlines:

"Take care that I have changed the deadlines: March 15 for an abstract,=20  
April 15 for a message of acceptance or rejection, and June 15 as the=20  
deadline for submitting full papers."

>Hi,  
>  
>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 March 15. Please send us both your proposals if you would=20  
>like to present a paper on this topic.  
>  
>CALL FOR PAPERS  
>  
>RC33 Sixth International Conference on Social Science Methodology  
>  
>Recent Developments and Applications in Social Research Methodology  
>  
> Amsterdam, The Netherlands, August 16-20, 2004



>  
>Website: <http://www.siswo.uva.nl/rc33/>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>Session on 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,=20  
>for presentation at the RC33-2004 Conference in Amsterdam. Topics would=  
>=20  
>include (but are not restricted to):  
>  
>    nonresponse on specific types of survey such as electoral=20  
> surveys;  
>  
>response maximization (e.g. call management in telephone surveys, training=  
>=20  
>and selection of personnel, incentives,...);  
>  
>theoretical approaches (e.g. leverage-salience exchange theory, social=20  
>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=20  
> sessions as homogeneous as possible.  
>

>Keywords: nonresponse, unit nonresponse

>

>

>

>Persons wishing to submit a paper for this session should email a=20

>proposal in which is formulated:

>

>- the title of the proposed paper

>

>- an abstract of approximately 400 words

>

>- name(s) and affiliation(s) of author(s)

>

>- key-words

>

>

>

>to <your email> and the Executive Scientific Committee of the conference=20

>(mentioning this session ) (email:=20

><mailto:%20%20rc33-conf@siswo.uva.nl>rc33-conf@siswo.uva.nl ).

>

>

>

>THE DEADLINE for abstracts for papers is March 15, 2004.

>

>A message of acceptation or rejection will be send by the chair of the=20

>session and the Executive Scientific Committee before April 15, 2004.

>

>THE DEADLINE FOR SUBMITTING FULL PAPERS (in pdf format) is June 15, 2004.

>

>

>

>Accepted papers of registrated participants will be published on a CD-ROM,=

=20

>available on the conference.

>

>

>

>

>

>FEES AND REGISTRATION:

> \* Fees: Euro 150.- for RC33 members (Euro 180.- for non-members);=20

> students and members from countries in monetary transition will have a=20

> reduced fee of 100 Euro.

> \* Subscriptions after May 1, 2004 will have to add 30 Euro to the fee.

> \* For registration , see website.

>

>

>

>

>

>Claire Durand

>Claire.Durand@umontreal.ca

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

>  
>Professeur,  
>Responsable des cycles sup=E9rieurs,  
>d=E9partement de sociologie,  
>Universit=E9 de Montr=E9al  
>C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,  
>Montr=E9al, Qu=E9bec, H3C 3J7

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

Professeur,  
Responsable des cycles sup=E9rieurs,  
d=E9partement de sociologie,  
Universit=E9 de Montr=E9al  
C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,  
Montr=E9al, Qu=E9bec, H3C 3J7

" Le chiffre est un =EAtre d=E9licat, sensible, qui, soumis =E0 la torture,=  
se=20  
livre =E0 des aveux conformes au d=E9sir de son bourreau. Mais d=E8s qu'il=  
est=20  
remis en libert=E9, il se r=E9tracte, maintenant intactes les v=E9rit=E9s=  
qu'il=20  
renferme, souvent accusatrices."

Sauvy A., Conjoncture et pr=E9vision =E9conomiques, Paris, PUF, 1977, p.27

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 19 Dec 2003 15:36:27 -0500  
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Saddam Hussein and 9/11  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

<http://www.usatoday.com/news/polls/tables/live/2003-12-17-poll.htm>

If you page down this about 3/4 of the way you will see that according to the most recent USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll results 53% of American adults think that Saddam Hussein was personally involved in the September 11th terrorist attacks. This is up 10% since mid-September.

--  
Leo G. Simonetta  
Art & Science Group, LLC

6115 Falls Road Suite 101  
Baltimore, MD 21209  
410-377-7880 ext. 14  
410-377-7955 fax

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

Date: Fri, 19 Dec 2003 15:12:39 -0600  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: Canada Drugs  
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Polls are showing strong support in the U.S. for importing pharmaceuticals from Canada. Have there been any polls in Canada showing how Canadian citizens feel about this and an their concerns; e.g., shortages, price increases, de facto subsidizing of U.S. consumers, etc.

Nick

Manley firm on drug price caps

By GERALDINE RYERSON-CRUZ  
Bloomberg News

UPDATED AT 3:39 PM EST Wednesday, Nov. 26, 2003

NEW YORK -- Canada won't bow to pressure from pharmaceutical companies to end price controls on prescription drugs to stem export sales to U.S. consumers, Finance Minister John Manley says.

Increasingly, U.S. residents are buying prescription drugs from Canada, where prices are cheaper because of government controls. Minnesota yesterday said it's inviting officials from other states, including Illinois and Iowa, to explore filling prescriptions in Canada to trim health-care costs.

The mounting purchases through Internet outlets and mail-order drugstores in Canada are leading New York-based Pfizer Inc., GlaxoSmithKline PLC and AstraZeneca PLC of Britain, Indianapolis-based Eli Lilly & Co. and other drug makers to retaliate by limiting shipments to Canada.

Price controls are "Canadian domestic policy intended to support Canadian consumers," Mr. Manley said in an interview with Bloomberg News. "I don't think that we have any intention of changing that policy."

There hasn't been pressure from U.S. officials to alter drug-pricing policy in Canada, Mr. Manley said. Canada's priority is to make sure there's enough medicine for its own citizens, he said.

Since 1987, a review board has set prices for all patented medications sold in Canada.

The price differences have drawn cities such as Springfield, Mass., and Burlington, Vt., to set up programs to buy drugs from Canada for municipal workers. The cities are flouting U.S. laws that make it illegal to import medications.

© 2003 Bell Globemedia Publishing Inc. All Rights Reserved.

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

Date: Sat, 20 Dec 2003 12:31:53 -0500  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Subject: Retropoll  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Does anyone have any opinions about Retropoll <<http://www.retropoll.org/>? In their latest release <[http://www.retropoll.org/press\\_release\\_poll03.htm](http://www.retropoll.org/press_release_poll03.htm)>, they report that at least one in three Americans thinks that Bush should be impeached for "misleading" the public about WMDs in Iraq. The results are hard to believe, but I'd be interested in hearing the specialists' views.

Specifically, I'd be interested in hearing what the thinking is on whether the views of refusers are any different from the population that consents to be polled.

Here's the text of their methodology page <[http://www.retropoll.org/about\\_stats.htm](http://www.retropoll.org/about_stats.htm)>:

>The most common question and concern regarding our first poll in >September 2002 on the War on Terrorism was: With a sample size of >only 150 how does the power of your results hold up against the >major media polls? (which often have 800-1000 responses). A few >people, instead of asking the question, have simply told us that our >sample size is too small to be of any value.

>  
>Response: The focal point of Retro Poll's report and general >methodology is an effort to look at correlations between >misinformation people obtain from the mass media and their >beliefs/viewpoints about proposed government policies. The

>association we have shown between having misinformation on Iraq's  
>sponsorship of Al Qaeda terrorism on the one hand, and a willingness  
>to go to war with Iraq, on the other, is very strong. Using standard  
>statistical testing (the chi square test) we have shown that there  
>is almost no chance ( $p < .001$ ) that this association is a random or  
>accidental event. In fact, this association is stronger than  
>anything that the large random sample polls can say about their  
>results. Health researchers and statisticians usually suggest a  
>sample size of at least 100 to make this kind of study useful. Retro  
>Poll 1 obviously surpasses that standard.

>  
>Comparing Retro Poll's association of two questions (factors) to the  
>results of simple polls (whether major media polls or our own) is  
>like comparing apples and oranges. The general public needs to  
>understand the serious weakness of public opinion research in the  
>U.S. Most public opinion polls (including ours) have to call and  
>speak with about 4 people before one person agrees to participate in  
>any survey. Since there is no way of knowing if the refusers have  
>different or the same views as the accepters, there is no valid way  
>to report that a poll really reflects the public viewpoint on  
>anything. When polls report a margin of error (usually 3-5%, though  
>our small sample size generated a statistic of 6-8%) they are, to  
>put it gently, fibbing. What they should be saying is "if the people  
>refusing to be polled were to have similar views to those polled,  
>then the results reflect those of the general population with a  
>margin of error of 3-5%". However, because the answer to the "if" is  
>usually unknown, the actual potential error margin, in simple  
>questioning, both in corporate media polls and in ours, is unknown  
>but definitely larger than reported.

>  
>Retro Poll will continue to focus on the method of testing the  
>association between background knowledge and viewpoint and these  
>correlations will not require large numbers. We will however, try to  
>get larger poll numbers in order to further strengthen the ability  
>to say that results to individual questions reflect the public's  
>views, even though we believe that this type of polling should not  
>be trusted by the public, even when the sample size is large.

--

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

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

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

signoff aapornet

---

Date: Sat, 20 Dec 2003 13:45:36 -0500  
Reply-To: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Retropoll  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <p05200f01bc0a36862f37@[192.168.1.100]>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Doug Henwood wrote in part:

>Does anyone have any opinions about Retropoll  
><<http://www.retropoll.org>>? In their latest release  
><[http://www.retropoll.org/press\\_release\\_poll03.htm](http://www.retropoll.org/press_release_poll03.htm)>, they report that  
>at least one in three Americans thinks that Bush should be impeached  
>for "misleading" the public about WMDs in Iraq.

That inference isn't justified by the actual question wording: "President Bush claimed that the US had to invade Iraq because Iraq had nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. None has been found. Do you think that misleading the U.S. public and Congress in order to take the country into war is grounds for impeachment?" An answer of "yes" cannot be construed as belief that Bush should be impeached. I think the press release is, umm, pretty squirrely. I'm not very happy with the questionnaire, either.

>Specifically, I'd be interested in hearing what the thinking is on  
>whether the views of refusers are any different from the population  
>that consents to be polled.

In a few minutes of nosing around the Retropoll site, I haven't found any explanation of how they conduct their surveys (except that they are phone surveys). If the researchers aren't doing callbacks, that could skew their results quite apart from refusals.

A lot has been said about non-response here. (If people don't have predetermined opinions on the answers to survey questions, then "the views of refusers" -- as defined and measured by those questions -- arguably just don't exist.) I do think that refusers may differ markedly from participants in some cases, and that for this reason the "true" margins of error arguably are larger than the reported ones. I don't understand whether this fact is supposed to make us feel better about Retropoll's sample sizes. But it's true that if the surveys are basically conducted with decent methods, then sample sizes of 150 should give us at least a back-of-the-envelope sense of how a bigger survey would turn out. Apparently at least a substantial minority of Americans would answer this question "Yes" -- whatever that implies about their beliefs.

Mark Lindeman  
Bard College

---

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

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

signoff aapornet

---

Date: Sat, 20 Dec 2003 14:40:31 -0500

Reply-To: Allen Barton <[allenbarton@mindspring.com](mailto:allenbarton@mindspring.com)>

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

From: Allen Barton <[allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM)>

Subject: Re: Retropoll

Comments: To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Mark Lindman is right that saying "yes" that "misleading the U.S. public and Congress in order to take the country into war is grounds for impeachment" does not imply accepting the two sentences that led up to the question - respondents could believe that there were other good reasons than weapons of mass destruction to invade Iraq, or they could believe that they have in fact been found or may still be found.

Another issue is that the statistical significance of a correlation between believing that Iraq was involved with Al Qaeda and willingness to go to war does not tell us how many people were influenced to support the war by that particular piece of misinformation. If the correlation were reported it would tell us "how much of the variation" in willingness to go to war is "predicted" by the misinformation, but that would still not show the causal influence of that misinformation. It may be associated with other beliefs which are also important, and if these beliefs were entered in a multiple regression to predict willingness to go to war, the coefficient for the "Al Qaeda" belief would surely be lower than the uncontrolled correlation. The statistical significance does not measure the size of the association let alone the independent contribution of that item.

One can agree that the Administration's exploitation of misinformation about Al Qaeda connections shows contempt for the American people, and that its statements claiming absolute certainty that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction, when what they had was mixed intelligence and at best a strong suspicion, was a dishonest attempt to stampede the Congress and the public. However the "Retropoll" operation and analysis looks pretty amateurish and is also misleadingly reported.

Allen Barton

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

From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>

Sent: Dec 20, 2003 12:31 PM

To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

Subject: Retropoll

Does anyone have any opinions about Retropoll <<http://www.retropoll.org>>? In their latest release <[http://www.retropoll.org/press\\_release\\_poll03.htm](http://www.retropoll.org/press_release_poll03.htm)>, they report that at least one in three Americans thinks that Bush should be impeached for "misleading" the public about WMDs in Iraq. The results are hard



to believe, but I'd be interested in hearing the specialists' views.

Specifically, I'd be interested in hearing what the thinking is on whether the views of refusers are any different from the population that consents to be polled.

Here's the text of their methodology page  
<[http://www.retropoll.org/about\\_stats.htm](http://www.retropoll.org/about_stats.htm)>:

>The most common question and concern regarding our first poll in  
>September 2002 on the War on Terrorism was: With a sample size of  
>only 150 how does the power of your results hold up against the  
>major media polls? (which often have 800-1000 responses). A few  
>people, instead of asking the question, have simply told us that our  
>sample size is too small to be of any value.

>  
>Response: The focal point of Retro Poll's report and general  
>methodology is an effort to look at correlations between  
>misinformation people obtain from the mass media and their  
>beliefs/viewpoints about proposed government policies. The  
>association we have shown between having misinformation on Iraq's  
>sponsorship of Al Qaeda terrorism on the one hand, and a willingness  
>to go to war with Iraq, on the other, is very strong. Using standard  
>statistical testing (the chi square test) we have shown that there  
>is almost no chance ( $p < .001$ ) that this association is a random or  
>accidental event. In fact, this association is stronger than  
>anything that the large random sample polls can say about their  
>results. Health researchers and statisticians usually suggest a  
>sample size of at least 100 to make this kind of study useful. Retro  
>Poll 1 obviously surpasses that standard.

>  
>Comparing Retro Poll's association of two questions (factors) to the  
>results of simple polls (whether major media polls or our own) is  
>like comparing apples and oranges. The general public needs to  
>understand the serious weakness of public opinion research in the  
>U.S. Most public opinion polls (including ours) have to call and  
>speak with about 4 people before one person agrees to participate in  
>any survey. Since there is no way of knowing if the refusers have  
>different or the same views as the accepters, there is no valid way  
>to report that a poll really reflects the public viewpoint on  
>anything. When polls report a margin of error (usually 3-5%, though  
>our small sample size generated a statistic of 6-8%) they are, to  
>put it gently, fibbing. What they should be saying is "if the people  
>refusing to be polled were to have similar views to those polled,  
>then the results reflect those of the general population with a  
>margin of error of 3-5%". However, because the answer to the "if" is  
>usually unknown, the actual potential error margin, in simple  
>questioning, both in corporate media polls and in ours, is unknown  
>but definitely larger than reported.

>  
>Retro Poll will continue to focus on the method of testing the  
>association between background knowledge and viewpoint and these  
>correlations will not require large numbers. We will however, try to  
>get larger poll numbers in order to further strengthen the ability

>to say that results to individual questions reflect the public's  
>views, even though we believe that this type of polling should not  
>be trusted by the public, even when the sample size is large.

--

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

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

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

=====  
Date: Sat, 20 Dec 2003 18:51:18 -0700  
Reply-To: Mike O'Neil <[mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU](mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike O'Neil <[mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU](mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU)>  
Subject: Web Survey Software  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I apologize for the extent to which this may resemble requests posted earlier, but as with much advertising we only pay attention to something when it affects us directly.

We have been using Perseus for occasional, rather straightforward web surveys. The product has been adequate for our needs up to now.

We have an application requiring the use of USERID and PASSWORDS to prevent multiple submissions. (Client is concerned about the appearance; I am convinced the actual incidence will be somewhere between nonexistent and minimal). Our version of Perseus does not support this. (We are also looking elsewhere because they are no longer supporting the version we purchased, an irritation). I would be interested in any information someone could provide about the relative features of different programs (a matrix would be ideal). I know this was done by someone years ago, but I assume anything that old is dated beyond usefulness.

Other than passwords, we need fairly basic features: skips, randomization of question order in blocks, some internal calculation ability would be nice. With passwords, we could send out reminders only to nonrespondents; we could do this manually by matching or via the program.

While it is not the way we normally operate, we would consider the use of an ASP or service bureau for this one study, but our disposition has always been to do everything in-house and own the software.

Hearing from anyone with information, especially if you have done a recent comparison, would be appreciated.

Mike O'Neil  
www.oneilresearch.com

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

=====  
Date: Sat, 20 Dec 2003 22:42:15 -0500  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Re: Retropoll  
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[p05200f01bc0a36862f37@\[192.168.1.100\]](mailto:p05200f01bc0a36862f37@[192.168.1.100])>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The presence of Justin Lewis as an advisor to Retropoll should be a clue that its "findings" are, to be charitable, a joke, and reading the materials there gives me a feeling of deja vu all over again.

As a professor at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst in 1998, Mr. Lewis was the lead author of a widely disseminated survey that supposedly demonstrated the ignorance of American voters about their elected leaders and pinned responsibility for this on the media. Cited as proof was the contention that a majority believed that Mr. Clinton was in favor of universal health coverage.

Here is the complete text of a message I sent to Mr. Lewis at the time, followed by his complete reply:

| In your recently released report you state the following:  
| \_\_\_\_\_  
|

When asked about President Clinton's position on healthcare reform, for example, respondents were given two options:

- a) That he promoted a universal system of national health insurance; or
- b) That he favored adjustments to the existing system of private insurance in order to give more people access to the system.

Although President Clinton has never advocated the first option and has consistently proposed the second, 26% chose the correct answer while a much higher percentage (59%) chose the incorrect one. Thus, given a one in two chance, most people opted for the wrong answer.

---

I would refer you to the exhaustive study of that matter conducted by the Brookings Institution (Joseph White, "Competing Solutions: American Health Care Proposals and International Experience", Brookings, 1995), which contains the following description of then-governor Clinton's statement published in the Sept. 10 1992 issue of "The New England Journal of Medicine" in which he laid out his health care plans:

'A national health board would establish a "core benefit package that must be available to every American."...Universal coverage would be "phased in by building on the public-private partnership that is uniquely American.'"

All-in-all, I believe that the majority of respondents to your survey had a far better grasp of what Clinton was actually aiming at than you and colleagues appear to give them credit for.

More disconcerting, the wording in your article (quoted above) does not match that actually used in the questionnaire, but gives no indication of this fact.

Also, while you state a range for a margin of error in this survey applicable for a simple random sample of 600 without non-response, you give no information on sampling methodology or response rates.

While this deplorable habit is the rule in the press, it is sad to see that academics don't teach better practices.

Jan Werner

---

Dear Jan Werner,

Thank you for your comments.

You imply in your message that the people are so well informed about Clinton that they are using a statement he made before he

| became President to evaluate his position on healthcare - NOT a  
| position articulated either as President or while campaigning for  
| the presidency. In the context of our survey - and all the other  
| surveys on public knowledge - this seems I'm sure you will agree,  
| decidedly implausible.

| Justin Lewis

-----  
In reply, I sent Mr. Lewis a long list of press releases from the Clinton White House web site calling for health coverage for all Americans, some of them using the specific phrase "universal health care." I did not hear back from him after that.

Here is the actual text of the question that was asked in the UMASS survey:

| 12. President Clinton tried without success to reform the Health  
| Care system in his first term. Would you say he favored: (a)  
| Moving to a national health insurance system that covers everyone,  
| or (b) Making our current private insurance system available to  
| more people?

| \* Moving to a national health insurance system that covers  
| everyone - 58.8 %

| \* Making our current private insurance system available to more  
| people - 26.2 %

| \* Other, don't know, no answer, etc. - 15.0 %

The full questionnaire and results are still available on the UMASS web site at: <http://www.umass.edu/newsoffice/archive/1998/021098study.html>

At the time I suspected that the authors of the survey may have meant to ask about a single payer health plan, but that was clearly not what the question wording said, or even implied. Mr. Lewis's failure to recognize and address this seemed to me to show a distressing lack of candor and responsibility. Looking at Retropoll, it seems more like part of an ongoing pattern.

Jan Werner

-----  
Doug Henwood wrote:

> Does anyone have any opinions about Retropoll  
> <<http://www.retropoll.org>>? In their latest release  
> <[http://www.retropoll.org/press\\_release\\_poll03.htm](http://www.retropoll.org/press_release_poll03.htm)>, they report that  
> at least one in three Americans thinks that Bush should be impeached  
> for "misleading" the public about WMDs in Iraq. The results are hard  
> to believe, but I'd be interested in hearing the specialists' views.

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

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

---

Date: Mon, 22 Dec 2003 16:36:54 -0600  
Reply-To: RASINSKI-KEN <[RASINSKI-KEN@NORC.NET](mailto:RASINSKI-KEN@NORC.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: RASINSKI-KEN <[RASINSKI-KEN@NORC.NET](mailto:RASINSKI-KEN@NORC.NET)>  
Subject: Re: AAPORNET Digest - 19 Dec 2003 to 20 Dec 2003 (#2003-93)  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Re: Retropoll, It is hard for me to imagine survey questions constructly =  
more poorly. The bias is clear in both the so-called knowledge =  
questions and in the opinion questions. =20

The following question from the November 4th poll is an amazing example =  
of being double-barrelled, of using loaded terms, and, at the same time, =  
of subtly leading respondents, or, more likely, of priming them for =  
subsequent anti-administration responses. =20

4. "Which nation has most weapons of mass destruction and supplied some =  
to Iraq?

- a) Russia (22.0%).
- b) U.S. (34.1%).
- c) North Korea (15.9%).
- d) don't know (28.0%).

I am no fan of the administration, but I do believe (as we all do) that =  
when doing surveys my opinions don't count and that the researcher has =  
to play fair. =20

The statistical defense retropoll offers for its small n is confused and =  
wrong, as well. No wonder their results are hard to believe.

Kenneth A. Rasinski, Ph.D.  
Principal Research Scientist  
NORC, at the University of Chicago  
Phone: 773-256-6278  
FAX: 773-753-7886=20

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Automatic digest =  
processor  
Sent: Saturday, December 20, 2003 11:00 PM  
To: Recipients of AAPORNET digests  
Subject: AAPORNET Digest - 19 Dec 2003 to 20 Dec 2003 (#2003-93)

There are 5 messages totalling 438 lines in this issue.

Topics of the day:

1. Retropoll (4)
2. Web Survey Software

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

Date: Sat, 20 Dec 2003 12:31:53 -0500  
From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Subject: Retropoll

Does anyone have any opinions about Retropoll =  
<<http://www.retropoll.org>>? In their latest release =  
<[http://www.retropoll.org/press\\_release\\_poll03.htm](http://www.retropoll.org/press_release_poll03.htm)>, they report that at =  
least one in three Americans thinks that Bush should be impeached for =  
"misleading" the public about WMDs in Iraq. The results are hard to =  
believe, but I'd be interested in hearing the specialists' views.

Specifically, I'd be interested in hearing what the thinking is on =  
whether the views of refusers are any different from the population that =  
consents to be polled.

Here's the text of their methodology page  
<[http://www.retropoll.org/about\\_stats.htm](http://www.retropoll.org/about_stats.htm)>:

>The most common question and concern regarding our first poll in=20  
>September 2002 on the War on Terrorism was: With a sample size of only=20  
>150 how does the power of your results hold up against the major media=20  
>polls? (which often have 800-1000 responses). A few people, instead of=20  
>asking the question, have simply told us that our sample size is too=20  
>small to be of any value.

>  
>Response: The focal point of Retro Poll's report and general=20  
>methodology is an effort to look at correlations between misinformation =

>people obtain from the mass media and their beliefs/viewpoints about=20  
>proposed government policies. The association we have shown between=20  
>having misinformation on Iraq's sponsorship of Al Qaeda terrorism on=20  
>the one hand, and a willingness to go to war with Iraq, on the other,=20  
>is very strong. Using standard statistical testing (the chi square=20  
>test) we have shown that there is almost no chance ( $p < .001$ ) that this=20  
>association is a random or accidental event. In fact, this association=20  
>is stronger than anything that the large random sample polls can say=20  
>about their results. Health researchers and statisticians usually=20  
>suggest a sample size of at least 100 to make this kind of study=20  
>useful. Retro Poll 1 obviously surpasses that standard.

>  
>Comparing Retro Poll's association of two questions (factors) to the=20  
>results of simple polls (whether major media polls or our own) is like=20  
>comparing apples and oranges. The general public needs to understand=20

>the serious weakness of public opinion research in the U.S. Most public =  
>opinion polls (including ours) have to call and speak with about 4=20  
>people before one person agrees to participate in any survey. Since=20  
>there is no way of knowing if the refusers have different or the same=20  
>views as the accepters, there is no valid way to report that a poll=20  
>really reflects the public viewpoint on anything. When polls report a=20  
>margin of error (usually 3-5%, though our small sample size generated a =  
>statistic of 6-8%) they are, to put it gently, fibbing. What they=20  
>should be saying is "if the people refusing to be polled were to have=20  
>similar views to those polled, then the results reflect those of the=20  
>general population with a margin of error of 3-5%". However, because=20  
>the answer to the "if" is usually unknown, the actual potential error=20  
>margin, in simple questioning, both in corporate media polls and in=20  
>ours, is unknown but definitely larger than reported.  
>  
>Retro Poll will continue to focus on the method of testing the=20  
>association between background knowledge and viewpoint and these=20  
>correlations will not require large numbers. We will however, try to=20  
>get larger poll numbers in order to further strengthen the ability to=20  
>say that results to individual questions reflect the public's views,=20  
>even though we believe that this type of polling should not be trusted=20  
>by the public, even when the sample size is large.

--

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

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

-----  
Date: Sat, 20 Dec 2003 13:45:36 -0500  
From: Mark Lindeman <[lindeman@BARD.EDU](mailto:lindeman@BARD.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Retropoll

Doug Henwood wrote in part:

>Does anyone have any opinions about Retropoll=20  
><<http://www.retropoll.org>>? In their latest release=20  
><[http://www.retropoll.org/press\\_release\\_poll03.htm](http://www.retropoll.org/press_release_poll03.htm)>, they report that=20



>at least one in three Americans thinks that Bush should be impeached=20  
>for "misleading" the public about WMDs in Iraq.

That inference isn't justified by the actual question wording: =  
"President Bush claimed that the US had to invade Iraq because Iraq had =  
nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. None has been found. Do you =  
think that misleading the U.S. public and Congress in order to take the =  
country into war is grounds for impeachment?" An answer of "yes" cannot =  
be construed as belief that Bush should be impeached. I think the press =  
release is, umm, pretty squirrely. I'm not very happy with the =  
questionnaire, either.

>Specifically, I'd be interested in hearing what the thinking is on=20  
>whether the views of refusers are any different from the population=20  
>that consents to be polled.

In a few minutes of nosing around the Retropoll site, I haven't found =  
any explanation of how they conduct their surveys (except that they are =  
phone surveys). If the researchers aren't doing callbacks, that could =  
skew their results quite apart from refusals.

A lot has been said about non-response here. (If people don't have =  
predetermined opinions on the answers to survey questions, then "the =  
views of refusers" -- as defined and measured by those questions -- =  
arguably just don't exist.) I do think that refusers may differ =  
markedly from participants in some cases, and that for this reason the =  
"true" margins of error arguably are larger than the reported ones. I =  
don't understand whether this fact is supposed to make us feel better =  
about Retropoll's sample sizes. But it's true that if the surveys are =  
basically conducted with decent methods, then sample sizes of 150 should =  
give us at least a back-of-the-envelope sense of how a bigger survey =  
would turn out. Apparently at least a substantial minority of Americans =  
would answer this question "Yes" -- whatever that implies about their =  
beliefs.

Mark Lindeman  
Bard College

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

-----  
Date: Sat, 20 Dec 2003 14:40:31 -0500  
From: Allen Barton <[allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:allenbarton@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Retropoll

Mark Lindman is right that saying "yes" that "misleading the U.S. public =  
and Congress in order to take the country into war is grounds for =  
impeachment" does not imply accepting the two sentences that led up to =  
the question - respondents could believe that there were other good =  
reasons than weapons of mass destruction to invade Iraq, or they could =

believe that they have in fact been found or may still be found.

Another issue is that the statistical significance of a correlation = between believing that Iraq was involved with Al Qaeda and willingness = to go to war does not tell us how many people were influenced to support = the war by that particular piece of misinformation. If the correlation = were reported it would tell us "how much of the variation" in = willingness to go to war is "predicted" by the misinformation, but that = would still not show the causal influence of that misinformation. It may = be associated with other beliefs which are also important, and if these = beliefs were entered in a multiple regression to predict willingness to = go to war, the coefficient for the "Al Qaeda" belief would surely be = lower than the uncontrolled correlation. The statistical significance = does not measure the size of the association let alone the independent = contribution of that item.

One can agree that the Administration's exploitation of misinformation = about Al Qaeda connections shows contempt for the American people, and = that its statements claiming absolute certainty that Iraq had weapons of = mass destruction, when what they had was mixed intelligence and at best = a strong suspicion, was a dishonest attempt to stampede the Congress and = the public. However the "Retropoll" operation and analysis looks pretty = amateurish and is also misleadingly reported.

Allen Barton

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

From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>

Sent: Dec 20, 2003 12:31 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Retropoll

Does anyone have any opinions about Retropoll = <<http://www.retropoll.org>>? In their latest release = <[http://www.retropoll.org/press\\_release\\_poll03.htm](http://www.retropoll.org/press_release_poll03.htm)>, they report that at = least one in three Americans thinks that Bush should be impeached for = "misleading" the public about WMDs in Iraq. The results are hard to = believe, but I'd be interested in hearing the specialists' views.

Specifically, I'd be interested in hearing what the thinking is on = whether the views of refusers are any different from the population that = consents to be polled.

Here's the text of their methodology page  
<[http://www.retropoll.org/about\\_stats.htm](http://www.retropoll.org/about_stats.htm)>:

>The most common question and concern regarding our first poll in=20  
>September 2002 on the War on Terrorism was: With a sample size of only=20  
>150 how does the power of your results hold up against the major media=20  
>polls? (which often have 800-1000 responses). A few people, instead of=20  
>asking the question, have simply told us that our sample size is too=20  
>small to be of any value.  
>  
>Response: The focal point of Retro Poll's report and general=20  
>methodology is an effort to look at correlations between misinformation =

>people obtain from the mass media and their beliefs/viewpoints about=20  
>proposed government policies. The association we have shown between=20  
>having misinformation on Iraq's sponsorship of Al Qaeda terrorism on=20  
>the one hand, and a willingness to go to war with Iraq, on the other,=20  
>is very strong. Using standard statistical testing (the chi square=20  
>test) we have shown that there is almost no chance ( $p<.001$ ) that this=20  
>association is a random or accidental event. In fact, this association=20  
>is stronger than anything that the large random sample polls can say=20  
>about their results. Health researchers and statisticians usually=20  
>suggest a sample size of at least 100 to make this kind of study=20  
>useful. Retro Poll 1 obviously surpasses that standard.

>  
>Comparing Retro Poll's association of two questions (factors) to the=20  
>results of simple polls (whether major media polls or our own) is like=20  
>comparing apples and oranges. The general public needs to understand=20  
>the serious weakness of public opinion research in the U.S. Most public =

>opinion polls (including ours) have to call and speak with about 4=20  
>people before one person agrees to participate in any survey. Since=20  
>there is no way of knowing if the refusers have different or the same=20  
>views as the accepters, there is no valid way to report that a poll=20  
>really reflects the public viewpoint on anything. When polls report a=20  
>margin of error (usually 3-5%, though our small sample size generated a =

>statistic of 6-8%) they are, to put it gently, fibbing. What they=20  
>should be saying is "if the people refusing to be polled were to have=20  
>similar views to those polled, then the results reflect those of the=20  
>general population with a margin of error of 3-5%". However, because=20  
>the answer to the "if" is usually unknown, the actual potential error=20  
>margin, in simple questioning, both in corporate media polls and in=20  
>ours, is unknown but definitely larger than reported.

>  
>Retro Poll will continue to focus on the method of testing the=20  
>association between background knowledge and viewpoint and these=20  
>correlations will not require large numbers. We will however, try to=20  
>get larger poll numbers in order to further strengthen the ability to=20  
>say that results to individual questions reflect the public's views,=20  
>even though we believe that this type of polling should not be trusted=20  
>by the public, even when the sample size is large.

--

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

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

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

-----  
Date: Sat, 20 Dec 2003 18:51:18 -0700  
From: Mike O'Neil <[mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU](mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU)>  
Subject: Web Survey Software

I apologize for the extent to which this may resemble requests posted earlier, but as with much advertising we only pay attention to something when it affects us directly.

We have been using Perseus for occasional, rather straightforward web surveys. The product has been adequate for our needs up to now.

We have an application requiring the use of USERID and PASSWORDS to prevent multiple submissions. (Client is concerned about the appearance; I am convinced the actual incidence will be somewhere between nonexistent and minimal). Our version of Perseus does not support this. (We are also looking elsewhere because they are no longer supporting the version we purchased, an irritation). I would be interested in any information someone could provide about the relative features of different programs (a matrix would be ideal). I know this was done by someone years ago, but I assume anything that old is dated beyond usefulness.

Other than passwords, we need fairly basic features: skips, randomization of question order in blocks, some internal calculation ability would be nice. With passwords, we could send out reminders only to nonrespondents; we could do this manually by matching or via the program.

While it is not the way we normally operate, we would consider the use of an ASP or service bureau for this one study, but our disposition has always been to do everything in-house and own the software.

Hearing from anyone with information, especially if you have done a recent comparison, would be appreciated.

Mike O'Neil  
[www.oneilresearch.com](http://www.oneilresearch.com)

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

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

-----  
Date: Sat, 20 Dec 2003 22:42:15 -0500  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Retropoll

The presence of Justin Lewis as an advisor to Retropoll should be a clue = that its "findings" are, to be charitable, a joke, and reading the = materials there gives me a feeling of deja vu all over again.

As a professor at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst in 1998, Mr. = Lewis was the lead author of a widely disseminated survey that = supposedly demonstrated the ignorance of American voters about their = elected leaders and pinned responsibility for this on the media. Cited = as proof was the contention that a majority believed that Mr. Clinton = was in favor of universal health coverage.

Here is the complete text of a message I sent to Mr. Lewis at the time, = followed by his complete reply:

| In your recently released report you state the following:=20

| \_\_\_\_\_  
| When asked about President Clinton's position on healthcare reform,=20  
| for example, respondents were given two options:

| a) That he promoted a universal system of national health insurance;=20  
| or

| b) That he favored adjustments to the existing system of private=20  
| insurance in order to give more people access to the system.

| Although President Clinton has never advocated the first option and=20  
| has consistently proposed the second, 26% chose the correct answer=20  
| while a much higher percentage (59%) chose the incorrect one. =20  
| Thus,given a one in two chance, most people opted for the wrong=20  
| answer. \_\_\_\_\_

| I would refer you to the exhaustive study of that matter conducted by=20  
| the Brookings Institution (Joseph White, "Competing Solutions:=20  
| American Health Care Proposals and International Experience",=20  
| Brookings, 1995), which contains the following description of=20  
| then-governor Clinton's statement published in the Sept. 10 1992 issue =

| of "The New England Journal of Medicine" in which he laid out his=20  
| health care plans:

| 'A national health board would establish a "core benefit package that=20  
| must be available to every American."...Universal coverage would be=20

"phased in by building on the public-private partnership that is uniquely American."

All-in-all, I believe that the majority of respondents to your survey had a far better grasp of what Clinton was actually aiming at than you =

and colleagues appear to give them credit for.

More disconcerting, the wording in your article (quoted above) does not match that actually used in the questionnaire, but gives no indication of this fact.

Also, while you state a range for a margin of error in this survey applicable for a simple random sample of 600 without non-response, you =

give no information on sampling methodology or response rates.

While this deplorable habit is the rule in the press, it is sad to see =

that academics don't teach better practices.

Jan Werner

-----  
Dear Jan Werner,

Thank you for your comments.

You imply in your message that the people are so well informed about Clinton that they are using a statement he made before he became President to evaluate his position on healthcare - NOT a position articulated either as President or while campaigning for the presidency. In the context of our survey - and all the other surveys on public knowledge - this seems I'm sure you will agree, decidedly implausible.

Justin Lewis

-----  
In reply, I sent Mr. Lewis a long list of press releases from the Clinton White House web site calling for health coverage for all Americans, some of them using the specific phrase "universal health care." I did not hear back from him after that.

Here is the actual text of the question that was asked in the UMASS survey:

12. President Clinton tried without success to reform the Health Care system in his first term. Would you say he favored: (a) Moving to a national health insurance system that covers everyone, or (b) Making our current private insurance system available to more people?

- \* Moving to a national health insurance system that covers everyone --20  
58.8 %
- \* Making our current private insurance system available to more people =  
- 26.2 %
- \* Other, don't know, no answer, etc. - 15.0 %

The full questionnaire and results are still available on the UMASS web =  
site at: <http://www.umass.edu/newsoffice/archive/1998/021098study.html>

At the time I suspected that the authors of the survey may have meant to =  
ask about a single payer health plan, but that was clearly not what the =  
question wording said, or even implied. Mr. Lewis's failure to recognize =  
and address this seemed to me to show a distressing lack of candor and =  
responsibility. Looking at Retropoll, it seems more like part of an =  
ongoing pattern.

Jan Werner

---

Doug Henwood wrote:

- > Does anyone have any opinions about Retropoll=20
- > <<http://www.retropoll.org>>? In their latest release=20
- > <[http://www.retropoll.org/press\\_release\\_poll03.htm](http://www.retropoll.org/press_release_poll03.htm)>, they report that=20
- > at least one in three Americans thinks that Bush should be impeached=20
- > for "misleading" the public about WMDs in Iraq. The results are hard=20
- > to believe, but I'd be interested in hearing the specialists' views.

---

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

---

End of AAPORNET Digest - 19 Dec 2003 to 20 Dec 2003 (#2003-93)

\*\*\*\*\*

---

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

---

Date: Mon, 22 Dec 2003 18:44:09 -0500  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Subject: Retropoll's tiny n  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[A9C06F2DBB0E8740B1FAD1DAC5CDFBC4223D8A@Xchange.ad2](mailto:A9C06F2DBB0E8740B1FAD1DAC5CDFBC4223D8A@Xchange.ad2)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

RASINSKI-KEN wrote:

>The statistical defense retropoll offers for its small n is confused  
>and wrong, as well. No wonder their results are hard to believe.

I've been filling the director's inbox with critiques - I thought doing the "factual" questions first stacked the "opinion" results in indefensible ways (and I'm politically sympathetic to these guys - but I prefer rigor and honesty). So could you expand on this bit?

--

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

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 23 Dec 2003 08:01:44 -0500  
Reply-To: [RFunk787@AOL.COM](mailto:RFunk787@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "G. Ray Funkhouser" <[RFunk787@AOL.COM](mailto:RFunk787@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: 2002 Exit Polls  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

from Opinionjournal.com (Wall Street Journal)

Missing Surveys Bode Ill for 2004 Democrats

The missing exit polls for the 2002 mid-term elections have finally been released and they offer strong evidence that the country is not as politically polarized as generally alleged. Rather, the national consensus has been shifting steadily to the right.

The Voter News Service, a media consortium that interviewed thousands of voters as they left the polls, didn't deliver its results on Election Night last year because of computer errors and other glitches. After some scrubbing for suspect numbers in individual states, the surveys paint a picture of a country that is not nearly as divided on a political knife-edge as conventional wisdom has it. In the 2000 presidential and House races, America may have been split exactly down the middle. But in 2002, Republicans opened up a gap. The GOP won



the national vote for House seats by 51% to 46% and voters who identified themselves as "conservative" increased to 34% from 30%.

Even more importantly, the number of self-identified "liberals" shrank in 2002 despite all the frantic efforts of Michael Moore and Al Franken to whip up the troops. GOP pollster David Winston notes that, in 2002, the number of self-identified liberals dipped to the lowest level in the past four elections

--  
17%. "Moderates" continued to dominate the electorate, representing 49% of all votes cast.

If the 2002 exit poll numbers were duplicated in next year's presidential electorate, the sledding would be rough for a liberal candidate. He or she would have to carry the Democratic base plus pick up "moderate" voters by a 2 to 1 margin. That's why if Howard Dean becomes the Democratic nominee, you can expect he will madly dash to the center, spewing rhetoric about balanced budgets and the need to leave social issues out of the campaign. But Democratic consultants wonder if a man who has called for repealing all the Bush tax cuts and signed a bill legalizing civil unions for gays in Vermont can pull off that trick.

--John Fund

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

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

-----  
Date: Tue, 23 Dec 2003 10:09:58 -0500  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Re: 2002 Exit Polls  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[67.1ef4d6a9.2d1996b8@aol.com](mailto:67.1ef4d6a9.2d1996b8@aol.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Interesting how some people who denigrate polls when they don't show what they like can suddenly treat them as gospel when they do.

The problem with this WSJ opinion piece is that, even if the exit poll results were accurate (and accurately characterised), they would still only describe only those people who actually voted in 2002.

A widely held opinion about the 2002 midterm elections is that Democrats fared poorly because they were not able to motivate their supporters to go to the polls for several reasons: because candidates presented were not inspiring, because so few races are competitive after increasingly

sophisticated gerrymandering, or simply because so many Democrats have lost faith in the electoral process after the what is perceived as the blatantly unfair outcome of the 2000 Presidential election.

Both sides believe the real challenge of the 2004 election will be to persuade supporters to get out and vote. This may well explain why so many Democratic leaders who might be expected to prefer one of the more "establishment" candidates have thrown their weight behind Howard Dean, seeing him as perhaps better able to get disaffected Democratic voters engaged enough to shake off their doldrums and go to the polls.

Jan Werner

---

G. Ray Funkhouser wrote:

> from Opinionjournal.com (Wall Street Journal)

>

> Missing Surveys Bode Ill for 2004 Democrats

>

> The missing exit polls for the 2002 mid-term elections have finally been

> released and they offer strong evidence that the country is not as

politically

> polarized as generally alleged. Rather, the national consensus has been

shifting

> steadily to the right.

> The Voter News Service, a media consortium that interviewed thousands of

> voters as they left the polls, didn't deliver its results on Election Night

last

> year because of computer errors and other glitches. After some scrubbing for

> suspect numbers in individual states, the surveys paint a picture of a

country

> that is not nearly as divided on a political knife-edge as conventional

wisdom

> has it. In the 2000 presidential and House races, America may have been

split

> exactly down the middle. But in 2002, Republicans opened up a gap. The GOP

won

> the national vote for House seats by 51% to 46% and voters who identified

> themselves as "conservative" increased to 34% from 30%.

>

> Even more importantly, the number of self-identified "liberals" shrank in

> 2002 despite all the frantic efforts of Michael Moore and Al Franken to whip

up

> the troops. GOP pollster David Winston notes that, in 2002, the number of

> self-identified liberals dipped to the lowest level in the past four

elections --

> 17%. "Moderates" continued to dominate the electorate, representing 49% of

all

> votes cast.

> If the 2002 exit poll numbers were duplicated in next year's presidential

> electorate, the sledding would be rough for a liberal candidate. He or she

would

> have to carry the Democratic base plus pick up "moderate" voters by a 2 to 1

> margin. That's why if Howard Dean becomes the Democratic nominee, you can

> expect he will madly dash to the center, spewing rhetoric about balanced budgets  
> and the need to leave social issues out of the campaign. But Democratic  
> consultants wonder if a man who has called for repealing all the Bush tax cuts and  
> signed a bill legalizing civil unions for gays in Vermont can pull off that  
> trick.

> --John Fund

>

>

> -----

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

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

> signoff aapornet

>

>

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

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

signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Tue, 23 Dec 2003 10:23:11 -0500

Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)

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

From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>

Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing

Subject: "Gay Marriage Pollsters Discuss Strategy"

Comments: To: AAPORNET <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Monday's "All Things Considered" program on NPR featured a fascinating discussion between Kathy Frankovic and Adam Clymer of the contradictory results reported by the CBS/NYT Poll and the Anneberg Project on the subject of support for a Constitutional Amendment to ban gay marriage.

The full 5:42 minute segment can be heard at:

<http://discover.npr.org/rundowns/segment.jhtml?wfId=1565949>

I know that headline writers need to make things short and punchy, but "Gay Marriage Pollsters Discuss Strategy?"

Jan Werner

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

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

signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Tue, 23 Dec 2003 10:22:45 -0500

Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>

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

From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>  
Subject: Re: 2002 Exit Polls  
Comments: To: "jwerner@jwdp.com" <jwerner@jwdp.com>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

Another interpretation of Fund's column is that he is one more conservative voice who is predicting a landslide victory for President Bush if Dr. Dean is the Democratic nominee [cf. today's editorial in the NYTimes by David Brooks, Andrew Sullivan's comments]. What possible motivation could conservative writers have for warning Democrats to beware a Dean Debacle? A spirit of fair play? Wanting to have a level playing field? Or could they have an intuition that Dean just might be able to best Bush in a head-to-head debate and ultimately in the election?

If anyone kept track of the Times/CBS daily polls in 2000, they would have seen that, until the night of the first debate, the Democratic Ticket held a consistent lead of 6-7 percentage points over the Republicans; from the day after the debate until the last weekend before the vote, when news of Bush's DUI was circulated, the Republicans held a consistent 5% lead, which made the final result very close to a dead heat.

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
Research Specialist  
Michigan State University  
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research  
517-355-6672

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

From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM]  
Sent: Tuesday, December 23, 2003 10:10 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: 2002 Exit Polls

Interesting how some people who denigrate polls when they don't show what they like can suddenly treat them as gospel when they do.

The problem with this WSJ opinion piece is that, even if the exit poll results were accurate (and accurately characterised), they would still only describe only those people who actually voted in 2002.

A widely held opinion about the 2002 midterm elections is that Democrats fared poorly because they were not able to motivate their supporters to go to the polls for several reasons: because candidates presented were not inspiring, because so few races are competitive after increasingly sophisticated gerrymandering, or simply because so many Democrats have lost faith in the electoral process after the what is perceived as the blatantly unfair outcome of the 2000 Presidential election.

Both sides believe the real challenge of the 2004 election will be to persuade supporters to get out and vote. This may well explain why so many Democratic leaders who might be expected to prefer one of the more "establishment" candidates have thrown their weight behind Howard Dean, seeing him as perhaps better able to get disaffected Democratic voters engaged enough to shake off their doldrums and go to the polls.

Jan Werner

---

G. Ray Funkhouser wrote:

> from Opinionjournal.com (Wall Street Journal)

>

> Missing Surveys Bode Ill for 2004 Democrats

>

> The missing exit polls for the 2002 mid-term elections have finally been

> released and they offer strong evidence that the country is not as politically

> polarized as generally alleged. Rather, the national consensus has been shifting

> steadily to the right.

> The Voter News Service, a media consortium that interviewed thousands of

> voters as they left the polls, didn't deliver its results on Election

Night last

> year because of computer errors and other glitches. After some scrubbing for

> suspect numbers in individual states, the surveys paint a picture of a country

> that is not nearly as divided on a political knife-edge as conventional wisdom

> has it. In the 2000 presidential and House races, America may have been split

> exactly down the middle. But in 2002, Republicans opened up a gap. The GOP won

> the national vote for House seats by 51% to 46% and voters who identified

> themselves as "conservative" increased to 34% from 30%.

>

> Even more importantly, the number of self-identified "liberals" shrank in

> 2002 despite all the frantic efforts of Michael Moore and Al Franken to

whip up

> the troops. GOP pollster David Winston notes that, in 2002, the number of

> self-identified liberals dipped to the lowest level in the past four

elections --

> 17%. "Moderates" continued to dominate the electorate, representing 49% of all

> votes cast.

> If the 2002 exit poll numbers were duplicated in next year's presidential

> electorate, the sledding would be rough for a liberal candidate. He or she would

> have to carry the Democratic base plus pick up "moderate" voters by a 2 to

1

> margin. That's why if Howard Dean becomes the Democratic nominee, you can

> expect he will madly dash to the center, spewing rhetoric about balanced budgets

> and the need to leave social issues out of the campaign. But Democratic

> consultants wonder if a man who has called for repealing all the Bush tax cuts and

> signed a bill legalizing civil unions for gays in Vermont can pull off

that

> trick.

> --John Fund

>

>

> -----

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

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

> signoff aapornet

>

>

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

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

signoff aapornet

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

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

signoff aapornet

=====  
Date: Tue, 23 Dec 2003 10:22:16 -0500

Reply-To: Larry Shiman <[lshiman@OPINIONDYNAMICS.COM](mailto:lshiman@OPINIONDYNAMICS.COM)>

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

From: Larry Shiman <[lshiman@OPINIONDYNAMICS.COM](mailto:lshiman@OPINIONDYNAMICS.COM)>

Subject: Re: 2002 Exit Polls

Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The major problem with the article in my opinion is that it is about = labels, not actual political beliefs. There's an assumption in it that = what makes a self-described "conservative", "moderate", and "liberal" = has remained constant over time, and I don't believe that assumption = holds water. People who may have at one time described themselves as = "liberals" may now call themselves "moderates" without actually changing = positions on any substantive issues, and without changing their party = affiliation. =20

Many self-described moderates are Democrats, and will vote against Bush = based on party affiliation alone. Others are Republicans. Of course = both candidates will campaign towards the center - that's where the = swing votes are. That's why Bush campaigned largely as a moderate in the = 2000 election. The percentage of self-described "liberals", = "moderates", and "conservatives" means very little for the 2004 = election.

Larry Shiman

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

From: Jan Werner [<mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM>]

Sent: Tuesday, December 23, 2003 10:10 AM

To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

Subject: Re: 2002 Exit Polls

Interesting how some people who denigrate polls when they don't show what they like can suddenly treat them as gospel when they do.

The problem with this WSJ opinion piece is that, even if the exit poll results were accurate (and accurately characterised), they would still only describe only those people who actually voted in 2002.

A widely held opinion about the 2002 midterm elections is that Democrats fared poorly because they were not able to motivate their supporters to go to the polls for several reasons: because candidates presented were not inspiring, because so few races are competitive after increasingly sophisticated gerrymandering, or simply because so many Democrats have lost faith in the electoral process after the what is perceived as the blatantly unfair outcome of the 2000 Presidential election.

Both sides believe the real challenge of the 2004 election will be to persuade supporters to get out and vote. This may well explain why so many Democratic leaders who might be expected to prefer one of the more "establishment" candidates have thrown their weight behind Howard Dean, seeing him as perhaps better able to get disaffected Democratic voters engaged enough to shake off their doldrums and go to the polls.

Jan Werner

---

G. Ray Funkhouser wrote:

> from Opinionjournal.com (Wall Street Journal)  
>  
> Missing Surveys Bode Ill for 2004 Democrats  
>  
> The missing exit polls for the 2002 mid-term elections have finally =  
been  
> released and they offer strong evidence that the country is not as =  
politically  
> polarized as generally alleged. Rather, the national consensus has =  
been shifting  
> steadily to the right.  
> The Voter News Service, a media consortium that interviewed thousands =  
of  
> voters as they left the polls, didn't deliver its results on Election =  
Night last  
> year because of computer errors and other glitches. After some =  
scrubbing for  
> suspect numbers in individual states, the surveys paint a picture of a =  
country  
> that is not nearly as divided on a political knife-edge as =  
conventional wisdom  
> has it. In the 2000 presidential and House races, America may have =  
been split  
> exactly down the middle. But in 2002, Republicans opened up a gap. The =  
GOP won  
> the national vote for House seats by 51% to 46% and voters who =

identified  
> themselves as "conservative" increased to 34% from 30%.  
>  
> Even more importantly, the number of self-identified "liberals" shrank =  
in  
> 2002 despite all the frantic efforts of Michael Moore and Al Franken =  
to whip up  
> the troops. GOP pollster David Winston notes that, in 2002, the number =  
of  
> self-identified liberals dipped to the lowest level in the past four =  
elections --  
> 17%. "Moderates" continued to dominate the electorate, representing =  
49% of all  
> votes cast.  
> If the 2002 exit poll numbers were duplicated in next year's =  
presidential  
> electorate, the sledding would be rough for a liberal candidate. He or =  
she would  
> have to carry the Democratic base plus pick up "moderate" voters by a =  
2 to 1  
> margin. That's why if Howard Dean becomes the Democratic nominee, you =  
can  
> expect he will madly dash to the center, spewing rhetoric about =  
balanced budgets  
> and the need to leave social issues out of the campaign. But =  
Democratic  
> consultants wonder if a man who has called for repealing all the Bush =  
tax cuts and  
> signed a bill legalizing civil unions for gays in Vermont can pull off =  
that  
> trick.  
> --John Fund  
>  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet  
>  
>

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

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

-----  
Date: Tue, 23 Dec 2003 10:35:55 -0500  
Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>



From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>  
Subject: Re: 2002 Exit Polls  
Comments: To: Larry Shiman <lshiman@OPINIONDYNAMICS.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

The data we collect in our Michigan State of the State poll is interesting in that self-described independents are virtually identical demographically and attitudinally to self-described Democrats, and distinct from Republicans.

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
Research Specialist  
Michigan State University  
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research  
517-355-6672

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

From: Larry Shiman [mailto:lshiman@OPINIONDYNAMICS.COM]  
Sent: Tuesday, December 23, 2003 10:22 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: 2002 Exit Polls

The major problem with the article in my opinion is that it is about labels, not actual political beliefs. There's an assumption in it that what makes a self-described "conservative", "moderate", and "liberal" has remained constant over time, and I don't believe that assumption holds water. People who may have at one time described themselves as "liberals" may now call themselves "moderates" without actually changing positions on any substantive issues, and without changing their party affiliation.

Many self-described moderates are Democrats, and will vote against Bush based on party affiliation alone. Others are Republicans. Of course both candidates will campaign towards the center - that's where the swing votes are. That's why Bush campaigned largely as a moderate in the 2000 election. The percentage of self-described "liberals", "moderates", and "conservatives" means very little for the 2004 election.

Larry Shiman

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

From: Jan Werner [mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM]  
Sent: Tuesday, December 23, 2003 10:10 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: 2002 Exit Polls

Interesting how some people who denigrate polls when they don't show what they like can suddenly treat them as gospel when they do.

The problem with this WSJ opinion piece is that, even if the exit poll results were accurate (and accurately characterised), they would still only describe only those people who actually voted in 2002.

A widely held opinion about the 2002 midterm elections is that Democrats fared poorly because they were not able to motivate their supporters to go to the polls for several reasons: because candidates presented were not inspiring, because so few races are competitive after increasingly sophisticated gerrymandering, or simply because so many Democrats have lost faith in the electoral process after the what is perceived as the blatantly unfair outcome of the 2000 Presidential election.

Both sides believe the real challenge of the 2004 election will be to persuade supporters to get out and vote. This may well explain why so many Democratic leaders who might be expected to prefer one of the more "establishment" candidates have thrown their weight behind Howard Dean, seeing him as perhaps better able to get disaffected Democratic voters engaged enough to shake off their doldrums and go to the polls.

Jan Werner

---

G. Ray Funkhouser wrote:

> from Opinionjournal.com (Wall Street Journal)

>

> Missing Surveys Bode Ill for 2004 Democrats

>

> The missing exit polls for the 2002 mid-term elections have finally been

> released and they offer strong evidence that the country is not as politically

> polarized as generally alleged. Rather, the national consensus has been shifting

> steadily to the right.

> The Voter News Service, a media consortium that interviewed thousands of

> voters as they left the polls, didn't deliver its results on Election

Night last

> year because of computer errors and other glitches. After some scrubbing for

> suspect numbers in individual states, the surveys paint a picture of a country

> that is not nearly as divided on a political knife-edge as conventional wisdom

> has it. In the 2000 presidential and House races, America may have been split

> exactly down the middle. But in 2002, Republicans opened up a gap. The GOP won

> the national vote for House seats by 51% to 46% and voters who identified

> themselves as "conservative" increased to 34% from 30%.

>

> Even more importantly, the number of self-identified "liberals" shrank in

> 2002 despite all the frantic efforts of Michael Moore and Al Franken to

whip up

> the troops. GOP pollster David Winston notes that, in 2002, the number of

> self-identified liberals dipped to the lowest level in the past four

elections --

> 17%. "Moderates" continued to dominate the electorate, representing 49% of

all

> votes cast.  
> If the 2002 exit poll numbers were duplicated in next year's presidential  
> electorate, the sledding would be rough for a liberal candidate. He or she  
would  
> have to carry the Democratic base plus pick up "moderate" voters by a 2 to  
1  
> margin. That's why if Howard Dean becomes the Democratic nominee, you can  
> expect he will madly dash to the center, spewing rhetoric about balanced  
budgets  
> and the need to leave social issues out of the campaign. But Democratic  
> consultants wonder if a man who has called for repealing all the Bush tax  
cuts and  
> signed a bill legalizing civil unions for gays in Vermont can pull off  
that  
> trick.  
> --John Fund  
>  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Unsubscribe? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> signoff aapornet  
>  
>

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

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

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 31 Dec 2003 12:44:08 -0500  
Reply-To: Angell Beza <[abeza@IRSS.UNC.EDU](mailto:abeza@IRSS.UNC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Angell Beza <[abeza@IRSS.UNC.EDU](mailto:abeza@IRSS.UNC.EDU)>  
Subject: Job Opening  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

Immediate Opening at Univ of North Carolina at  
Chapel Hill: Research statistician with social  
science survey experience. Detailed description  
at: [www.odum.unc.edu](http://www.odum.unc.edu) and click on Job Opening  
on right side of first screen.

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

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