

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 LOG0401"

Date: Mon, 5 Jan 2004 10:14:40 -0700
Reply-To: Doris Northrup <coda89@AOL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doris Northrup <coda89@AOL.COM>
Subject: Opening for Project Manager in NC
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

CODA, Inc., a health research organization, seeks a Project Manager for longitudinal epidemiological study conducted for NIEHS in our Durham, NC office. Position involves providing support to the Study Director in management of telephone screening and interviewing, in-field specimen collection and general study operations. Project Manager will provide oversight to: activities of a subcontractor operating a telephone hotline for disseminating study information and enrolling eligible volunteers; CATI interviewing activity conducted in CODA=92s Telephone Research Center with a=

staff of 35 interviewers, a telephone center manager and several supervisors and support staff; data collection activities of a subcontractor completing CATI interviews from a Western call center; activities of a subcontractor responsible for in-home biological and environmental specimen data collection; receipt of self-administered questionnaires from participants; tracing operations to maintain contact with participants over a 10-year period; and general study operations. More information about this study can be found at: <http://www.sisterstudy.org>. Candidates should have minimum of 5+ years of project management, including telephone survey management. Preferred candidate will have solid background in management of CATI and Web-based survey operations. Salary negotiable. (EOE M/F/H/V) Please send resume to Doris Northrup, President, CODA, Inc., 1100 Wayne Avenue, Suite 750, Silver Spring, MD 20901.

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

Date: Mon, 5 Jan 2004 10:10:39 -0800
Reply-To: Christopher Moore <chrismoore77@YAHOO.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Christopher Moore <chrismoore77@YAHOO.COM>
Subject: Iowa Poll
Comments: To: aapor@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Does anyone know who is conducting the last Iowa poll before the Jan 19
Caucus?

Also, any word on the questionnaire/methodology? I am particularly interested
in the wording of the horserace question.

Thanks,
Chris Moore

Do you Yahoo!?
Free Pop-Up Blocker - Get it now

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

Date: Mon, 5 Jan 2004 21:33:36 -0500
Reply-To: Gary Andres <Gary.Andres@DUTKOGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Gary Andres <Gary.Andres@DUTKOGROUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Iowa Poll
Comments: To: Christopher Moore <chrismoore77@YAHOO.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=utf-8
Content-transfer-encoding: base64

```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l
NzdAWUFIT08uQ09NXSANCglTZW50OibNbn24gMS81LzlwMDQgMT0xMCBQTSANCglUbzogQUFQT1JO
RVRAYXN1LmVkdSANCglDYzogDQoJU3ViamVjdDogSW93YSBQb2xscDQoJDQoJDQoJJDQoNCglEbzVzIGFu
eW9uZSBBrbm93IHdobyBpcyBjb25kdWN0aW5nIHRoZSBsYXN0IElvd2EgcG9sbCBiZWZvcuUgdGhl
IEphbiAxOSBDYXVjdXN0IA0KDQoJQWxzbywgYW55IHdvcuUgdG8gdGhIHF1ZXN0aW9uYWlyZS9t
ZXR0b2RvbG9neT8gSSBhbSBwYXJ0aWN1bG9yYbHkgaW50ZXJlc3RlZCBpbiB0aGUgd29yZGlzYyBv
ZiB0aGUgaG9yc2VyaWN0IHFI1ZXN0aW9uLiANCg0KCVRoYW5rcywgDQoJQ2hyaXN0aW9uZGUgDQoN
Cg0KDQoNCgktLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0t
IT8gDQoJRnJlZSBQb3AtVXAgaG9yY2tciAtIEdldCBpdCBub3cgDQoNCgktLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0t
LS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tIA0KCUFY2hpdmVzOiBodHRw
Oi8vbGlzdHMuaXN1LmVkdS9hcmNoaXZlc9hYXBvcuUgdG8gdG81sIA0KCVVuc3Vic2NyaWJlPyBT
ZW5kIGVtYWlsIHRvIGxpc3RzZXJ2QGZdS5lZHUgd2l0aCB0aGlzIHRleHQ6IA0KCNpZ25vZmYg
YWFwb3JuZXQgDQoNCg==
```

Date: Tue, 6 Jan 2004 09:55:24 -0500

Reply-To: Jane Sheppard Miller <janemiller53@NEO.RR.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jane Sheppard Miller <janemiller53@NEO.RR.COM>
Subject: CMOR Third Annual Respondent Cooperation Workshop
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Make a New Year's resolution to get involved with the research industry =
in two easy steps!

- > First step is to register and attend CMOR's Third Annual =
Respondent Cooperation Workshop. =20
- > Second step, pass this information along to your colleagues =
and clients who may not have received this message.

The workshop is being held March 2-3, 2004 at The Flamingo Hotel in Las =
Vegas. =20

For the 1st time, we're combining legislative and technological research =
issues and data collection topics! This comprehensive program will =
cover all facets of Survey Research and features speakers from such =
organizations as: Harris Interactive, GfK Custom Research, Bureau of =
Labor Statistics, Arbitron, The Urban Institute, Disney, and Marketing =
Systems Group.

After two comprehensive days you'll leave with:

- =A7 Information and practices you can implement in your own =
organization to increase respondent cooperation rates,=20
- =A7 Improved awareness of industry efforts to improve relations =
with the public, and=20
- =A7 Creative solutions to safeguard the research industry's most =
important asset - the respondent.=20

For the complete agenda and registration details visit =
http://www.cmor.org/resp_coop_events.htm=20

Jane Sheppard Miller
Director Respondent Cooperation=20
CMOR...Promoting & Advocating Survey Research
2899 MacDuff Dr. N.W.
North Canton, OH 44720
Phone: 330-244-8616
Fax: 330-244-8626
Email: jmiller@cmor.org
Website: www.cmor.org

Available ! 2003 Respondent Cooperation & Industry Image Study Report
Mark Your Calendar! Respondent Cooperation Workshop - March 2-3, =
2004, Las Vegas Flamingo Hotel

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

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

Date: Wed, 7 Jan 2004 13:26:58 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Poll on GMOs misleads, some say
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Ukiah Daily Journal

Poll on GMOs misleads, some say
Measure H proponents charge it's intended to manipulate the voters
By GLENDA ANDERSON/The Daily Journal
<http://www.ukiahdailyjournal.com/Stories/0,1413,91~3089~1875942,00.html#>

Wednesday, January 07, 2004 -

Opponents of a ballot measure that would ban the growing of genetically modified crops in Mendocino County confirmed this week they're conducting a poll in Mendocino County.

According to Measure H proponents, the California Plant Health Association's survey is a "push poll" designed to manipulate voters into checking the no box on their ballots.

"It's a really duplicitous and heavy-hitting negative distortion of facts," said Measure H spokeswoman Laura Hamburg. She said the American Association for Public Opinion Research -- an organization concerned with professional polling standards -- said it will investigate the allegation.

Steve Beckley, president of the Sacramento-based plant association, said he's not sure what push polling is. However, he did say the organization's polling questions require more than simple yes or no answers.

"The polling will let us know exactly where we are in this issue," Beckley said. He said he does not know what the survey questions are.

SNIP

According to American Association for Public Opinion President Elizabeth Martin, polls that give out information and ask theoretical questions are legitimate, as long as the information is factual.

According to Hamburg, the questions being reported to her are not.

SNIP

Another bit of false information being propagated by the polling company -- Promark Research, of Houston -- is that Greenpeace favors genetically

modified organisms, Hamburg said.

Several people who've been polled said they found the poll appalling.

"It felt as though they were looking for the item that was going to influence me to change my point of view," said Sharon Kiichli.

She said only one of the questions she was asked was positive about Measure H, the other 14, or so, were negative. They included statements implying the measure would cost the county lots of money and would increase the need for pesticide use, Kiichli said.

While Promark wouldn't say who hired it to do the survey, Kiichli said it was apparent it was someone against Measure H, and that someone would need to have a lot of money to be conducting lengthy surveys.

SNIP

--

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

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

=====

Date: Wed, 7 Jan 2004 14:05:55 -0500
Reply-To: Melissa Marcello <mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Melissa Marcello <mmarcello@PURSUANTRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Re: Poll on GMOs misleads, some say
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <[00c201c3d54b\\$d7b6a2c0\\$0c0a010a@LEO](mailto:00c201c3d54b$d7b6a2c0$0c0a010a@LEO)>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Interesting story Leo, thanks for posting. If I had to guess, it would =
be
that the poll's intent is message testing prior to some sort of
communications outreach rather than trying to sway the actual =
respondents
whom they have on the phone.=20

Usually in testing situations such as these some sort of baseline =
measure is
first obtained, and then the respondent is read a series of statements =
aimed
at moving an unfavorable opinion towards the survey sponsor's position. =

For example, "if you heard the following, would that increase, decrease =
or
have no effect on your opinions toward... (or something of that sort)"=20

It is not unusual to find on the back end (and it is unfortunate when =
this
happens) messages that test well which are later found to be untrue and
therefore unusable in the outreach efforts that follow.=20

Melissa Marcello
Pursuant, Inc.
2141 P Street NW
Suite 103
Washington, DC 20037
p 202.887.0070=20
f 800.567.1723
c 202.352.7462
=20
Visit our website at www.pursuantresearch.com
=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo G. Simonetta
Sent: Wednesday, January 07, 2004 1:27 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Poll on GMOs misleads, some say

Ukiah Daily Journal

Poll on GMOs misleads, some say
Measure H proponents charge it's intended to manipulate the voters
By GLENDA ANDERSON/The Daily Journal
<http://www.ukiahdailyjournal.com/Stories/0,1413,91~3089~1875942,00.html#>

Wednesday, January 07, 2004 -

Opponents of a ballot measure that would ban the growing of genetically
modified crops in Mendocino County confirmed this week they're =
conducting a
poll in Mendocino County.

According to Measure H proponents, the California Plant Health =
Association's
survey is a "push poll" designed to manipulate voters into checking the =
no
box on their ballots.

"It's a really duplicitous and heavy-hitting negative distortion of =
facts,"
said Measure H spokeswoman Laura Hamburg. She said the American =
Association

for Public Opinion Research -- an organization concerned with =
professional
polling standards -- said it will investigate the allegation.

Steve Beckley, president of the Sacramento-based plant association, said
he's not sure what push polling is. However, he did say the =
organization's
polling questions require more than simple yes or no answers.

"The polling will let us know exactly where we are in this issue," =
Beckley
said. He said he does not know what the survey questions are.

SNIP

According to American Association for Public Opinion President Elizabeth
Martin, polls that give out information and ask theoretical questions =
are
legitimate, as long as the information is factual.

According to Hamburg, the questions being reported to her are not.

SNIP

Another bit of false information being propagated by the polling company =
--
Promark Research, of Houston -- is that Greenpeace favors genetically
modified organisms, Hamburg said.

Several people who've been polled said they found the poll appalling.

"It felt as though they were looking for the item that was going to
influence me to change my point of view," said Sharon Kiichli.

She said only one of the questions she was asked was positive about =
Measure
H, the other 14, or so, were negative. They included statements implying =
the
measure would cost the county lots of money and would increase the need =
for
pesticide use, Kiichli said.

While Promark wouldn't say who hired it to do the survey, Kiichli said =
it
was apparent it was someone against Measure H, and that someone would =
need
to have a lot of money to be conducting lengthy surveys.

SNIP

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

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

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

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

=====
Date: Wed, 7 Jan 2004 17:47:10 -0500
Reply-To: Phillip Downs <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Phillip Downs <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>
Subject: UK ethnic groups
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

We're doing a survey in the UK and want to get the ethnic composition question right. After some research, we've found classifications as divergent as the 2 following:

White
Mixed
Indian
Pakistani
Bangladeshi
Other Asian
Black Caribbean
Black African
Black other
Chinese
Other

English
Scottish
Irish
Welsh
Ulster
West Indian
Indian
Pakistani
Other

Does anyone have a simple, but "correct" listing? Thanks

Phillip E. Downs, PhD
Kerr & Downs Research

2992 Habersham Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32309
Phone: 850.906.3111
Fax: 850.906.3112
www.kerr-downs.com

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

Date: Fri, 9 Jan 2004 10:56:10 -0500
Reply-To: David Dutwin <ddutwin@ICRSURVEY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: David Dutwin <ddutwin@ICRSURVEY.COM>
Subject: Faculty Announcement
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The Department of Communication Studies at West Chester University of Pennsylvania invites applications for a tenure-track Assistant Professor position to begin with the fall semester of 2004. This position was necessitated by a recently approved general education requirement in communication.=20

The successful candidate for this position will=20

demonstrate the ability to effectively teach any or all of the approved courses meeting the general education requirement, including Public Speaking, Business and Professional Communication, and Small Group Communication=20

possess a Ph.D. in communication by August, 2004 (ABD will be considered)=20

have the potential to meet Department, College and University requirements for tenure & promotion=20

articulate a scholarly agenda that complements department needs=20

Finalists for this position must successfully complete an on-campus interview and an undergraduate teaching demonstration.=20

The Department of Communication Studies values strong teaching, continuing scholarly growth, and a commitment to service. We seek individuals who like to teach, who are comfortable with communication technology, and who desire a collegial atmosphere. The search committee will give preference to those applicants with prior college teaching experience, and in particular, those with experience teaching public speaking, writing, and general education courses, and experience with communication technology.=20

West Chester University offers highly competitive salaries and excellent benefits. The university is one of the largest institutions in Pennsylvania's State System of Higher Education, with an enrollment of =

over 12,000 students. The university is located in the charming city of West Chester, the county seat of Chester County, one of five counties that comprise the Philadelphia metropolitan area. West Chester is approximately 25 miles west of downtown Philadelphia and 15 miles north of Wilmington, Delaware, and is conveniently located midway between New York City and Washington, DC.

Candidates should submit a letter of application, comprehensive vita, three current letters of reference, a one-page description of teaching philosophy, a one-page description of scholarly agenda, and transcripts of both graduate and undergraduate studies. Review of applications will begin February 24, 2004 and will continue until the position is filled. Send all materials to:

Philip A. Thompsen, Ph.D.
Search Committee Chair
Department of Communication Studies
508 Main Hall
West Chester University
West Chester, PA 19383

Position availability subject to funding. West Chester University is an Affirmative Action - Equal Opportunity Employer. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply.

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

=====
Date: Fri, 9 Jan 2004 12:02:22 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Students falsified Peterson survey
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I am not astounded often - but this did it . . .

Students falsified Peterson survey
By Garth Stapley and John Cot
The Modesto Bee
Published 01/09/04 05:50:19

Several university students said Thursday that they fabricated survey results that factored into a judge's decision to move Scott Peterson's capital murder trial out of Modesto.

SNIP

"We falsified the info," said a 20-year-old criminal justice student at

California State University, Stanislaus. "The stuff we submitted wasn't true."

He referred to the 10-county Peterson bias survey compiled by 65 = students and overseen by professor Stephen Schoenthaler.

Informed Thursday evening of the students' claims, Schoenthaler said, = "I'm stunned, and I find it hard to believe. It seems impossible that I could have missed something like that."

SNIP

The student and five others -- all seniors -- said Thursday that they = made up every answer on all the surveys they submitted because they found it difficult to gather legitimate data.

They did it, they said, because they were short on time and money. They = were required to participate in the survey for 20% of their grade and were = given no money for dozens of lengthy long-distance phone calls, they said.

Another senior said she struggled to complete half of her required = surveys, then gave up and faked the rest. Another said she refused to cheat but didn't have the resources to do the survey, so she didn't -- knowing = that her grade could be lowered from an A to a C.

Three of the eight said they used answers from friends and relatives on = some surveys, also in violation of survey ethics.

SNIP

On the witness stand Thursday, Schoenthaler insisted that his = methodology was sound when prosecutor Dave Harris questioned the survey's integrity.

SNIP

Schoenthaler said that he required the students who were conducting the survey to include the phone numbers they supposedly called when = submitting data but that he had not verified any by calling them himself.

Formulas developed to detect fraud didn't alert him to anything unusual, = he said.

Before The Modesto Bee published the survey results Sunday, Schoenthaler

said he used 65 students to poll 1,175 prospective jurors randomly by telephone in late November and early December. He said 114 to 122 people responded in each of California's eight largest counties, split evenly between Northern and Southern California, plus Stanislaus and San Joaquin counties.

SNIP

SNIP

A class syllabus given to the students at the beginning of the fall semester states that 20% of their grade would be based on a class project.

The description:

"Each student will be assigned to survey public opinion attitudes and knowledge on the telephone from 20 people in various parts of California to test hypotheses that will be done in class. The survey typically takes five or six hours to complete and an hour of practice."

Stephen Lubet of Northwestern University School of Law in Chicago said, "The point is to teach students, not obtain their labor."

=A9 2002 , The Fresno Bee =20

--=20

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax
=20

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

Date: Fri, 9 Jan 2004 10:07:11 -0800
Reply-To: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>
Organization: Competitive Edge Research & Comm.
Subject: Re: Students falsified Peterson survey
Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <[012a01c3d6d2\\$59194390\\$0c0a010a@LEO](mailto:012a01c3d6d2$59194390$0c0a010a@LEO)>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Don't be astounded; be outraged. This sort of thing happened when I was in grad school (90-94). The comment at the end of the article is wholly appropriate and it also comes down throwing kids who don't know what they are doing into something quite onerous that requires professional experience. The whole thing stinks and we commercial polling firms sometimes compete against this slave labor. =20

John E. Nienstedt, Sr.
john@cerc.net
Get the edge at www.cerc.net
=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo G. Simonetta
Sent: Friday, January 09, 2004 9:02 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Students falsified Peterson survey

I am not astounded often - but this did it . . .

Students falsified Peterson survey=20
By Garth Stapley and John Cot=E9
The Modesto Bee
Published 01/09/04 05:50:19

Several university students said Thursday that they fabricated survey results that factored into a judge's decision to move Scott Peterson's capital murder trial out of Modesto.

SNIP

"We falsified the info," said a 20-year-old criminal justice student at California State University, Stanislaus. "The stuff we submitted wasn't true."

He referred to the 10-county Peterson bias survey compiled by 65 students and overseen by professor Stephen Schoenthaler.

Informed Thursday evening of the students' claims, Schoenthaler said, "I'm stunned, and I find it hard to believe. It seems impossible that I could have missed something like that."

SNIP

The student and five others -- all seniors -- said Thursday that they made up every answer on all the surveys they submitted because they found it difficult to gather legitimate data.

They did it, they said, because they were short on time and money. They

were
required to participate in the survey for 20% of their grade and were
given
no money for dozens of lengthy long-distance phone calls, they said.

Another senior said she struggled to complete half of her required
surveys,
then gave up and faked the rest. Another said she refused to cheat but
didn't have the resources to do the survey, so she didn't -- knowing
that
her grade could be lowered from an A to a C.

Three of the eight said they used answers from friends and relatives on
some
surveys, also in violation of survey ethics.

SNIP

On the witness stand Thursday, Schoenthaler insisted that his
methodology
was sound when prosecutor Dave Harris questioned the survey's integrity.

SNIP

Schoenthaler said that he required the students who were conducting the
survey to include the phone numbers they supposedly called when
submitting
data but that he had not verified any by calling them himself.

Formulas developed to detect fraud didn't alert him to anything unusual,
he
said.

Before The Modesto Bee published the survey results Sunday, Schoenthaler
said he used 65 students to poll 1,175 prospective jurors randomly by
telephone in late November and early December. He said 114 to 122 people
responded in each of California's eight largest counties, split evenly
between Northern and Southern California, plus Stanislaus and San
Joaquin
counties.

SNIP

SNIP

A class syllabus given to the students at the beginning of the fall
semester
states that 20% of their grade would be based on a class project.

The description:

"Each student will be assigned to survey public opinion attitudes and
knowledge on the telephone from 20 people in various parts of California
to

test hypotheses that will be done in class. The survey typically takes five or six hours to complete and an hour of practice."

Stephen Lubet of Northwestern University School of Law in Chicago said, "The point is to teach students, not obtain their labor."

=A9 2002 , The Fresno Bee =20

--=20

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax
=20

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

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

Date: Fri, 9 Jan 2004 13:21:53 -0500
Reply-To: Brian Vargus <igem100@IUPUI.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Brian Vargus <igem100@IUPUI.EDU>
Subject: Re: Students falsified Peterson survey
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <[002401c3d6db\\$6e6cc5b0\\$1a01a8c0@CERC2.cerc.net](mailto:002401c3d6db$6e6cc5b0$1a01a8c0@CERC2.cerc.net)>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

As one who ran a student staffed laboratory for many years, this is why I like IRB's required for all student projects. We paid our interviewers and verified, etc. Class assignments, such as this one apparently, are exploitative anyway---especially when the Professor uses the data for anything. Was the PI paid for his testimony? =20

Brian Vargus
Professor, Political Science
Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis
Former Director, Indiana University Public Opinion Laboratory

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of John Nienstedt

Sent: Friday, January 09, 2004 1:07 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Students falsified Peterson survey

Don't be astounded; be outraged. This sort of thing happened when I was =
in
grad school (90-94). The comment at the end of the article is wholly
appropriate and it also comes down throwing kids who don't know what =
they
are doing into something quite onerous that requires professional
experience. The whole thing stinks and we commercial polling firms
sometimes compete against this slave labor. =20

John E. Nienstedt, Sr.
john@cerc.net
Get the edge at www.cerc.net
=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo G. Simonetta
Sent: Friday, January 09, 2004 9:02 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Students falsified Peterson survey

I am not astounded often - but this did it . . .

Students falsified Peterson survey=20
By Garth Stapley and John Cot=E9
The Modesto Bee
Published 01/09/04 05:50:19

Several university students said Thursday that they fabricated survey
results that factored into a judge's decision to move Scott Peterson's
capital murder trial out of Modesto.

SNIP

"We falsified the info," said a 20-year-old criminal justice student at
California State University, Stanislaus. "The stuff we submitted wasn't
true."

He referred to the 10-county Peterson bias survey compiled by 65 =
students
and overseen by professor Stephen Schoenthaler.

Informed Thursday evening of the students' claims, Schoenthaler said, =
"I'm
stunned, and I find it hard to believe. It seems impossible that I could
have missed something like that."

SNIP

The student and five others -- all seniors -- said Thursday that they =

made
up every answer on all the surveys they submitted because they found it
difficult to gather legitimate data.

They did it, they said, because they were short on time and money. They =
were
required to participate in the survey for 20% of their grade and were =
given
no money for dozens of lengthy long-distance phone calls, they said.

Another senior said she struggled to complete half of her required =
surveys,
then gave up and faked the rest. Another said she refused to cheat but
didn't have the resources to do the survey, so she didn't -- knowing =
that
her grade could be lowered from an A to a C.

Three of the eight said they used answers from friends and relatives on =
some
surveys, also in violation of survey ethics.

SNIP

On the witness stand Thursday, Schoenthaler insisted that his =
methodology
was sound when prosecutor Dave Harris questioned the survey's integrity.

SNIP

Schoenthaler said that he required the students who were conducting the
survey to include the phone numbers they supposedly called when =
submitting
data but that he had not verified any by calling them himself.

Formulas developed to detect fraud didn't alert him to anything unusual, =
he
said.

Before The Modesto Bee published the survey results Sunday, Schoenthaler
said he used 65 students to poll 1,175 prospective jurors randomly by
telephone in late November and early December. He said 114 to 122 people
responded in each of California's eight largest counties, split evenly
between Northern and Southern California, plus Stanislaus and San =
Joaquin
counties.

SNIP

SNIP

A class syllabus given to the students at the beginning of the fall =
semester
states that 20% of their grade would be based on a class project.

The description:

"Each student will be assigned to survey public opinion attitudes and knowledge on the telephone from 20 people in various parts of California = to test hypotheses that will be done in class. The survey typically takes = five or six hours to complete and an hour of practice."

Stephen Lubet of Northwestern University School of Law in Chicago said, = "The point is to teach students, not obtain their labor."

=A9 2002 , The Fresno Bee =20

--=20

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax
=20

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

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

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

=====
Date: Fri, 9 Jan 2004 12:59:28 -0700
Reply-To: Steve Mockabee <mockabst@EMAIL.UC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Steve Mockabee <mockabst@EMAIL.UC.EDU>
Subject: job description: Director, Institute for Policy Research
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Director, Institute for Policy Research, University of Cincinnati.

The University of Cincinnati (UC) invites qualified individuals to apply for the position of director of the UC Institute for Policy Research (IPR).

The IPR is an academic survey research center providing expertise in a variety of approaches to data collection, research design and methods (see <http://www.ipr.uc.edu/Home/Home.cfm>). In addition to the Survey Research Center, the IPR also hosts the Southwest Ohio Regional Data Center and the Social, Behavioral and Health Science Data Archive. The IPR supports faculty, staff and students conducting academic and applied research projects to advance the University's education, research and public service missions. The IPR also works with local, state and national agencies and organizations to address issues of public policy research. The Institute is an autonomous unit within the University whose director reports to the vice president for research/university dean for advanced studies.

We are seeking a director to provide leadership and strategic, administrative and financial oversight of IPR activities. He/she is charged with enhancing and expanding the IPR's role as a research and education partner with UC faculty, staff and students by continually developing and promoting innovative approaches to survey and public policy research. The Director is responsible for hiring and providing direction to IPR's professional staff of 11, and for oversight of IPR's budget of approximately \$1,000,000 annually.

Candidates must possess administrative leadership experience, including a track record of working with diverse research teams and building strong collaborative relationships with internal and external stakeholders. Essential to the position are a demonstrated history of contract survey research, funding of peer-reviewed grants, and the ability to attract grants and contracts.

Candidates must possess an earned doctorate in a social or behavioral sciences discipline as well as a substantial record of relevant research. Publication in high quality professional journals is desirable. Candidates with appropriate credentials and experience will be considered for an academic appointment at the University of Cincinnati.

Interested candidates should send a letter of application, curriculum vita, and contact information for three professional references to Robert A. Frank, Chair, IPR Search Committee, Mail Location 627, Research and Advanced Studies, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221-0627. Dr. Frank also can be contacted at Robert.Frank@uc.edu. Review of application materials will begin immediately and will continue until the position is filled.

Director, Institute for Policy Research, University of Cincinnati.

Position Description and Responsibilities:

- 1) Report to the Vice President for Research and University Dean for Advanced Studies.
- 2) Responsible for the overall direction and management of the IPR, with direct reports from the Assistant Director and professional staff of the IPR.

- 3) Fiscal responsibility for budgeting and planning of the IPR.
- 4) Provide strategic oversight for establishing policies and goals for the IPR.
- 5) Develop collaborative relationships both with internal stakeholders from within the University of Cincinnati, and with external stakeholders from throughout the community, the state, the region and at the national level.
- 6) Develop funded contract survey research projects and peer-reviewed grant proposals.
- 7) Pursue funding and continue research in their own area of interest and expertise.
- 8) Faculty title will be granted in the appropriate academic department commensurate with education and experience.

Desired Attributes of Successful Candidates:

- 1) Earned Ph.D. in a related field.
- 2) Recognized national figure in an area of research relevant to the missions of the IPR.
- 3) Administrative and leadership experience.
- 4) Strong record of scholarly research and funded research.
- 5) Collaborative working with teams of researchers.
- 6) Strong written and oral communication skills.

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

Stephen T. Mockabee
 Department of Political Science
 University of Cincinnati
 Cincinnati, OH 45221-0375

phone: 513-556-3394
 fax: 513-556-2314
 e-mail: Stephen.Mockabee@uc.edu

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

Date: Fri, 9 Jan 2004 16:35:13 -0500
 Reply-To: elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV
 Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
 From: Betsy Martin <elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV>
 Subject: Please send your nominations for the newly-established AAPOR
 Book

Award by February 15th!
 Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
 MIME-version: 1.0
 Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
 Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

AAPOR BOOK AWARD

AAPOR currently has three awards (the AAPOR Award, the Innovators Award, and the Impact Award) that recognize, respectively, the contributions of individuals, innovations in theory/methodology/technology, and research influencing policy. The potential contribution of a given book, however, is not readily captured or recognized by the existing awards. For this reason, AAPOR Council has established an AAPOR Book Award.

AAPOR members are invited to submit nominations for the Book Award by February 15, 2004. Nominations should identify the book, and discuss how it meets the criteria listed below. Monographs or edited volumes by AAPOR and non-AAPOR members are eligible for the award.

The award would be determined by the Committee and presented at the annual May meeting. Awards may not be given every year.

SCOPE: The AAPOR Book Award seeks to recognize influential books that have:

- (1) stimulated theoretical and scientific research in public opinion; and/or
- (2) influenced our understanding or application of survey research methodology.

This award is to be given to books published after 1992, the last year encompassed in AAPOR's list of "Fifty Books That Significantly Shaped Public Opinion Research." Books must be at least three years old to be eligible, to allow time for books to be read and reviewed.

CRITERIA FOR BOOK AWARD:

The following criteria will be the basis for making an award to a book or monograph:

1. The excellence of exposition, ideas, and methods.
2. The monograph's impact with respect to:
 - a. stimulating theoretical or empirical research;
 - b. influencing the way public opinion researchers think about or conduct research on public opinion;
 - c. significantly influencing broader understanding of the theo=

ry
or methods of public opinion; or
d. advancing the state of the art or practice of survey methodology.

3. Its lasting value, as indicated by (for example) the judgments of peers and citation in the literature.

PROCESS: The President has appointed the following Book Award Committee to receive nominations and decide on the award. Committee members include

AAPOR members broadly representative of different specialty areas, who will serve for staggered terms of 3-5 years, in order to create a longer-running committee that can effectively identify, read, and evaluate all nominations for the Book Award. (Members of the committee may not vote on their own books, or books to which they have contributed.)

AAPOR BOOK AWARD COMMITTEE

Chair: Howard Schuman, University of Michigan
Paul Biemer, Research Triangle Institute
Larry Bobo, Harvard University
Henry Brady, University of California at Berkeley
Scott Keeter, Pew Research Center
Paul Lavrakas, Nielsen
Patricia Moy, University of Washington
Vincent Price, University of Pennsylvania
Nora Cate Shaeffer, University of Wisconsin
Bob Shapiro, Columbia University
Tom Smith, NORC

Please forward all nominations by 15 February 2004 to:

Howard Schuman
255 Popham Road
Phippsburg ME 04562
Telephone: 207-389-9101
Email: hschuman@umich.edu

or to

Elizabeth Martin
U.S. Bureau of the Census
3715 FOB3
Washington, DC 20233
Telephone: 301-763-4905

Email: emartin@census.gov

=

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

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

Date: Fri, 9 Jan 2004 18:16:38 -0600

Reply-To: Cynthia Nelson <cnelson@NIU.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Cynthia Nelson <cnelson@NIU.EDU>

Subject: Re: Students falsified Peterson survey

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To: <[002401c3d6db\\$6e6cc5b0\\$1a01a8c0@CERC2.cerc.net](mailto:002401c3d6db$6e6cc5b0$1a01a8c0@CERC2.cerc.net)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

I at times get calls from people who are surprised they can't have their survey done at a lower cost because students could do the data collection as a class project. Maybe I'll keep this posting as an example of the kinds of problems that can occur.

Although clinical practice /laboratory practice/ other realistic work experience can be an important part of training for students, it sounds as if this professor was exploiting the students. And it sounds as if the students got revenge...

Then the professor testified about the methodology, when it sounds as if the methodology included unsupervised, unmonitored telephone calls made by individuals who had, perhaps, interests that conflicted with the conduct of the research.

I wonder if he was paid as an expert witness for his time in court?

Cynthia Nelson

Cynthia Nelson
Center for Governmental Studies
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL 60115

voice 815 753-1918 fax 815 753-2305 email cnelson@niu.edu

***** REPLY SEPARATOR *****

On 1/9/04 at 10:07 AM John Nienstedt wrote:

>Don't be astounded; be outraged. This sort of thing happened when I was
>in grad school (90-94). The comment at the end of the article is wholly
>appropriate and it also comes down throwing kids who don't know what
>they are doing into something quite onerous that requires professional
>experience. The whole thing stinks and we commercial polling firms
>sometimes compete against this slave labor.

>
>John E. Nienstedt, Sr.
>john@cerc.net
>Get the edge at www.cerc.net

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo G. Simonetta
>Sent: Friday, January 09, 2004 9:02 AM
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>Subject: Students falsified Peterson survey

>
>I am not astounded often - but this did it . . .

>
>Students falsified Peterson survey
>By Garth Stapley and John Coté
>The Modesto Bee
>Published 01/09/04 05:50:19

>
>Several university students said Thursday that they fabricated survey
>results that factored into a judge's decision to move Scott Peterson's
>capital murder trial out of Modesto.

>
>SNIP

>
>"We falsified the info," said a 20-year-old criminal justice student at
>California State University, Stanislaus. "The stuff we submitted wasn't
>>true."

>
>He referred to the 10-county Peterson bias survey compiled by 65
>students
>and overseen by professor Stephen Schoenthaler.

>
>Informed Thursday evening of the students' claims, Schoenthaler said,
>"I'm
>stunned, and I find it hard to believe. It seems impossible that I could
>have missed something like that."

>
>SNIP

>
>The student and five others -- all seniors -- said Thursday that they
>made
>up every answer on all the surveys they submitted because they found it
>difficult to gather legitimate data.

>
>They did it, they said, because they were short on time and money. They
>were

>required to participate in the survey for 20% of their grade and were
>given
>no money for dozens of lengthy long-distance phone calls, they said.
>
>Another senior said she struggled to complete half of her required
>surveys,
>then gave up and faked the rest. Another said she refused to cheat but
>didn't have the resources to do the survey, so she didn't -- knowing
>that
>her grade could be lowered from an A to a C.
>
>Three of the eight said they used answers from friends and relatives on
>some
>surveys, also in violation of survey ethics.
>
>SNIP
>
>On the witness stand Thursday, Schoenthaler insisted that his
>methodology
>was sound when prosecutor Dave Harris questioned the survey's integrity.
>
>SNIP
>
>Schoenthaler said that he required the students who were conducting the
>survey to include the phone numbers they supposedly called when
>submitting
>data but that he had not verified any by calling them himself.
>
>Formulas developed to detect fraud didn't alert him to anything unusual,
>he
>said.
>
>Before The Modesto Bee published the survey results Sunday, Schoenthaler
>said he used 65 students to poll 1,175 prospective jurors randomly by
>telephone in late November and early December. He said 114 to 122 people
>responded in each of California's eight largest counties, split evenly
>between Northern and Southern California, plus Stanislaus and San
>Joaquin
>counties.
>
>SNIP
>
>SNIP
>
>A class syllabus given to the students at the beginning of the fall
>semester
>states that 20% of their grade would be based on a class project.
>
>The description:
>
>"Each student will be assigned to survey public opinion attitudes and
>knowledge on the telephone from 20 people in various parts of California
>to
>test hypotheses that will be done in class. The survey typically takes

>five
>or six hours to complete and an hour of practice."
>
>Stephen Lubet of Northwestern University School of Law in Chicago said,
>"The
>point is to teach students, not obtain their labor."

>
>
>© 2002 , The Fresno Bee

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

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

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

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

Date: Fri, 9 Jan 2004 19:42:25 -0500
Reply-To: Susan Carol Losh <slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Susan Carol Losh <slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Students falsified Peterson survey
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <200401091816380370.0F5019CC@corn.cso.niu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Good points all.

For many years I ran Project TAL, a survey of the Tallahassee Metro area (yes, we DO have one). This project became part of a public opinion class I developed and exclusively used student interviewers. However, students contributed topics and questions to the questionnaire and we used the Social Sciences Survey Research Telephone Lab, Cases (then), and had assistance from lab personnel. This was a very popular course in Sociology (we also did focus groups and content analysis). The one time we received partial payment was from the county Health Department to replicate the CDC Behavioral Risk Factors survey for the Leon County area (it was only half the survey) and it appealed to idealism among us all. Student morale was

high, the students did a fabulous job in general. So I have had extensive experience with student interviewers under non-exploitative circumstances and it will remain as a high point of my academic experience (we don't have a comparative course in Ed Research and we don't have an undergraduate major--otherwise I guess I would still be in the saddle).

Happy New Year everyone,
Susan

Susan Carol Losh, PhD
American Statistical Association-NSF/SRS Research Fellow 2003-2004
Program Leader, Learning and Cognition
Department of Educational Psychology and Learning Systems
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

850-644-8778 VOICE (voice mail available)
850-644-8776 FAX

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
Visit the site: <http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh/Index.htm>

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

=====
Date: Fri, 9 Jan 2004 19:31:04 -0600
Reply-To: Rick Weil <fweil@COX.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Rick Weil <fweil@COX.NET>
Subject: Re: Students falsified Peterson survey
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

My experience has been similar to Susan's. We've done 4 annual Baton Rouge surveys, and plan the 5th this spring. The mayor has come to class the last 2 times (his chief of staff came the first two times), and plans to keep coming. The students design the full survey, give reports to the mayor, & have high morale. Our checks on integrity have been good so far. Nobody makes any money on the thing. Other classes here do simiar projects with good results. I have seen & heard about bad ones (tho not in my department!), so my conclusion is that you can't draw blanket conclusions about these. To me, the big issue is whether the students are doing the instructor's work and the latter is profiting, while the students aren't learning much that's useful. That's a formula for trouble.

Rick Weil, LSU

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

From: "Susan Carol Losh" <slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU>
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Sent: Friday, January 09, 2004 6:42 PM

Subject: Re: Students falsified Peterson survey

Good points all.

For many years I ran Project TAL, a survey of the Tallahassee Metro area (yes, we DO have one). This project became part of a public opinion class I developed and exclusively used student interviewers. However, students contributed topics and questions to the questionnaire and we used the Social Sciences Survey Research Telephone Lab, Cases (then), and had assistance from lab personnel. This was a very popular course in Sociology (we also did focus groups and content analysis). The one time we received partial payment was from the county Health Department to replicate the CDC Behavioral Risk Factors survey for the Leon County area (it was only half the survey) and it appealed to idealism among us all. Student morale was high, the students did a fabulous job in general. So I have had extensive experience with student interviewers under non-exploitative circumstances and it will remain as a high point of my academic experience (we don't have a comparative course in Ed Research and we don't have an undergraduate major--otherwise I guess I would still be in the saddle).

Happy New Year everyone,
Susan

Susan Carol Losh, PhD
American Statistical Association-NSF/SRS Research Fellow 2003-2004
Program Leader, Learning and Cognition
Department of Educational Psychology and Learning Systems
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

850-644-8778 VOICE (voice mail available)
850-644-8776 FAX

slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
Visit the site: <http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh/Index.htm>

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

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

=====
Date: Sat, 10 Jan 2004 09:21:23 -0600
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Organization: Market Shares Corporation
Subject: NH Push Poll?
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/chi-0401100112jan10,1,418431.story?coll=chi-newsnationworld-hed>

Chicago Tribune-Campaign dispatches

CALLING ALL DEAN SUPPORTERS?

Jill Zuckman and John McCormick

January 10, 2004

Something sneaky may be happening in New Hampshire.

When the American Research Group asked older, independent voters whom they planned to support in the Jan. 27 primary, many said they had been told they could not vote because a deadline to register as a Democrat had passed. But when one woman said she was supporting Howard Dean, the caller from an anonymous campaign told her she would be eligible.

None of the callers could identify which campaign had been making the calls. New Hampshire allows undeclared voters to cast a ballot in either party's primary.

Dick Bennett, who operates the research group, said he planned to report the suspicious calls to authorities, even though he said they do not seem to violate the state's law prohibiting "push polling," or negative attacks on rival candidates under the pretense of a poll.

The poll discovered that Wesley Clark's campaign is gaining strength among undeclared, older voters, while Dean excels among younger voters. The calls spurred allegations between the Clark and Dean campaigns.

"If this is true--that a campaign is trying to discourage independent voters from coming to the polls--it is a sad day," said Clark spokesman Mo Elleithee.

Dorie Clark, a spokeswoman for Dean, said: "Our campaign is absolutely not making these phone calls. ... We're encouraging as many people to come to the polls as possible."

-- Jill Zuckman

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

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

Date: Mon, 12 Jan 2004 10:15:20 -0500

Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

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

Subject: Re: Students falsified Peterson survey

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To: <003601c3d719\$69c2e380\$1108a8c0@D1LGNX21>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I didn't mean that I was astounded that anyone would use unpaid students to conduct a survey - I meant that I was astounded by the lack of controls and the nature of the assignment.

What I see as problems:

Expecting students to pay for long distance phone calls.

Not checking up/monitoring interviewers.

One hour of training for survey work (with untrained interviewers).

Time estimated to complete 20 surveys - 5 to 6 hours.

And these are from a cursory review of a couple of news articles.

I have been involved in unpaid surveying both as a student and as a professional and I know it can be well done. The problem is that it is often seen as a fast, easy way to collect reliable, valid data and it really isn't. If it is done correctly and professional time, resources etc. are figured in it probably costs as about much as surveys done by professional interviewers.

I did like this comment from the Bee:

<http://www.modbee.com/local/story/7989170p-8858030c.html>

"Steven Hughes, director of the university's Center for Public Policy Studies, also voiced concern. Hopefully, he said, people would be familiar enough with the center's research to know the work is legitimate.

Survey research, he said, is costly and time-consuming, and is not conducted at the center.

'It's evolved into a highly skilled specialty,' Hughes said."

--

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 Rick Weil

> Sent: Friday, January 09, 2004 8:31 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Students falsified Peterson survey

>

> My experience has been similar to Susan's. We've done 4 annual Baton

> Rouge

> surveys, and plan the 5th this spring. The mayor has come to class the

> last

> 2 times (his chief of staff came the first two times), and plans to keep
> coming. The students design the full survey, give reports to the mayor, &
> have high morale. Our checks on integrity have been good so far. Nobody
> makes any money on the thing. Other classes here do similar projects with
> good results. I have seen & heard about bad ones (tho not in my
> department!), so my conclusion is that you can't draw blanket conclusions
> about these. To me, the big issue is whether the students are doing the
> instructor's work and the latter is profiting, while the students aren't
> learning much that's useful. That's a formula for trouble.

>
> Rick Weil, LSU

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

> From: "Susan Carol Losh" <slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU>

> To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

> Sent: Friday, January 09, 2004 6:42 PM

> Subject: Re: Students falsified Peterson survey

>
>
> Good points all.

>
> For many years I ran Project TAL, a survey of the Tallahassee Metro area
> (yes, we DO have one). This project became part of a public opinion class
> I
> developed and exclusively used student interviewers. However, students
> contributed topics and questions to the questionnaire and we used the
> Social Sciences Survey Research Telephone Lab, Cases (then), and had
> assistance from lab personnel. This was a very popular course in Sociology
> (we also did focus groups and content analysis). The one time we received
> partial payment was from the county Health Department to replicate the CDC
> Behavioral Risk Factors survey for the Leon County area (it was only half
> the survey) and it appealed to idealism among us all. Student morale was
> high, the students did a fabulous job in general. So I have had extensive
> experience with student interviewers under non-exploitative circumstances
> and it will remain as a high point of my academic experience (we don't
> have

> a comparative course in Ed Research and we don't have an undergraduate
> major--otherwise I guess I would still be in the saddle).

>
> Happy New Year everyone,

> Susan

>
> Susan Carol Losh, PhD
> American Statistical Association-NSF/SRS Research Fellow 2003-2004
> Program Leader, Learning and Cognition
> Department of Educational Psychology and Learning Systems
> Florida State University
> Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

>
> 850-644-8778 VOICE (voice mail available)

> 850-644-8776 FAX

>
> slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

> Visit the site: <http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh/Index.htm>

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

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

Date: Mon, 12 Jan 2004 10:49:00 -0500
Reply-To: DivaleBill@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: William Divale <DivaleBill@AOL.COM>
Subject: Students in Surveys
Comments: To: simonetta@ARTSCI.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear Colleagues:

As an academic I want to say that I think it is quite okay to use students as interviewers in surveys and I do it. I am not defending the Peterson survey, but I think the main thrust of any surveys using free student labor has to be training. If the results are useful that is a bonus but it should not be the main purpose. Certainly students should not be expected to pay any of the costs.

I think the Peterson survey broke many rules, both ethical and methodological, but I would not like to see it used as an excuse to slam all academic based surveys using students.

Bill

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

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

Date: Mon, 12 Jan 2004 11:59:32 -0500
Reply-To: Paul Braun <pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Paul Braun <pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Re: Students in Surveys
Comments: To: DivaleBill@AOL.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <82.2f5fd4b.2d341bec@aol.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear Colleagues:

As someone who manages telephone interviewers while also enduring the pressures of time and deadlines, I thought I could contribute to this posting.

Interviewers, and I suppose students will usually rise to most occasions when they understand what is at stake. Often, we have to go the extra mile to finish a project, make a deadline or satisfy a client. We borrow from NASA and say to ourselves "failure is not an option". No one likes to make that call that a project isn't completed. Further, it takes an exceptionally strong person to say something can't be done. That being said, there are realistic goals that can be achieved and then there are abusive pushes that can send people over the edge. What I'd like to contribute is that sometimes good people make bad choices when they feel overwhelmed. Perhaps students feel that pressure in a special way because their grades are riding on success. Motivation to do more cannot be confused with unrealistic expectations.

Thanks and Regards,

Paul Braun
Braun Research, Inc.
Princeton NJ

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of William Divale
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2004 10:49 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Students in Surveys

Dear Colleagues:

As an academic I want to say that I think it is quite okay to use students as interviewers in surveys and I do it. I am not defending the Peterson survey, but I think the main thrust of any surveys using free student labor has to be training. If the results are useful that is a bonus but it should not be the main purpose. Certainly students should not be expected to pay any of the costs.

I think the Peterson survey broke many rules, both ethical and methodological, but I would not like to see it used as an excuse to slam all academic based surveys using students.

Bill

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

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

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

=====
Date: Mon, 12 Jan 2004 10:39:07 -0800
Reply-To: Wei Yen <weiyen@UCLA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Wei Yen <weiyen@UCLA.EDU>
Subject: To Name or Not To Name
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Hi,

Has anyone done any experiment with a list telephone sample in which respondents are randomly grouped into 1) those to be identified by name upon contact and 2) those to be targeted in a "random" within-household selection (but not identified by name)? If yes, have you observed any differences in response rates and response patterns between the two groups?

Thanks,

Wei Yen, PhD
UCLA Center for Health Policy Research
10911 Weyburn Ave., Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90024
Phone: (310)794-2399
Fax: (310)794-2686
Email: weiyen@ucla.edu

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

=====
Date: Mon, 12 Jan 2004 13:52:49 -0600
Reply-To: Linda Owens <lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Linda Owens <lindao@SRL.UIC.EDU>
Subject: Job Posting: UIC Survey Lab Field Manager
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

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

Field Operations Manager=20

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

Minimum Requirements: BS/BA degree with at least 4 years experience in research methods, questionnaire development, data collections procedures and techniques, including CATI operations and management, survey research management and other supervisory responsibilities.
For full consideration, send your resume and a detailed cover letter outlining your qualifications to the below address.

Linda Owens
Assistant Director
University of Illinois - Urbana Campus
Survey Research Laboratory
505 East Green Street, Suite #3
Champaign, IL 61820
FAX: 217-244-4408

Applications will be accepted until position is filled.

NO PHONE CALLS OR EMAILS WILL BE ACCEPTED. To learn more about the Survey Research Laboratory, visit our Web site at www.srl.uic.edu <<http://www.srl.uic.edu>>.

The University of Illinois is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer.

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

Date: Mon, 12 Jan 2004 15:06:20 -0500
Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Students in Surveys
Comments: To: "DivaleBill@AOL.COM" <DivaleBill@AOL.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

With all due respect, I have to disagree. Using interviewers who are trained well, carefully monitored, and paid for the work they do constitutes a

minimal set of specifications for valid work. When one introduces the possibility of negative consequences, i.e. failing to get course credit if the survey is not completed, the results will always be questionable. The case in point here is the worst-case scenario: the students avoided the worst-case scenario by falsifying the data.

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.

Research Specialist

Michigan State University

Institute for Public Policy and Social Research

517-355-6672

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

From: William Divale [mailto:DivaleBill@AOL.COM]

Sent: Monday, January 12, 2004 10:49 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Students in Surveys

Dear Colleagues:

As an academic I want to say that I think it is quite okay to use students as interviewers in surveys and I do it. I am not defending the Peterson survey, but I think the main thrust of any surveys using free student labor has to be training. If the results are useful that is a bonus but it should not be the main purpose. Certainly students should not be expected to pay any of the costs.

I think the Peterson survey broke many rules, both ethical and methodological, but I would not like to see it used as an excuse to slam all academic based surveys using students.

Bill

William Divale, Ph.D.

Professor of Anthropology

Director, MARC (Minority Access to Research Careers) Honors Program

Director, Social Science Survey Research Laboratory

York College, CUNY

Jamaica, NY 11451

718-262-2982

Fax 262-3790

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

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

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

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

Date: Mon, 12 Jan 2004 18:40:14 -0500
Reply-To: DivaleBill@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: William Divale <DivaleBill@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: Students in Surveys
Comments: To: pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Colleagues

I agree with the comments by Ehrlich and Braun, but the point I wanted to make was that free student labor as part of a class should only be for "training purposes," e.g., as part of teaching the students how to do survey research. If one gets results and the methodology is sound, that is so much the better. Any study that has time constraints and where the survey is primary, then students should be paid and the work not be part of any class.

The issue raised about the pressure of the work being related to a grade is a good one, and I have to think about it more. But again, if the survey work is primarily for the training of the student, then the pressure is no different than any other assignment. One can usually combine training with relevant "real surveys" but sometimes you can't, and then it would be unethical to use students in a course as "free workers."

Bill Divale

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

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

Date: Tue, 13 Jan 2004 13:18:56 +0100
Reply-To: director@zuma-mannheim.de
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Peter Mohler <mohler@ZUMA-MANNHEIM.DE>
Organization: ZUMA Mannheim
Subject: peterson, students, etc
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

to my view, the discussion clearly indicates

- a. that survey research is a profession
- b. training students in survey research should not be used for professional surveys, but for teaching projects
- c. on the issue of fraud - we found in our quality controls that checking numbers in a file is never sufficient. One needs additional information (like calling back to respondents) and even better evidence on paper. However, with the advent of fully computerized interviewing, such additional evidence is vanishing quickly. This in turn opens the flood-gates for systematically fiddeling the computer-files (similar to the 'fine tuning' of files in tax fraud cases).
- d. while a and b could be handled by setting up rules barring student training from professional surveys, c, could become (or might already be) a major problem for our profession.

Peter

--

Prof. Dr. Peter Ph. Mohler
GESIS Board of Directors
ZUMA Director

Mannheim Germany
P.O.Box 122155

Phone +49-621-1246-172
Fax +49-621-1246-100

e-mail director@zuma-mannheim.de

ZUMA - The Centre for Survey Research and Methodology

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

=====
Date: Tue, 13 Jan 2004 13:23:02 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Peterson poll, costs on trial
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Modbee.com
Peterson poll, costs on trial
COMPLETE ARTICLE AT
<http://www.modbee.com/local/story/7999475p-8867500c.html>

BY GARTH STAPLEY

BEE STAFF WRITER

A survey scandal in the Scott Peterson case will delay a murder trial in Fresno County whose defendant -- an alleged Muslim terrorist -- relied on the same survey expert.

Also Monday, the leader of a national surveyors' association condemned the supervision of the Peterson poll.

SNIP

Stanislaus State University officials have launched an official inquiry into the allegations surrounding the Peterson poll; the probe could conclude later this week.

Scandal distresses poll group

The Peterson scandal has rocked the American Association for Public Opinion Research, the association's president said Monday.

Chatter on an online bulletin board run by the association has been thick since Friday's revelation, said the president, Elizabeth Martin.

"This certainly makes survey researchers look bad," she said. "This sounds like it was done without sufficient training or oversight, and it sounds like the students were exploited."

SNIP

"Data integrity is a product of organizational integrity," reads an excerpt from a paper issued by the pollsters' association.

Industry standards advocated by the group urge "centralized telephone facilities where behavior can be observed and monitoring of interviewers is routine."

The standards warn against "inadequate supervision, lack of concern about interviewer motivation, poor quality control, inadequate compensation, excessive workload and off-site isolation of interviewers."

The standards also call for verification by recontacting from 5 percent to 15 percent of survey respondents. Schoenthaler said he called none of the phone numbers submitted by his students.

While Schoenthaler spent "over an hour" training his student surveyors, the University of Connecticut requires three days of training.

Chris Barnes, associate director of that university's Center for Research and Analysis, said no reputable supervisor sends students home to make survey calls.

The Peterson poll fiasco "is an amazing event in our industry," Barnes said. "It's just horrible."

Stanislaus State University Vice Provost Diana Demetrulias last week called Schoenthaler "a very respected researcher." In 14 years, he has overseen 31 change-of-venue surveys, using student surveyors for the three highest-profile cases. They involved Richard Allen Davis, convicted of murdering 12-year-old Polly Klaas; San Joaquin County serial killer Louis Peoples; and Peterson.

"We do it as a public service," Schoenthaler said Monday. "It's good for the community, good for the students and good for taxpayers."

Schoenthaler hired private polling companies on the other 28 cases, he said. They included the trial of George Souliotes, convicted of killing three people in a Modesto arson. Jurors were bused from San Joaquin County for that proceeding.

SNIP

Bee staff writer Garth Stapley can be reached at 578-2390 or gstapley@modbee.com.

Posted on 01/13/04 06:05:14

<http://www.modbee.com/local/story/7999475p-8867500c.html>

--

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

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

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

Date: Tue, 13 Jan 2004 12:34:26 -0800
Reply-To: Richard Rands <rrands@CFMC.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Richard Rands <rrands@CFMC.COM>
Subject: Re: peterson, students, etc
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <4003E230.2000604@zuma-mannheim.de>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

At 04:18 AM 1/13/2004, Peter Mohler wrote:
>to my view, the discussion clearly indicates
>a. that survey research is a profession

Amen!

>b. training students in survey research should not be used for
>professional surveys, but for teaching projects

Enough has already been discussed on this topic.

- >c. on the issue of fraud - we found in our quality controls that
- >checking numbers in a file is never sufficient. One needs additional
- >information (like calling back to respondents) and even better evidence
- >on paper. However, with the advent of fully computerized interviewing,
- >such additional evidence is vanishing quickly. This in turn opens the
- >flood-gates for systematically fiddling the computer-files (similar to
- >the 'fine tuning' of files in tax fraud cases).
- >d. while a and b could be handled by setting up rules barring student
- >training from professional surveys, c, could become (or might already
- >be) a major problem for our profession.

Computerized survey systems do not intrinsically change the potential for fraud. Paper and pencil survey methods can just as easily be fiddled as a computer file. In fact, computerized survey systems improve the ability to control quality by having independent, live monitoring of telephone interviewing sessions without the knowledge of the interviewer. For example, in CfMC's Survent CATI system, a supervisor can use his or her station as a monitoring device at any time, and a bank of stations can be set up in a back room or at a remote location to monitor the activities of interviewers. The monitoring allows one to hear the conversation and see what is being entered by the interviewer. We emphasize to our clients that monitoring is critical to quality work.

We also allow clients to measure the timing of each question, and to watch for repetitive sequences as a way to determine if a respondent is not giving thoughtful, reasonable data. But the most useful help that a computerized system can have is a data "cleaning" system. This method uses the intrinsic logic of the questionnaire to validate the consistency of the data. For example, if a record contains data in fields that should be blank because the skip pattern went another way, the data is flagged as questionable. If x number of people answered a certain question in a way that forced a skip, then there should be x number of responses to the question that was skipped to. And so on. Computerized data cleaning makes it very easy to spot fiddled data, unless the culprit is extremely careful.

One final comment. Occasionally, our support team is asked to troubleshoot problems with data files. In some cases the client will claim that they have not touched the data, but we usually find that they have actually done something to the data. So we have a hidden flag in each record that is cleared when a record is accessed after the fact. We use that to determine whether or not we are dealing with untouched data or not.

All of these quality control techniques are available because of computerized systems. So I suggest that item c mentioned above is less of a problem that before.

Richard Rands
CfMC

>Peter
>
>--
>Prof. Dr. Peter Ph. Mohler
>GESIS Board of Directors
>ZUMA Director
>
>Mannheim Germany
>P.O.Box 122155
>
>Phone +49-621-1246-172
>Fax +49-621-1246-100
>
>e-mail director@zuma-mannheim.de
>
>ZUMA - The Centre for Survey Research and Methodology
>
>-----
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>signoff aapornet

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

=====
Date: Tue, 13 Jan 2004 17:24:27 -0500
Reply-To: elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Betsy Martin <elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV>
Subject: FYI: Press release
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Statement from The American Association for Public Opinion Research

For immediate release

January 13, 2004

The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) condemns the unethical and irresponsible practices reported to have been used to conduct a survey introduced as evidence in the Scott Peterson murder trial, according to a local newspaper. "Survey research is one of the most effective tools we have for understanding what the public believes, needs,

and wants. It would be a disgrace if the allegations set forth in news reports are correct, and falsified interviews were in fact used to influence an important decision about change of venue in a capital murder trial," said Dr. Elizabeth Martin, President of AAPOR.

"If the reports are correct, then AAPOR would condemn the manner in which this so-called survey was carried out. News reports indicate that students were neither adequately trained nor supervised. Both are necessary to conduct a survey of acceptable quality. Interviewer falsification is a form of scientific misconduct. All reputable surveys monitor or check for the possibility of falsification by directly observing or by calling back a sample of cases to ensure interviews were done," said Dr. Martin.

"Second, it is exploitive to require students to carry out a telephone survey with inadequate supervision and at their own expense. The primary goal of a student-conducted survey should be teaching and training students to use survey methods. Reports indicate that goal was not met in this case."

Background and comment: The Modesto Bee has recently reported that Professor Stephen Schoenthaler of California State University, Stanislaus, required students in his class to conduct interviews by telephone to receive credit for a course, but failed to provide resources and oversight or to validate that the students carried out the interviews. The Bee reported that student interviewers received only an hour of training and were expected to pay for long distance charges. Several students have come forward to say they falsified their interviews because they were pressed for time and would have to make lengthy long distance telephone calls at their own expense, according to the Bee. Some students made up results, and others interviewed friends and relatives rather than randomly selected respondents, according to the story.

AAPOR is an organization of 1,800 individual members working in public opinion, survey research, and allied fields, which provides education a=

bout
surveys and other opinion research to its members, the media and the
public. AAPOR members subscribe to a professional code of ethics. More
information can be found at www.aapor.com or by contacting AAPOR's
President Elizabeth Martin (301-763-4905), President-Elect Nancy Belden
(202-822-6090), or Past-President Mark Schulman (212-779-7700 x114).

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

=====
Date: Tue, 13 Jan 2004 17:47:16 -0500
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Re: FYI: Press release
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

I liked the AAPOR statement as far as it went on the poll used for a
change of venue in the Peterson case. However, it omits what I think is an
important criticism. There is no mention of the dereliction of the court in
accepting the survey without critical review of the work. Why didn't the
judge ask questions about the work before accepting it? The next AAPOR
statement, or even any comments to the press should mention the judge's
error, as well.
warren mitofsky

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

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 Fax

www.mitofskyinternational.com
mitofsky@mindspring.com

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

=====
Date: Tue, 13 Jan 2004 17:48:46 -0500
Reply-To: elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Betsy Martin <elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV>
Subject: Ignore previous: this is the actual press release
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Statement from The American Association for Public Opinion Research

For immediate release January 13, 2004

The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) condemns the unethical and irresponsible practices reported to have been used to conduct a survey introduced as evidence in the Scott Peterson murder trial. "Survey research is one of the most effective tools we have for understanding what the public believes, needs, and wants. It would be a disgrace if the allegations set forth in news reports are correct, and falsified interviews were in fact used to influence an important decision about change of venue in a capital murder trial," said Dr. Elizabeth Martin, President of AAPOR.

"If the reports are correct, then AAPOR would condemn the manner in which this so-called survey was carried out. News reports indicate that students were neither adequately trained nor supervised. Both are necessary to conduct a survey of acceptable quality. Interviewer falsification is a form of scientific misconduct. All reputable surveys monitor or check for the possibility of falsification by directly observing or by calling back a sample of cases to ensure interviews were done," said Dr. Martin.

"Second, it is exploitive to require students to carry out a telephone survey with inadequate supervision and at their own expense. The primary goal of a student-conducted survey should be teaching and training students to use survey methods. Reports indicate that goal was not met in this case."

Background and comment: The Modesto Bee has recently reported that Professor Stephen Schoenthaler of California State University, Stanislaus,

required students in his class to conduct interviews by telephone to receive credit for a course, but failed to provide resources and oversight or to validate that the students carried out the interviews. The Bee reported that student interviewers received only an hour of training and were expected to pay for long distance charges. Several students have come forward to say they falsified their interviews because they were pressed for time and would have to make lengthy long distance telephone calls at their own expense, according to the Bee. Some students made up results, and others interviewed friends and relatives rather than randomly selected respondents, according to the story.

AAPOR is an organization of 1,800 individual members working in public opinion, survey research, and allied fields, which provides education about surveys and other opinion research to its members, the media and the public. AAPOR members subscribe to a professional code of ethics. More information can be found at www.aapor.com or by contacting AAPOR's President Elizabeth Martin (301-763-4905), President-Elect Nancy Belden (202-822-6090), or Past-President Mark Schulman (212-779-7700 x114).

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

Date: Tue, 13 Jan 2004 15:00:20 -0800
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
Subject: Re: press release
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

And I'm curious if Schoenthaler is a member of AAPOR (or another professional association), and should he be somehow formally reprimanded by the association? =20

-Leora

Leora Lawton, Ph.D.
Director of Consumer & Demographic Research

Population Research Systems, LLC
A Member of the FSC Group
100 Spear, Suite 1700
San Francisco, CA 94105
v: 415 777-0707, ex. 117; f: 415 777-2420;
m: 510 928-7572
www.populationresearchsystems.com

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

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

> Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2004 2:49 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Ignore previous: this is the actual press release

>=20

>=20

> Statement from The American Association for Public Opinion Research

>=20

>=20

>=20

> For immediate release January 13, 2004

>=20

> The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)=20

> condemns the

> unethical and irresponsible practices reported to have been=20

> used to conduct

> a survey introduced as evidence in the Scott Peterson murder trial.

> "Survey research is one of the most effective tools we have for

> understanding what the public believes, needs, and wants. =20

> It would be a

> disgrace if the allegations set forth in news reports are correct, and

> falsified interviews were in fact used to influence an=20

> important decision

> about change of venue in a capital murder trial," said Dr. Elizabeth

> Martin, President of AAPOR.

>=20

>=20

> "If the reports are correct, then AAPOR would condemn the=20

> manner in which

> this so-called survey was carried out. News reports indicate=20

> that students

> were neither adequately trained nor supervised. Both are necessary to

> conduct a survey of acceptable quality. Interviewer=20

> falsification is a

> form of scientific misconduct. All reputable surveys monitor=20

> or check for

> the possibility of falsification by directly observing or by=20

> calling back a

> sample of cases to ensure interviews were done," said Dr. Martin.

>=20

>=20

> "Second, it is exploitive to require students to carry out a telephone

> survey with inadequate supervision and at their own expense. =20

> The primary

> goal of a student-conducted survey should be teaching and=20

> training students
> to use survey methods. Reports indicate that goal was not met in this
> case."
>=20
> Background and comment: The Modesto Bee has recently reported that
> Professor Stephen Schoenthaler of California State=20
> University, Stanislaus,
> required students in his class to conduct interviews by telephone to
> receive credit for a course, but failed to provide resources=20
> and oversight
> or to validate that the students carried out the interviews. The Bee
> reported that student interviewers received only an hour of=20
> training and
> were expected to pay for long distance charges. Several=20
> students have come
> forward to say they falsified their interviews because they=20
> were pressed
> for time and would have to make lengthy long distance=20
> telephone calls at
> their own expense, according to the Bee. Some students made=20
> up results,
> and others interviewed friends and relatives rather than=20
> randomly selected
> respondents, according to the story.
>=20
>=20
> AAPOR is an organization of 1,800 individual members working in public
> opinion, survey research, and allied fields, which provides=20
> education about
> surveys and other opinion research to its members, the media and the
> public. AAPOR members subscribe to a professional code of=20
> ethics. More
> information can be found at www.aapor.com or by contacting AAPOR's
> President Elizabeth Martin (301-763-4905), President-Elect=20
> Nancy Belden
> (202-822-6090), or Past-President Mark Schulman (212-779-7700 x114).
>=20
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
>=20

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

Date: Tue, 13 Jan 2004 15:20:34 -0800
Reply-To: steve johnson <stevej@nsdssurvey.org>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: steve johnson <stevej@NSDSSURVEY.ORG>
Subject: Re: FYI: Press release
Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Warren,
Good point. The manual for Complex Litigation and other legal sources set out quite rigorous standards for the admissibility of survey research. Failure to adhere to these standards moves the research into the "junk science" category. Having done research for class action litigation and capital murder cases I am quite surprised that any judge would have allowed this and that the attorneys on the other side did not raise questions about the methodology.

Steve Johnson, Ph.D.
President, Northwest Survey & Data Services

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

From: "Warren Mitofsky" <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2004 2:47 PM
Subject: Re: FYI: Press release

> I liked the AAPOR statement as far as it went on the poll used for a
> change of venue in the Peterson case. However, it omits what I think is an
> important criticism. There is no mention of the dereliction of the court
in
> accepting the survey without critical review of the work. Why didn't the
> judge ask questions about the work before accepting it? The next AAPOR
> statement, or even any comments to the press should mention the judge's
> error, as well.

> warren mitofsky

>

>

>

>

> MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL

> 1776 Broadway, Suite 1708

> New York, NY 10019

>

> 212 980-3031

> 212 980-3107 Fax

>

> www.mitofskyinternational.com

> mitofsky@mindspring.com

>

> -----

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

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

> signoff aapornet

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

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

signoff aapornet

Date: Tue, 13 Jan 2004 15:44:48 -0800
Reply-To: "Pollack, Lance" <LPollack@PSG.UCSF.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Pollack, Lance" <LPollack@PSG.UCSF.EDU>
Subject: Re: FYI: Press release
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

I believe what needs to be done here is to review the judge's decision as written. I have not followed this closely, but the news reports here in northern California reported that the survey was a small piece of a decision based primarily on the overwhelming amount of pre-trial publicity. I think critical questions were not asked because the survey was not the central issue in the decision by the judge and I suspect the prosecution went through the motions of a "done deal" hearing. That is why no "firestorm" on the legal side has occurred, i.e., I don't see any great cry to not move the trial.

Just as an aside, I expect the students involved also to be heavily sanctioned. They submitted fraudulent data to complete an assignment and mis-represented their efforts to get a passing grade. The impossibility of the assignment may be mitigating, but their response to it was not to complain to the department (i.e., the instructor's "supervisor"), but instead to invent data. If the instructor had acted appropriately, the students would never have been put in that position. If the students had acted appropriately, the glaring problems with data collection would have been exposed. If the judge had acted appropriately, he would not have accepted the results (although his decision probably would not have changed). Of course, if Scott Peterson had acted appropriately...

Lance M. Pollack, Ph.D.
Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)
University of California, San Francisco
lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu

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

From: steve johnson [mailto:stevej@NSDSSURVEY.ORG]
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2004 3:21 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: FYI: Press release

Warren,
Good point. The manual for Complex Litigation and other legal sources set out quite rigorous standards for the admissibility of survey research. Failure to adhere to these standards moves the research into the "junk science" category. Having done research for class action litigation and capital murder cases I am quite surprised that any judge would have allowed this and that the attorneys on the other side did not raise questions about the methodology.

Steve Johnson, Ph.D.
President, Northwest Survey & Data Services

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

From: "Warren Mitofsky" <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2004 2:47 PM
Subject: Re: FYI: Press release

> I liked the AAPOR statement as far as it went on the poll used for a
> change of venue in the Peterson case. However, it omits what I think is an
> important criticism. There is no mention of the dereliction of the court
in
> accepting the survey without critical review of the work. Why didn't the
> judge ask questions about the work before accepting it? The next AAPOR
> statement, or even any comments to the press should mention the judge's
> error, as well.

> warren mitofsky

>

>

>

>

> MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL

> 1776 Broadway, Suite 1708

> New York, NY 10019

>

> 212 980-3031

> 212 980-3107 Fax

>

> www.mitofskyinternational.com

> mitofsky@mindspring.com

>

> -----

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

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

> signoff aapornet

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

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

signoff aapornet

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

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

signoff aapornet

Date: Tue, 13 Jan 2004 23:58:00 -0500

Reply-To: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>

Subject: FW: FYI: Press release

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

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

From: Andrew A Beveridge [mailto:beveridg@optonline.net]
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2004 6:09 PM
To: Warren Mitofsky; AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: RE: FYI: Press release

Dear Warren, et al:

The judge had three surveys to use. One could also criticize the defense for not carefully reviewing the work before it was presented; and the prosecution for not cross-examining the Prof. better.

This shows how much junk social science is actually out there.

Below is another example:

I have been working with a student from an elite school in NYC. He is on track to go to an Ivy League University. He was told by his teacher that he must do an original survey. It is to be handed out in two apartment buildings with no controls on who answers it or anything like that.

The teacher told him that he must carry-out original work, which must not include questions others have used or data that others have analyzed because then it would not be original. He then must put analyze his survey using the computer.

We have a lot of work in the Public Affairs area ahead of us.

Andy Beveridge

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2004 5:47 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: FYI: Press release

I liked the AAPOR statement as far as it went on the poll used for a change of venue in the Peterson case. However, it omits what I think is an important criticism. There is no mention of the dereliction of the court in accepting the survey without critical review of the work. Why didn't the judge ask questions about the work before accepting it? The next AAPOR statement, or even any comments to the press should mention the judge's error, as well.

warren mitofsky

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

212 980-3031

212 980-3107 Fax

www.mitofskyinternational.com
mitofsky@mindspring.com

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

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

Date: Wed, 14 Jan 2004 10:09:57 -0500
Reply-To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: FW: FYI: Press release
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

My observation is that attitudes toward survey research in many many university and college programs is that standards don't really matter as they teach students. I just had a former employee who is now in a grad program and taking a course in analytic methods relate an example. Her professor gave a class assignment telling them specifically they would need to cut corners as they drew samples and collected data in order to not spend too much time on the project. I had to wonder what the value of this exercise might be. They were clearly not demonstrating their knowledge of standards, nor was the professor engendering much respect for standards. What was it they were supposed to learn? There are a thousand other ways to teach students how to gather data properly. You can see how students don't respect the process. JAS

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

visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

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

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

signoff aapornet

Date: Wed, 14 Jan 2004 11:05:04 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Another apparent positioning poll mischaracterized as a push poll
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Challenger upset with incumbent over campaign poll=20
By Shruti Dat=E9 Singh Daily Herald Staff Writer
Posted January 14, 2004=20

http://www.dailyherald.com/cook/main_story.asp?intID=3D3800012#

Republican challenger Patricia "Pat" Sutarik has filed a complaint with =
the
Illinois State Board of Elections, saying incumbent state Rep. Suzanne
"Suzie" Bassi violated campaign ethics in a recent poll.

Sutarik, who along with Palatine Councilman Warren Kostka is challenging
Bassi for the 54th state House seat, said in a letter to the elections =
board
this week that Bassi's poll was used to spread "negative comments and/or
spin about me, my campaign, where my family worships and what school my
children attend."

"The practice of push polling is an outrageous and despicable tactic and
evidence of a desperate campaign that lacks ethics," added Sutarik, a
longtime GOP activist from Palatine.

A push poll is a series of calls in which people who support a =
particular
candidate offer negative information about a rival candidate. Push polls =
are
generally used toward the end of the campaign season to leave little =
time
for the rival to respond.=20

SNIP

Her campaign tapped Public Opinion Research, a polling firm based in
Virginia, to poll about 300 people throughout the district with positive =
and
negative questions about all three candidates, she said.=20

Bassi said the pollsters did not ask questions about her challenger's =
church
affiliation, but they did ask for opinions about Christian Liberty =

Academy,
a private school that Sutarik's son attends.=20

SNIP

--=20

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax
=20

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

Date: Wed, 14 Jan 2004 11:03:24 -0500
Reply-To: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Susan Carol Losh <slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU>
Subject: On teaching methods, surveys or otherwise
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain
Content-transfer-encoding: binary
Content-disposition: inline

Unfortunately a lot of the problems that our colleagues mention stem from the way methods is taught in the behavioral sciences. All too often there may be ONE required undergraduate or graduate course students must take. As a result the methods course begins to resemble "if it's Tuesday, this must be Belgium," a bit of experimental, a bit on surveys, a bit on content analysis, a bit on ethnographies. Some instructors try to motivate their students and give them a "taste" of the method, usually by conducting a "quickndirty" survey. As a result, the students leave the methods course thinking "this is all you do."

I find at least some of the problem inherent in the course structure. My department has the same kind of Methods graduate course which I taught each year for three in a row. I decided no survey was better than an ersatz survey, but really, it is a nightmare and an exercise in frustrated futility for both students and instructor to try to cover "all basic methodology" in 13 weeks. I know we're not alone! I have reviewed dozens of methods texts and virtually all generic ones take the same "candybox sampler" route. I won't go into some of the other egrarious errors (did you know that causality can be determined by whether you have qualitative or quantitative variables? I didn't either...)

We would never dream of teaching statistics that way. Our department has separate courses for causal models, analysis of variance, multivariate regression models, nonparametric, etc. When I was in Sociology here, we

had separate courses for intro, multivariate, qualitative, SEM, etc. That way, each topic can be addressed in some depth and students get first-hand analytic experience.

I am trying to get our program to restructure teaching methods in analogous fashion. Separate courses on surveys (unfortunately not in our department due to historical reasons), ethnographic, experimental, etc. Of course institutional change is a long and laborious process but we have begun a dialogue.

Susan

On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 10:09:57 -0500 "J. Ann Selzer" wrote:

- > My observation is that attitudes toward survey research in many many
- > university and college programs is that standards don't really matter
- > as they teach
- > students. I just had a former employee who is now in a grad program
- > and taking a
- > course in analytic methods relate an example. Her professor gave a class
- > assignment telling them specifically they would need to cut corners
- > as they drew
- > samples and collected data in order to not spend too much time on the
- > project.
- > I had to wonder what the value of this exercise might be. They were
- > clearly
- > not demonstrating their knowledge of standards, nor was the professor
- > engendering much respect for standards. What was it they were
- > supposed to learn?
- > There are a thousand other ways to teach students how to gather data
- > properly.
- > You can see how students don't respect the process. JAS
- >
- > J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
- > Selzer & Company, Inc.
- > Des Moines, Iowa 50312
- > 515.271.5700
- >
- > visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com
- >
- > E-mail address for purposes of this list: JAnnSelzer@aol.com; otherwise,
- > contact JASelzer@SelzerCo.com.
- >
- > -----
- > Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
- > Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
- > signoff aapornet

Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.
American Statistical Association/NSF-SRS Research Fellow 2003-2004
Program Leader, Learning & Cognition
Department of Educational Psychology & Learning Systems

Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

VOICE (850) 644-8778
FAX (850) 644-8776

visit the site: <http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh/Index.htm>

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

Date: Wed, 14 Jan 2004 12:06:23 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: AAPOR issues a tersely worded statement
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Modbee.com
Survey review could take months

By GARTH STAPLEY
BEE STAFF WRITER

A California State University, Stanislaus, investigation into a survey scandal involving the Scott Peterson double-murder case may last several weeks or months, President Marvalene Hughes said Tuesday.

A preliminary inquiry launched Thursday at the Turlock campus, which had been predicted to take a week, has evolved into the full-blown investigation, Hughes said.

"I want the community to have the patience that is needed in order to investigate this case thoroughly and appropriately," she said.

SNIP

Also Tuesday:

Another criminal justice student came forward to The Bee, bringing to nine the number who have claimed fabricating survey responses. All said they were pressed for time during finals and worried about telephone bills because they were required to make dozens of lengthy, long-distance calls with their own phones.

A national association of pollsters issued a rare official statement, calling the survey a disgrace if the allegations are true.

SNIP

Schoenthaler continues to teach a course during Stanislaus State's winter term, university spokesman Don Hansen said, and is expected to teach other classes during the spring semester. Hughes said the professor will remain on the job during the investigation.

"I would like to give the community the absolute assurance that we will take all cautions necessary to protect the individuals involved," Hughes said, "and to protect the quality of the academic process at the university."

Schoenthaler initially said he did not believe the students' claims and later said he needed more information.

Hughes said the investigation will take two tracks, one to scrutinize Schoenthaler and the other his students. Overseeing the probes are, respectively, Vice Provost Diana Demetrulias and Vice President for Student Affairs Stacey Morgan-Foster.

SNIP

Survey review an issue

In a press release, Hughes said the probe will review whether Schoenthaler submitted his plan for the survey to a university committee overseeing such research. Schoenthaler last week said he did not, maintaining that his surveys are exempt from federal regulations, but his division coordinator and Demetrulias said all such plans must be presented for review.

SNIP

Meanwhile, the 1,800-member American Association for Public Opinion Research issued a tersely worded condemnation of "unethical and irresponsible practices reported to have been used" in Schoenthaler's survey.

Bad publicity for pollsters

Association President Elizabeth Martin said from her office in Washington, D.C., that her group released the statement "because of all the publicity, and we don't want people to think this is how surveys are normally done."

The release states: "All reputable surveys monitor or check for the possibility of falsification by directly observing or by calling back a sample of cases to ensure interviews were done." Schoenthaler previously conceded that he did neither.

The statement added: "It is exploitative to require students to carry out a telephone survey with inadequate supervision and at their own expense."

Martin said Schoenthaler does not appear on her group's membership list.

A section of the association's Web page dedicated to press releases and official statements lists only one other condemnation of an ethics violation -- issued in 1997. A Virginia firm had failed to cooperate with an inquiry into a poll on the 1994 Republican Contract With America.

SNIP

Bee staff writer Garth Stapley can be reached at 578-2390 or gstapley@modbee.com.

Posted on 01/14/04 06:10:09

<http://www.modbee.com/local/story/8003111p-8870820c.html>

--

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

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

=====
Date: Wed, 14 Jan 2004 13:16:00 -0800
Reply-To: Mary Ann Jones <maryann.jones@NYU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mary Ann Jones <maryann.jones@NYU.EDU>
Subject: Re: On teaching methods, surveys or otherwise
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <200401141603.i0EG3Om17224@fire3.fsu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

For many years in the graduate program in which I teach, we devoted our two required research methods courses to having the students form groups, propose a study, carry it out, analyze, and report it. It was a whirlwind and difficult, but kind of fun and active. Some nice little studies were done, and some students really enjoyed it, and some probably got a lot out of it. We finally faced up to the fact, however, that we were not fulfilling our pedagogical assignment: to teach students the concepts, principles, logic, and design choices and consequences of the varieties of empirical research. Instead, most of the time and energy of the courses was going into the very real demands of the student projects.

We have switched to a more conventional, didactic approach, teaching the methods and standards of the varieties of empirical research augmented by reading research articles from the professional literature that illustrate those methods. The students are now learning the difference between and consequences of experimental vs. non-experimental designs and random vs. non-random sampling approaches, to take two big examples. While not always as much

fun as putting
out fires, helping students develop a study, watching the delight of some
students as they
obtain their first "findings," I now content myself with getting those
pleasures
from working with doctoral students on their dissertations, and focus the
research
methods classes on helping students learn the fundamentals and become more
knowledgable readers of the professional empirical literature.

At 11:03 AM 1/14/2004 -0500, Susan Carol Losh wrote:

>Unfortunately a lot of the problems that our colleagues mention stem from
>the way methods is taught in the behavioral sciences. All too often there
>may be ONE required undergraduate or graduate course students must take.
>As a result the methods course begins to resemble "if it's Tuesday, this
>must be Belgium," a bit of experimental, a bit on surveys, a bit on
>content analysis, a bit on ethnographies. Some instructors try to
>motivate their students and give them a "taste" of the method, usually by
>conducting a "quickndirty" survey. As a result, the students leave the
>methods course thinking "this is all you do."

>
>I find at least some of the problem inherent in the course structure. My
>department has the same kind of Methods graduate course which I taught
>each year for three in a row. I decided no survey was better than an
>ersatz survey, but really, it is a nightmare and an exercise in
>frustrated futility for both students and instructor to try to cover "all
>basic methodology" in 13 weeks. I know we're not alone! I have reviewed
>dozens of methods texts and virtually all generic ones take the same
>"candybox sampler" route. I won't go into some of the other egrarious
>errors (did you know that causality can be determined by whether you have
>qualitative or quantitative variables? I didn't either...)

>
>We would never dream of teaching statistics that way. Our department has
>separate courses for causal models, analysis of variance, multivariate
>regression models, nonparametric, etc. When I was in Sociology here, we
>had separate courses for intro, multivariate, qualitative, SEM, etc. That
>way, each topic can be addressed in some depth and students get
>first-hand analytic experience.

>
>I am trying to get our program to restructure teaching methods in
>analagous fashion. Separate courses on surveys (unfortunately not in our
>department due to historical reasons), ethnographic, experimental, etc.
>Of course institutional change is a long and laborious process but we
>have begun a dialogue.

>
>Susan

>
>On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 10:09:57 -0500 "J. Ann Selzer" wrote:

>
>> My observation is that attitudes toward survey research in many many

>> university and college programs is that standards don't really matter
>> as they teach
>> students. I just had a former employee who is now in a grad program
>> and taking a
>> course in analytic methods relate an example. Her professor gave a class
>> assignment telling them specifically they would need to cut corners
>> as they drew
>> samples and collected data in order to not spend too much time on the
>> project.
>> I had to wonder what the value of this exercise might be. They were
>> clearly
>> not demonstrating their knowledge of standards, nor was the professor
>> engendering much respect for standards. What was it they were
>> supposed to learn?
>> There are a thousand other ways to teach students how to gather data
>> properly.
>> You can see how students don't respect the process. JAS

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

>>
>> visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

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

>>
>> -----

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

>
>
>

>Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.
>American Statistical Association/NSF-SRS Research Fellow 2003-2004
>Program Leader, Learning & Cognition
>Department of Educational Psychology & Learning Systems
>Florida State University
>Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

>
>VOICE (850) 644-8778
>FAX (850) 644-8776
>
>visit the site: <http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh/Index.htm>

>
>-----

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

>
> Mary Ann Jones, DSW
> Associate Professor

Ehrenkranz School of Social Work
New York University
1 Washington Square North, Room G02
New York, N.Y. 10003

212-998-5972

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

Date: Wed, 14 Jan 2004 11:33:28 -0800
Reply-To: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>
Organization: Competitive Edge Research & Comm.
Subject: Re: Another apparent positioning poll mischaracterized as a push
poll
Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <[003801c3dab8\\$2c568090\\$d00a010a@LEO](mailto:003801c3dab8$2c568090$d00a010a@LEO)>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

While it is great that AAPOR has a strong statement regarding push polls, I think it's confusing in parts and needs to be reworded. As a pollster who works on campaigns all the time, it is imperative that we draw a distinct, clear line between research and advocacy disguised as research. Instead, our statement talks a lot about negative campaigning and that the statements in a push poll are "stretched or fabricated." 1st, a push poll isn't necessarily negative. 2nd, one candidate's stretched or fabricated statement is another candidate's fact sheet -- there's generally no way for anyone to conclusively tell whether the statements are, in fact, bogus. When I test messages in polls I include many different statements on candidates, all of them true, but this doesn't stop some respondents from crying "push poll!". This is where we have the problem with respondents perceiving a push poll when it's really not. Attacking the veracity of push poll arguments does not belong in our statement. 3rd, as the 1st line of the statement alludes to, it is the DECEPTION (a campaign disguising the advocacy call as a research call) that is insidious. That's what we should focus on. =20

John E. Nienstedt, Sr.
john@cerc.net
Get the edge at www.cerc.net
=20

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Leo G. Simonetta
Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2004 8:05 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Another apparent positioning poll mischaracterized as a push
poll

Challenger upset with incumbent over campaign poll=20

By Shruti Dat=E9 Singh Daily Herald Staff Writer

Posted January 14, 2004=20

http://www.dailyherald.com/cook/main_story.asp?intID=3D3800012#

Republican challenger Patricia "Pat" Sutarik has filed a complaint with the Illinois State Board of Elections, saying incumbent state Rep. Suzanne "Suzie" Bassi violated campaign ethics in a recent poll.

Sutarik, who along with Palatine Councilman Warren Kostka is challenging Bassi for the 54th state House seat, said in a letter to the elections board this week that Bassi's poll was used to spread "negative comments and/or spin about me, my campaign, where my family worships and what school my children attend."

"The practice of push polling is an outrageous and despicable tactic and evidence of a desperate campaign that lacks ethics," added Sutarik, a longtime GOP activist from Palatine.

A push poll is a series of calls in which people who support a particular candidate offer negative information about a rival candidate. Push polls are generally used toward the end of the campaign season to leave little time for the rival to respond.=20

SNIP

Her campaign tapped Public Opinion Research, a polling firm based in Virginia, to poll about 300 people throughout the district with positive and negative questions about all three candidates, she said.=20

Bassi said the pollsters did not ask questions about her challenger's church affiliation, but they did ask for opinions about Christian Liberty Academy, a private school that Sutarik's son attends.=20

SNIP

--=20

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

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

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

Date: Wed, 14 Jan 2004 13:45:32 -0600
Reply-To: Rick Weil <fweil@COX.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Rick Weil <fweil@COX.NET>
Subject: Teaching methods
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I think there's an implicit model in some of the discussion about teaching that I don't agree with, and I'd like to put in a good word for learning by doing.

An example from my own undergrad days. My college roommate, EJ Dionne, and I were very interested in survey research, but had no training in it, and we took a seminar from Bill Schneider. Bill was working with the nascent CBS/NYT poll in the '72 primaries, and every couple weeks, he'd plunk a big pile of output down in front of us and say, "here, tell me what's going on." Then I wanted to do a survey for my senior thesis, and Bill gave me a little advice on collecting the data, put the SPSS manual in my hands and said, "here, figure out how to run tables, and decide if the percentage differences are big or not" (nothing formal about samples or stats here, just common sense). EJ & I learned more formal stats & methods later, and I don't think this educational path hurt either of us.

We've developed a kind of liability/accountability thinking in our society that says, since someone has to be blamed if something goes wrong, that we have to cover all our bases in preparing for the event. This makes a certain amount of sense when we're talking about professionals working for clients or for publication - but even then the buyer/reader needs to cut sufficient slack that the process may not be capable of producing error-free results.

But this thinking has entered methods teaching, too, and I don't think the results are optimal. I don't think we can give the students formal coverage of everything - there's simply too much - or that this is even a good idea by itself. I like to have students learn by doing, and along with that comes making some mistakes. I do indeed make my undergrads read a textbook and listen to lectures, and this gives them some semblance of complete coverage - and it puts them to sleep. So I augment that with data analysis exercises and, importantly, a real survey project. Of course, the students

stumble at various points - and I'm there to guide & help them - but I think they learn a lot more from their engagement in the project than in the book/lecture/exercise learning. Also, we present the results to a real audience (the mayor; the press if they want it) to increase the students' appreciation of the work. But we present the results as student research - carried out with valid procedures, but not by trained professionals.

Thus, my argument is not against standards and coverage as such, but rather that (1) we can never cover all of it (you never know for sure which student is really going to go into which field - say, survey research, ethnography, or one of the many other fields - and you don't have time to teach them all completely), and (2) students learn as much or more by doing rather than by reading/hearing about it. The question is how to get them from zero to sixty, given that it can't happen all at once, and that probably a lot of it can't happen at school anyway. Some degree of on-the-job training is probably unavoidable and a good thing. The apprentice/workshop model has an important role to fill.

Bottom line: formal coverage is important, but it generally can't cover everything, and it probably doesn't teach as well as working on a project. If you could actually teach a student everything s/he needs to know for a profession with formal methods, that would be one thing, but you can't. On-the-job training is necessary to complete almost all professional training. But I don't think it's an either-or choice. I think formal methods and learning-by-doing augment each other.

...I assume it goes without saying that this is not a defense of what happened in California, which included a number of other errors.

Rick Weil
Department of Sociology
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA 70803

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

=====
Date: Wed, 14 Jan 2004 15:55:36 -0500
Reply-To: Dale Kulp <DKulp@M-S-G.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Dale Kulp <DKulp@M-S-G.COM>
Subject: FW: trial consulting
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Anybody else get this timely sales pitch in their in-box?=20

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

From: lharmon@trialfocus.com [mailto:lharmon@trialfocus.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2004 2:43 PM
To: =20
Subject: trial consulting

Research colleagues:

Trial Focus is now offering moderators and research=20 consultants the opportunity to learn the fascinating and=20 lucrative profession of trial consulting.=20

Trial consulting less competitive than marketing research and=20 the trial preparation business is growing by leaps and=20 bounds. This opportunity is ideal for those wanting to add=20 trial consulting to their existing services, or those seeking=20 a refreshing change. The other advantages of trial consulting=20 are:

- 80% profit margins
- no overnight travel
- no long report writing
- continuous challenges and discoveries
- minimal overhead

Trial consulting has always been very difficult to tap into.=20 However, we will train the individual or company so they will=20 be able to perform their own mock trials and legal focus=20 groups within a couple of weeks, but we'll hold your hand=20 until you are a success. The licensing package includes:=20

- licensing of Trial Focus' techniques and methodologies
- training, to include participation in an actual=20 project.
- continuous project and marketing support
- ongoing educational opportunities
- database and client development=20
- the opportunity to network with our other=20 consultants around the country.=20
- on-site support with your first project
- exclusive rights to all business in your state

No legal background needed. This is a business opportunity=20 for a career in trial consulting, not a training seminar. It=20 is entirely realistic to build up a client base in your state=20 and then sell out for an amount to retire on!

Financing of our licensing package is available.=20

Only one individual/company will be trained per state, and no=20 more than 30 are expected to be licensed nationwide.

We have two training sessions slated for January and=20 February, so call or email us today. For more detailed=20

licensing info, you can visit our web site and click=20
on "Training/Biz Op". Download our word document for further=20
detailed information and pricing.

Best regards,

Linda Harmon
Trial Focus
Jackson, MS=20
(601)291-0717
www.Trialfocus.com

Linda Harmon
Trial Focus
www.Trialfocus.com
Jackson, MS=20
(601) 291-0717

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

=====
Date: Wed, 14 Jan 2004 13:40:19 -0800
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
Subject: Call for Nominations for the ASA's Sociological Practice Section
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Since I know some of you are sociologists, I thought I would run this =
Call for Nominations by you. We are working to revamp the Section to =
make its functions more integral to the ASA, and to make the ASA a place =
where non-academic sociologists can learn, get training, and network for =
clients and jobs. For example, I now consult in the energy and =
environment worlds, and for the 2005 ASA I designed a session on =
Sociology in the Public Utilities. So if you are interested in having a =
real impact on an association, your career, and meeting a lot of great =
people, consider submitting your name, or the name of a sociologist you =
know. (Of course, you have to be a member of the ASA and the section to =
run.) =20

Thanks,
Leora Lawton
Chair, Sociological Practice Section

Call For Nominations 2004 Sociological Practice Section

The Sociological Practice Section of the American Sociological Association is seeking nominations for the positions of Chair (1 year position) and three Council Members (3 year positions). Nominations may be self-initiated. An electronic version of a biographical statement is needed with the following information: Name: Name of the candidate (as it should appear on the ballot); Present Position: title/rank, place of employment (dates of employment); Education: Degree, Institution, Year; Offices, Committee Memberships, and Editorial Appointments Held in ASA: List most recent first, list no more than three; Publications and Professional Accomplishments: List most recent first, list no more than five, to include: title, journal and volume or publisher, year, if appropriate. Send nominating information to Kristine Ajrouch, email: kajrouch@emich.edu. The deadline for nominations is January 25, 2004.

Kristine J. Ajrouch, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Sociology, Anthropology, Criminology
Eastern Michigan University
712 Pray-Harrod
Ypsilanti, MI 48197
Tel: (734) 487-7921 Fax: (734) 487-7010

Leora Lawton, Ph.D.
Director of Consumer & Demographic Research
Population Research Systems, LLC
A Member of the FSC Group
100 Spear, Suite 1700
San Francisco, CA 94105
v: 415 777-0707, ex. 117; f: 415 777-2420;
m: 510 928-7572
www.populationresearchsystems.com

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

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

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

Date: Wed, 14 Jan 2004 16:06:58 -0600
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Re: press release
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

A search of the AAPOR Membership database reflects that Professor =
Schoenthaler is not a member of AAPOR. =20

Michael P. Flanagan, CAE=20
Executive Coordinator=20
American Association for Public Opinion Research =20
P. O. Box 14263=20
Lenexa, KS 66285-4263=20
(913) 495-4470=20
FAX: (913) 599-5340 =20
www.aapor.org <<http://www.aapor.org>> =20

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

From: Leora Lawton [<mailto:leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>]
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2004 5:00 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: press release

And I'm curious if Schoenthaler is a member of AAPOR (or another =
professional association), and should he be somehow formally reprimanded =
by the association? =20

-Leora

Leora Lawton, Ph.D.
Director of Consumer & Demographic Research
Population Research Systems, LLC
A Member of the FSC Group
100 Spear, Suite 1700
San Francisco, CA 94105
v: 415 777-0707, ex. 117; f: 415 777-2420;
m: 510 928-7572
www.populationresearchsystems.com

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

> From: Betsy Martin [<mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV>]
> Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2004 2:49 PM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Ignore previous: this is the actual press release

>=20
>=20
> Statement from The American Association for Public Opinion Research
>=20
>=20
>=20
> For immediate release January 13, 2004
>=20
> The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR)=20
> condemns the
> unethical and irresponsible practices reported to have been=20
> used to conduct
> a survey introduced as evidence in the Scott Peterson murder trial.
> "Survey research is one of the most effective tools we have for
> understanding what the public believes, needs, and wants. =20
> It would be a
> disgrace if the allegations set forth in news reports are correct, and
> falsified interviews were in fact used to influence an=20
> important decision
> about change of venue in a capital murder trial," said Dr. Elizabeth
> Martin, President of AAPOR.
>=20
>=20
> "If the reports are correct, then AAPOR would condemn the=20
> manner in which
> this so-called survey was carried out. News reports indicate=20
> that students
> were neither adequately trained nor supervised. Both are necessary to
> conduct a survey of acceptable quality. Interviewer=20
> falsification is a
> form of scientific misconduct. All reputable surveys monitor=20
> or check for
> the possibility of falsification by directly observing or by=20
> calling back a
> sample of cases to ensure interviews were done," said Dr. Martin.
>=20
>=20
> "Second, it is exploitive to require students to carry out a telephone
> survey with inadequate supervision and at their own expense. =20
> The primary
> goal of a student-conducted survey should be teaching and=20
> training students
> to use survey methods. Reports indicate that goal was not met in this
> case."
>=20
> Background and comment: The Modesto Bee has recently reported that
> Professor Stephen Schoenthaler of California State=20
> University, Stanislaus,
> required students in his class to conduct interviews by telephone to
> receive credit for a course, but failed to provide resources=20
> and oversight
> or to validate that the students carried out the interviews. The Bee
> reported that student interviewers received only an hour of=20
> training and

> were expected to pay for long distance charges. Several=20
> students have come
> forward to say they falsified their interviews because they=20
> were pressed
> for time and would have to make lengthy long distance=20
> telephone calls at
> their own expense, according to the Bee. Some students made=20
> up results,
> and others interviewed friends and relatives rather than=20
> randomly selected
> respondents, according to the story.
>=20
>=20
> AAPOR is an organization of 1,800 individual members working in public
> opinion, survey research, and allied fields, which provides=20
> education about
> surveys and other opinion research to its members, the media and the
> public. AAPOR members subscribe to a professional code of=20
> ethics. More
> information can be found at www.aapor.com or by contacting AAPOR's
> President Elizabeth Martin (301-763-4905), President-Elect=20
> Nancy Belden
> (202-822-6090), or Past-President Mark Schulman (212-779-7700 x114).
>=20
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
>=20

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

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

Date: Wed, 14 Jan 2004 18:57:52 -0500
Reply-To: Charles Kadushin <kadushin@BRANDEIS.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Charles Kadushin <kadushin@BRANDEIS.EDU>
Subject: Re: FW: trial consulting
Comments: To: Dale Kulp <DKulp@M-S-G.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Not in my box.

I was a close friend of the late sociologist Jay Schulman who together with my Columbia University colleague social psychologist Dick Christie, now also deceased, invented the entire field of trial consulting in a brilliant

application of social science to radical activities. Jay was fired from City College for allegedly actively assisting students to protest the war. He contested this but an agreement was reached in which City College paid Jay three year's salary in return for a promise never to darken their doors again. Jay and Dick used this "fellowship" to invent social science assisted voir dire and other activities. Their first success was a hung jury in

"the 1972 federal trial of the Harrisburg Seven, in which Father Philip Berrigan and six other Catholic war resisters stood accused of conspiring to do everything from the raiding draft boards to kidnapping then-Secretary of State Henry Kissinger.

"Schulman and his colleagues spent weeks exhaustively studying and polling Harrisburg's jury pool. The extensive background work the consultants did helped the Harrisburg Seven's lawyers pick a jury far more sympathetic to their case than the government anticipated. In the end, the Harrisburg jury hung, and the work of Schulman and his consultants was viewed as a major reason for the unexpected outcome."

Jason Gay in the Worcesterphoenix archives, 1997, 7 November.

This account is accurate except, possibly, for the phrase "far more sympathetic." Jay believed that you could never predict a sympathetic jury, but you could work to achieve one with minimum bias such that they would listen to the defense's case. In his view, the government always had the advantage of prejudice in their favor, especially the way jury pools were constructed in those days. Jay successfully worked on legal challenges such that the more restrictive ways of recruiting jury pools from such things as tax payer lists and voter registration lists and other such sources of "good citizens" were overturned.

I worked with Jay on a number of projects as a survey analyst including a survey that helped secure what was at that time the only change of venue in New York State for a murder trial, that of Katherine Boudin.

Jay also worked for a number of commercial clients, ranging from AT&T to alleged Mafioso. Anyone who was harassed by the government gained his interest and sympathy, especially if they paid well.

Is this licensable? I doubt it. Jay, a man of Rabelasian stature and temperament had by the time of his untimely death seen the growth of this industry, both in the radical lawyer sector but also in such applications as this solicitation. He was not chagrined, I think, but amused.

At 03:55 PM 1/14/2004 -0500, Dale Kulp wrote:

>Anybody else get this timely sales pitch in their in-box?

>

>

>

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

>From: lharmon@trialfocus.com [mailto:lharmon@trialfocus.com]

>Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2004 2:43 PM

>To:

>Subject: trial consulting

>

>

>Research colleagues:

>

>Trial Focus is now offering moderators and research

>consultants the opportunity to learn the fascinating and

>lucrative profession of trial consulting.

>

>Trial consulting less competitive than marketing research and

>the trial preparation business is growing by leaps and

>bounds. This opportunity is ideal for those wanting to add

>trial consulting to their existing services, or those seeking

>a refreshing change. The other advantages of trial consulting

>are:

>

>-80% profit margins

>-no overnight travel

>-no long report writing

>-continuous challenges and discoveries

>-minimal overhead

>

>Trial consulting has always been very difficult to tap into.

>However, we will train the individual or company so they will

>be able to perform their own mock trials and legal focus

>groups within a couple of weeks, but we'll hold your hand

>until you are a success. The licensing package includes:

>

>-licensing of Trial Focus' techniques and methodologies

>-training, to include participation in an actual

>project.

>-continuous project and marketing support

>-ongoing educational opportunities

>-database and client development

>-the opportunity to network with our other

>consultants around the country.

>-on-site support with your first project

>-exclusive rights to all business in your state

>

>No legal background needed. This is a business opportunity

>for a career in trial consulting, not a training seminar. It

>is entirely realistic to build up a client base in your state

>and then sell out for an amount to retire on!

>

>Financing of our licensing package is available.

>

>Only one individual/company will be trained per state, and no

>more than 30 are expected to be licensed nationwide.

>

>We have two training sessions slated for January and

>February, so call or email us today. For more detailed

>licensing info, you can visit our web site and click

>on "Training/Biz Op". Download our word document for further

>detailed information and pricing.

>

>Best regards,

>

>Linda Harmon

>Trial Focus

>Jackson, MS

>(601)291-0717

>www.Trialfocus.com

>

>

>

>Linda Harmon

>Trial Focus

>www.Trialfocus.com

>Jackson, MS

>(601) 291-0717

>

>-----

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

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

>signoff aapornet

>

>-----

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

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

signoff aapornet

=====

Date: Wed, 14 Jan 2004 16:46:16 -0800

Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>

Subject: FW:

Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu

Comments: cc: Warren Gold <WGold@itsa.ucsf.edu>,

Al Vallecillo <avalle@cal.net>, Diego Kusnir <oupin1@sbcglobal.net>,

James True <jtrue@mindspring.com>,

Laura Harper <shepharper@charter.net>,

mickeyhuff@mac.com, Peter Phillips <peter.phillips@sonoma.edu>,

Suzanne Grady <suziandchuck@yahoo.com>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Writing for Retro Poll: This is a month old business as an earlier discussion on the list served occurred before I had joined AAPOR but I think it is important respond nonetheless.

I appreciate Doug Henwood's opening a discussion about our work on the AAPOR mail list. We heard about the back and forth incidentally from another friend. The only message I myself saw concerning Retro Poll was from Allen Barton and was in response to Doug and Mark Lindman, so I am somewhat handicapped and probably only feeling the elephant's tail, but will try and respond to Allen's comments anyway.

We have found a number of interesting correlations in each of our 3 small surveys. One of the most interesting is that people who know that there is no sustainable evidence associating Saddam Hussein and Al Qaeda or Saddam with 9/11 generally oppose the war and occupation in contrast to people who accept that story, who support the war. It makes logical sense. In fact, this association is consistent over time in our 3 random national polls (sample sizes 150, 215, 165= 530). In the most recent poll (November 2003) we also found the following correlation:

Those who know there isn't evidence on an Al Qaeda link to Saddam think that George W Bush's misleading the public on WMD is "grounds for impeachment" (by 72% yes).

Of course we agree with the comment that an association between two factors, no matter how strong does not in anyway impute causation. The independent variable can always be a surrogate for one or several others or the direction of the association may be opposite. What it does show as do many of our correlations between media-government propaganda/misinformation and support for an aggressive foreign policy of invasion and occupation is that "people who have trouble reading the media critically (or between the lines)" defines the core sector of the population that is rallied (one might conclude "manipulated" to support unjust or self-agrandizing government policies (whether they be removal of democratic rights for U.S. citizens and others, or attacking non-threatening adversaries). Unless this relationship is exposed polls will tend to create the illusion of public support for basically anti-popular policies. Is anyone besides us and PIPA talking about this problem?

The key issue in discussing Retro Poll's surprising finding of 39% support for impeachment in the November sample should not become an effort to explain away the findings through methodologic analysis of how our question was structured but rather, to use Allen's own words, "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...was a dishonest attempt to stampede the Congress and the public." Allen here says the same truths that we put forward in the prefatory sentences yet then calls us "amateurish" in our attempt link that truth to an opinion question about impeachment. We'll admit that we made it easier for people to say yes by stating the facts, but they still had to decide if this behavior "is grounds for impeachment." Who really believes that the respondents thought it was a hypothetical question unrelated to Mr. Bush's actual behavior?

What we ask now is that some opinion researchers might go the extra mile and insist that some surveys take the pulse of the nation with similar if not the same questions on larger random sample sizes.

We qualify this suggestion, however, because asking the simple question:

"Should President Bush be impeached?" in our view is not a similar question since it leaves all the existing assumptions of authority in place. Most people are unlikely to challenge the authority of the Presidency when they are talking with an anonymous pollster unless they have some sense that it is both safe to do so and the poll sets a context based up some actual facts people can assess, as we did.

Indeed, this, in our view, is what is wrong with much political public opinion polling today in our country. Polls often validate the status quo because they act as if there are no assumptions already on the line when they call people around such charged issues. We wonder how polling

organizations can ignore the fact that context already exists with assumptions set by those in power in government and media. As social science researchers well know, some, or perhaps many people tend to want to say what they think you want to hear, rather than their true opinions. To call Retro Poll biased, as some have done, because we take that existing underlying bias in polling seriously and think about how to neutralize it is doing the public and our democracy a disservice.

Look for example at the "patriotism" bias at the time of war. It's a well known phenomenon, yet if you look at how many polls are done about this war or other wars, is it not a fact that concentrated polling is done at precisely the time when the "patriotism" bias is most obvious. Or am I mistaken that the time density of polls taken increases around the time of the initiation of wars? Does that really do a service to our nation or to democracy? Is not polling people often at times we know they are going to be least willing to give critical views (for not wanting to seem unpatriotic) not an obvious form of biased polling?

On a methodologic question that Doug Henwood raised: we do systematically call back no answers and answering machines, usually 3 times.

Allen raised a question about regression analysis. Anyone who wants to do multivariate regression work on our data can contact me. I'm thinking that the small numbers won't lend themselves to that but, in any case, the fractional extent to which views on various background questions contribute to the support for the war (or other policies) is of interest but not currently that important to us. In the long run we do want to build models to better understand these associations as we continue to correlate factual background and opinion questions.

On the other hand we have shown that, overwhelmingly, Americans, even the misinformed, have strong democratic instincts when it comes to supporting international war crimes tribunals, to opposing torture of prisoners and indeterminate detentions and when it comes to intrusions into rights

guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights. These views are consistently in opposition to the current policies and practices of the U.S. government, but are not being revealed by major public opinion research organizations. Those are areas that major polls might spend more time on because they show that our nation's future as a democracy could be bright if the media were not moving progressively toward limiting critical views in reporting and generally not resisting government attacks on dissent while legitimizing the tabloidization and oversimplification of public and daily life and discourse.

Retro Poll has been called down for how it reported the results to the impeachment question in its press release of November 24. I think it necessary to admit that our statement that 39% of people think Bush "should face impeachment" is a conclusion rather than a statement of fact from the responses. 39% said that Bush's behavior in misleading the public and Congress are "grounds for impeachment". That is similar to, but not the same thing as, a statement that he "should be" impeached. However, this is still a striking finding that deserves further evaluation. We accept the criticism of the report language, but we note that, so far as we know, not one media outlet or polling organization has publicly stated that this is a surprising and potentially important finding that must be investigated further. Prove us wrong.

I would argue that our press release, though it over-reaches in that linguistic error, is a less egregious problem than the thundering silence that the actual data from the poll has met in the public arena. Does anyone even care that the public may be seriously fed up with being deceived? Or angry that these deceptions were used to justify the attack and take over of a sovereign nation, actions that have killed 500 young Americans and will undoubtedly have major long term consequences for us and others?

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director, Retro Poll
www.retropoll.org

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

=====
Date: Thu, 15 Jan 2004 06:03:15 -0500
Reply-To: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>
Subject: Re: On teaching methods, surveys or otherwise
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

This is an ongoing problem. I am trying an experiment one credit hour courses focused on a specific topic to avoid the "bit of this and a bit of that" technique. To add

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

From: Susan Carol Losh [mailto:slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU]

Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2004 11:03 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: On teaching methods, surveys or otherwise

Unfortunately a lot of the problems that our colleagues mention stem from the way methods is taught in the behavioral sciences. All too often there may be ONE required undergraduate or graduate course students must take. As a result the methods course begins to resemble "if it's Tuesday, this must be Belgium," a bit of experimental, a bit on surveys, a bit on content analysis, a bit on ethnographies. Some instructors try to motivate their students and give them a "taste" of the method, usually by conducting a "quickndirty" survey. As a result, the students leave the methods course thinking "this is all you do."

I find at least some of the problem inherent in the course structure. My department has the same kind of Methods graduate course which I taught each year for three in a row. I decided no survey was better than an ersatz survey, but really, it is a nightmare and an exercise in frustrated futility for both students and instructor to try to cover "all basic methodology" in 13 weeks. I know we're not alone! I have reviewed dozens of methods texts and virtually all generic ones take the same "candybox sampler" route. I won't go into some of the other egrarious errors (did you know that causality can be determined by whether you have qualitative or quantitative variables? I didn't either...)

We would never dream of teaching statistics that way. Our department has separate courses for causal models, analysis of variance, multivariate regression models, nonparametric, etc. When I was in Sociology here, we had separate courses for intro, multivariate, qualitative, SEM, etc. That way, each topic can be addressed in some depth and students get first-hand analytic experience.

I am trying to get our program to restructure teaching methods in analagous fashion. Separate courses on surveys (unfortunately not in our department due to historical reasons), ethnographic, experimental, etc. Of course institutional change is a long and laborious process but we have begun a dialogue.

Susan

On Wed, 14 Jan 2004 10:09:57 -0500 "J. Ann Selzer" wrote:

> My observation is that attitudes toward survey research in many many
> university and college programs is that standards don't really matter
> as they teach
> students. I just had a former employee who is now in a grad program

- > and taking a
- > course in analytic methods relate an example. Her professor gave a class
- > assignment telling them specifically they would need to cut corners
- > as they drew
- > samples and collected data in order to not spend too much time on the
- > project.
- > I had to wonder what the value of this exercise might be. They were
- > clearly
- > not demonstrating their knowledge of standards, nor was the professor
- > engendering much respect for standards. What was it they were
- > supposed to learn?
- > There are a thousand other ways to teach students how to gather data
- > properly.
- > You can see how students don't respect the process. JAS
- >
- > J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
- > Selzer & Company, Inc.
- > Des Moines, Iowa 50312
- > 515.271.5700
- >
- > visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com
- >
- > E-mail address for purposes of this list: JAnnSelzer@aol.com; otherwise,
- > contact JASelzer@SelzerCo.com.
- >
- > -----
- > Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
- > Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
- > signoff aapornet

Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.
American Statistical Association/NSF-SRS Research Fellow 2003-2004
Program Leader, Learning & Cognition
Department of Educational Psychology & Learning Systems
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

VOICE (850) 644-8778
FAX (850) 644-8776

visit the site: <http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh/Index.htm>

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

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

Date: Thu, 15 Jan 2004 06:20:17 -0500

Reply-To: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
Subject: Bad Methods Text and Teaching
Comments: To: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <FCDC58EC0F22D4119F0800A0C9E58995D24ECC@exchange.chep.udel.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear All:

First, when I teach methods I agree that trying to do a survey in class either as a group project or for each student is very silly. It gives exactly the wrong idea to students of what methods consists of. On the other hand having students do a few exercises or assignments that highlight aspects of methods (e.g. observation, surveys, data analysis, qualitative, even historical) is possible. For example, they can write a questionnaire (open ended) and ask questions of a few people. In science students are not expected to collect original data and analyze it for a grade.

But one of the greatest problems in undergraduate methods is the textbooks, and the fact that they are written by people who have not done in serious research work for years and years.

The category leader in this area should be known by everyone on this list, so I am not going to name it. It is shot through with inaccuracies. One of my favorite examples:

Response rates on mail questionnaires are acceptable if they are 50 percent.

Maybe someone actually involved in survey research should try to write a text book for undergrads. It will be hard to displace the market leader, I fear.

Andy

Andrew A. Beveridge
Professor of Sociology
Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY
Suite 233 Powdermaker Hall
65-30 Kissena Blvd
Flushing, NY 11367-1597
Phone: 718-997-2837
FAX: 718-997-2820
email: beveridg@optonline.net
web: www.sociaexplorer.com

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

Date: Thu, 15 Jan 2004 12:30:11 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Re: Another apparent positioning poll mischaracterized as a push
poll
Comments: To: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <000001c3dad5\$4a6491e0\$1a01a8c0@CERC2.cerc.net>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I tend to agree with John on this (at least in part) - the primary =
marker of
a push poll is not the veracity of the statements that it contains =
(because
we don't want to get into the business of deciding truth in political
campaigning). =20

Push polls are done not to collect data but to move people and to do =
that
they contact a whole bunch more people than does a poll. While I have =
never
heard of a push poll using positive statement I defer to John's =
experience.

I think that the AAPOR statement could be tweaked a little bit so that
message testing or positioning polls don't so often appear to be 'Push
polls.'

When I do refer reporters to the AAPOR statement I usually point out two
specific sections:

Push polls typically call thousands of people.
The people called are not a representative sample
of voters. Instead, they're people who are targeted
because they're thought to be undecided voters or
supporters of a rival candidate.

&
Usually people's answers are not tabulated; the
intent is to create a negative effect on potential
voters.

--=20
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax
=20

> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of John Nienstedt
> Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2004 2:33 PM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Another apparent positioning poll mischaracterized as a =
> push
> poll
>=20
> While it is great that AAPOR has a strong statement regarding push
> polls, I think it's confusing in parts and needs to be reworded. As a
> pollster who works on campaigns all the time, it is imperative that we
> draw a distinct, clear line between research and advocacy disguised as
> research. Instead, our statement talks a lot about negative =
> campaigning
> and that the statements in a push poll are "stretched or fabricated."
> 1st, a push poll isn't necessarily negative. 2nd, one candidate's
> stretched or fabricated statement is another candidate's fact sheet --
> there's generally no way for anyone to conclusively tell whether the
> statements are, in fact, bogus. When I test messages in polls I =
> include
> many different statements on candidates, all of them true, but this
> doesn't stop some respondents from crying "push poll!". This is where
> we have the problem with respondents perceiving a push poll when it's
> really not. Attacking the veracity of push poll arguments does not
> belong in our statement. 3rd, as the 1st line of the statement =
> alludes
> to, it is the DECEPTION (a campaign disguising the advocacy call as a
> research call) that is insidious. That's what we should focus on.
>=20
> John E. Nienstedt, Sr.
> john@cerc.net
> Get the edge at www.cerc.net
>=20
>=20
> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo G. Simonetta
> Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2004 8:05 AM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Another apparent positioning poll mischaracterized as a push
> poll
>=20
> Challenger upset with incumbent over campaign poll
> By Shruti Dat=E9 Singh Daily Herald Staff Writer
> Posted January 14, 2004
>=20
> http://www.dailyherald.com/cook/main_story.asp?intID=3D3800012#
>=20
>=20
> Republican challenger Patricia "Pat" Sutarik has filed a complaint =
> with
> the
> Illinois State Board of Elections, saying incumbent state Rep. Suzanne
> "Suzie" Bassi violated campaign ethics in a recent poll.
>=20
> Sutarik, who along with Palatine Councilman Warren Kostka is =
> challenging
> Bassi for the 54th state House seat, said in a letter to the elections
> board

> this week that Bassi's poll was used to spread "negative comments =
> and/or
> spin about me, my campaign, where my family worships and what school =
> my
> children attend."
>=20
> "The practice of push polling is an outrageous and despicable tactic =
> and
> evidence of a desperate campaign that lacks ethics," added Sutarik, a
> longtime GOP activist from Palatine.
>=20
> A push poll is a series of calls in which people who support a
> particular
> candidate offer negative information about a rival candidate. Push =
> polls
> are
> generally used toward the end of the campaign season to leave little
> time
> for the rival to respond.
>=20
> SNIP
>=20
> Her campaign tapped Public Opinion Research, a polling firm based in
> Virginia, to poll about 300 people throughout the district with =
> positive
> and
> negative questions about all three candidates, she said.
>=20
> Bassi said the pollsters did not ask questions about her challenger's
> church
> affiliation, but they did ask for opinions about Christian Liberty
> Academy,
> a private school that Sutarik's son attends.
>=20
> SNIP
>=20
> --
> Leo G. Simonetta
> Art & Science Group, LLC
> 6115 Falls Road Suite 101
> Baltimore, MD 21209
> 410-377-7880 ext. 14
> 410-377-7955 fax
>=20
>=20
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet
>=20
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
> signoff aapornet

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

Date: Thu, 15 Jan 2004 11:54:54 -0600
Reply-To: Mary Uyeda <MUyeda@THENRCPICKERGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mary Uyeda <MUyeda@THENRCPICKERGROUP.COM>
Subject: skip patterns and analysis
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

The use of skip patterns, as I understand it, is to direct respondents to ignore (skip) questions certain questions and uses a Y/N filter question to do that.

The question to me is how do we handle data from persons who should have skipped a section, based on the answer to the filter question, but didn't. Persons who answered a series of questions when they should have skipped them.

My knee-jerk answer is you exclude the answers when you present the response data. Not from the data set, but in the presentation of the overall data such as frequencies. An analysis rule would then state that these responses are not included in summaries or frequencies etc. I'm being questioned on this.

The question then is, How do you handle data from questions answered inappropriately (if that's the correct characterization) as directed by skip patterns.

Please answer to me and I'll post back if you want.

Thank you in advance.

Mary Uyeda

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

Date: Thu, 15 Jan 2004 12:01:15 -0600
Reply-To: Mary Uyeda <MUyeda@THENRCPICKERGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mary Uyeda <MUyeda@THENRCPICKERGROUP.COM>
Subject: mail and phone survey data
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

I am interested in comments or studies about phone vs mail surveys in terms of respondent characteristics, response data quality or questionnaire

completeness. I'm getting several questions such as "we used to use phone and got more completes; now we're mailing and not getting as many....." I can do a fairly decent job of pointing out differences in response behavior, but am not aware of studies about this nor it's influence on the nature of the data that comes from the study.

I know there is literature on this but I'm hoping, to be candid, to use this group as a filter to direct me.

Thanks so much in advance.

Mary Uyeda

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

Date: Thu, 15 Jan 2004 16:01:20 -0500
Reply-To: "DeBell, Matthew" <MDeBell@AIR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "DeBell, Matthew" <MDeBell@AIR.ORG>
Subject: Re: Retropoll
Comments: To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Marc Sapir wrote, "Those who know there isn't evidence on an Al Qaeda = link to Saddam think that George W Bush's misleading the public on WMD = is 'grounds for impeachment' (by 72% yes)." Later Dr. Sapir referred to = "39 percent support for impeachment" and wrote, "39% said that Bush's = behavior in misleading the public and Congress are 'grounds for = impeachment.'"

From what I see in the questionnaire, the data cannot support these = statements. The questions were as follows:

6. Is there evidence that Saddam Hussein work [sic] with Al Queda = [sic]?

31. 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?=20

A Yes response to #31 does not demonstrate that the respondent thinks = Bush misled the public, and it does not demonstrate that the respondent = wants Bush impeached. The question doesn't ask these things, and it is = not valid to conclude that respondents think Bush misled the public or = that anything he has done warrants impeachment.=20

Marc Sapir wrote: "We'll admit that we made it easier for people to say=20 yes by stating the facts, but they still had to decide if this behavior=20 "is grounds for impeachment."=""=20

Your poll does more than state the facts. The point of view of the pollster is strongly evident throughout the questionnaire, and the facts are selected to support that point of view. This is a bias likely to skew the measurement of opinion, which defeats the purpose of descriptive polling. =20

The topic of the relationship between what people think is true and what they think of policy is fascinating, but the Retropoll questionnaire would tell us more about that without the bias.=20

>[....]

>On the other hand we have shown that, overwhelmingly, Americans,=20
>even the misinformed, have strong democratic instincts when it comes
> to supporting international war crimes tribunals, to opposing torture=20
> of prisoners and indeterminate detentions and when it comes to=20
> intrusions into rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution and the=20
> Bill of Rights. These views are consistently in opposition to the=20
> current policies and practices of the U.S. government, but are not=20
> being revealed by major public opinion research organizations. [....]

Unfortunately, the expression of these views is contingent on the wording of your questionnaire. "Making it easier for people to say yes" works both ways. Just try biasing your questions the other way in your next poll. It will not be hard to "show" that the American public has strong anti-democratic views. Remind them of September 11, state some facts about how many atom bombs-worth of fissile material have been lost or stolen in Russia, and you can probably scare them enough to support any number of police-state policies.

--

Matthew DeBell

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

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

Date: Thu, 15 Jan 2004 19:35:57 -0500
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Organization: Rider University
Subject: Meeting of NJAAPOR-- all invited!!!
Comments: To: AAPOR <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Dear Friends,

The next meeting of the New Jersey chapter of AAPOR will be on January 20,2004 at 5:30 PM.

"Deliberative Discussions on Terrorism in the United States: How Citizen Dialogues can Inform our Understanding of Public Discussion"

Dr. Harold Saunders, Director of International Programs, The Kettering Foundation

Room 16 Lower Level
Robertson Hall (on the corner of Washington and Prospect Streets)
Princeton University

Dr. Harold Saunders has been involved in deliberations on democracy and peace research for many years. He was involved in the "shuttle diplomacy" with Henry Kissinger, and was also involved in the settlement of the Camp David accords between Begin, Sadat, and President Carter. This should be a wonderful program!

Admission is free and open to all. Hors d'oeuvres and beverages will be served. Please join us.

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

Date: Thu, 15 Jan 2004 16:47:46 -0800
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Subject: Re: Retropoll
Comments: To: "DeBell, Matthew" <MDeBell@air.org>, aapornet@asu.edu
Comments: cc: Warren Gold <WGold@itsa.ucsf.edu>, Al Vallecillo <avalle@cal.net>, Diego Kusnir <oupin1@sbcglobal.net>, James True <jtrue@mindspring.com>, Laura Harper <shepharper@charter.net>, mickeyhuff@mac.com, Peter Phillips <peter.phillips@sonoma.edu>, Suzanne Grady <suziandchuck@yahoo.com>
In-Reply-To: <D9A552CD27E0974FA91ADE56D744D3E8A359FE@dc2ex1.air.org>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Re: comment of Matthew DeBell

I see no title for DeBell so I do not know his affiliation--such information would be helpful in responding. Actually I think DeBell makes our case fairly well. It is a fact that Mr. Bush misled the public, not an opinion. We weren't interested in what people's opinion on that may be for this question. Public opinions on how it happened vary from those who think it was overexhuberance and shoddy information to those who ask why the CIA assessments were disregarded and believe it was part of what former Treasury Secretary O'Neill has suggested was a rather devious plan of action set in motion within hours or days of the Supreme Court ending the vote recount in Florida. We weren't interested in those opinions either because the fact still is that Bush misled the public and made a very big deal of it in the 2003 State of the Union.

And sometimes people forget that war is a very big deal when they sit in a country never invaded in the modern era.

If survey researchers do not have the right and responsibility to provide such background facts in some of their questionnaires then they will serve as little more than flaks for the government-media consensus on what is prevailing and legitimate opinion and discourse, and on what is truth. I completely agree with DeBell that if survey researchers made a big deal about something like the disappearance of fissionable material from Russia they could scare people into voicing more paranoid opinions about nuclear threats, terrorism and Russia. This is precisely our point: whoever controls the assumptions and background information on discourse creates public opinion, whether or not the facts they present are true (and whether or not they weight reality with their own personal biases). To imagine that opinion research can be meaningful to a democracy means imagining/developing methods to unbias the self-serving spin of corporate media, particularly TV and government flaks, experts, pundits. Otherwise the whole effort is fraudulent for it only measures what those with the most influence and power over discourse/media content tell people is true. In this way polling becomes a form of market or rat behavioral research for the inventors of realities that suit their needs. They say blah blah blah therefore we must invade Iraq. Then pollsters are paid to go out and find out what percentage of people are able to spout back blah, blah, therefore we must invade Iraq. The results, unless the percentage is very small, provide help for the cause: invasion of Iraq.

Although I'm a physician, I've worked on some community needs assessment surveys in public health and education before I got involved in this politically charged effort. The assumptions of the work were different. We tried to find out what people think are the needs of their community, their families, themselves etc. There were no forces in the background controlling assumptions, discourse and "truth", other than cultural and personal beliefs, which are the relevant parameters. But with political policy polling, objectivity is a pretense, covering up the controlling influences of TV etc. Perhaps if we (Retro Poll) do some in depth face to face interviews in the future we might have some questions in a format: "...so and so says this, but influential critics say the contrary. Given this controversy what do you think?" But my point is that public opinion research that tries to eliminate context is unintentionally promoting bias.

All that said, nowhere does DeBell try to explain why 39% in the survey and 72% of those who realize there is no Al Qaeda--Saddam connection said yes to the question: Is misleading the Congress and the Public grounds for impeachment? This continues the line that our methods are so bad that the result can be ignored. But such results should not be ignored. They should be shown, by further research, to be either true or false representations of public opinion.

DeBell does one thing that particularly annoys. He's taken our admission that we "made it easy for people to say yes" on the "grounds for impeachment" question and used it to attack the findings of public support for international war crimes tribunals, against torture and so

forth. But he doesn't bother to critique the wording of those questions he says are biased. That's an ad hominem argument and not worthy of response.

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director
Retro Poll
www.retropoll.org

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

From: DeBell, Matthew [mailto:MDeBell@air.org]
Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2004 1:01 PM
To: Marc Sapir; AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: RE: Retropoll

Marc Sapir wrote, "Those who know there isn't evidence on an Al Qaeda link to Saddam think that George W Bush's misleading the public on WMD is 'grounds for impeachment' (by 72% yes)." Later Dr. Sapir referred to "39 percent support for impeachment" and wrote, "39% said that Bush's behavior in misleading the public and Congress are 'grounds for impeachment.'"

From what I see in the questionnaire, the data cannot support these statements. The questions were as follows:

6. Is there evidence that Saddam Hussein work [sic] with Al Queda [sic]?

31. 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?

A Yes response to #31 does not demonstrate that the respondent thinks Bush misled the public, and it does not demonstrate that the respondent wants Bush impeached. The question doesn't ask these things, and it is not valid to conclude that respondents think Bush misled the public or that anything he has done warrants impeachment.

Marc Sapir wrote: "We'll admit that we made it easier for people to say yes by stating the facts, but they still had to decide if this behavior "is grounds for impeachment.'"

Your poll does more than state the facts. The point of view of the pollster is strongly evident throughout the questionnaire, and the facts are selected to support that point of view. This is a bias likely to skew the measurement of opinion, which defeats the purpose of descriptive polling.

The topic of the relationship between what people think is true and what they think of policy is fascinating, but the Retropoll questionnaire would tell us more about that without the bias.

>[....]

>On the other hand we have shown that, overwhelmingly, Americans,
>even the misinformed, have strong democratic instincts when it comes
> to supporting international war crimes tribunals, to opposing torture
> of prisoners and indeterminate detentions and when it comes to
> intrusions into rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution and the
> Bill of Rights. These views are consistently in opposition to the
> current policies and practices of the U.S. government, but are not
> being revealed by major public opinion research organizations. [....]

Unfortunately, the expression of these views is contingent on the wording of your questionnaire. "Making it easier for people to say yes" works both ways. Just try biasing your questions the other way in your next poll. It will not be hard to "show" that the American public has strong anti-democratic views. Remind them of September 11, state some facts about how many atom bombs-worth of fissile material have been lost or stolen in Russia, and you can probably scare them enough to support any number of police-state policies.

--
Matthew DeBell

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

=====
Date: Thu, 15 Jan 2004 20:45:28 -0500
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <cporter@HP.UFL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Colleen Porter <cporter@HP.UFL.EDU>
Subject: Re: Students in Surveys
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

>>> "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU> 1/12/2004
3:06:20 PM >>>

> With all due respect, I have to disagree. Using interviewers who are
trained
> well, carefully monitored, and paid for the work they do constitutes a
> minimal set of specifications for valid work.

Nat, I'm with you on the training and monitoring, which was the real problem in this case.

But I'm not sure there is anything magical about being paid for work that makes the product more reliable than the efforts of an earnest volunteer. I think many of us have donated our time and expertise to worthy causes now and then, and still gave the same professional effort for which clients will pay megabucks (or at least bucks). When we lived in Brazil for a semester, I taught a graduate seminar without being paid, but the grades for the students still counted on their university transcripts :)

More seriously, I had the privilege of taking a graduate course in survey research from Pam Shoemaker at the University of Texas. We graduate students functioned as the survey management team, and conducted a real survey. We designed and programmed the questionnaire, pulled the sample, and trained and supervised an undergraduate class which provided the interviewing. It was required that they work two shifts as part of their course requirement in an undergraduate research course. (But this was in a CATI lab, with no opportunity nor incentive for falsification of data.)

For us graduate students, it didn't seem like the "whirlwind" some have described, because we had the entire semester to go through the various steps.

I found that it was a marvelous experience to walk through the process of what doing a survey is like--to meet with clients, talk about their expectations, prepare a report and ultimately present findings to the client. (I remember obsessing and having long discussions with other students about what to wear on the day we presented our findings; I've never worried about that since.)

When I interviewed for my first paid survey management job, I had the report our class had produced tucked under my arm, and I had experienced every step in the process. My new co-workers were so impressed that I could just take charge and plan out what to do next.

I had worked at the survey lab for more than a year prior to that class, but the level of responsibility in the class was different. We weren't just helping; we were in charge. Instead of seeing one piece of it, we could view the big picture. The responsibility was ours, and we had to step up to the plate and handle it. The professor functioned as a great coach.

This experience is fresh in my mind because recently I've gotten lots of questions about that "hands on" survey course, as the department where I currently work is considering how to expand their offerings in research methods. I think it would be a shame if universities shied away from letting students do real research like that as part of their training, because I know how invaluable it was for me, and shaped my career and research interests.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter
Senior Project Coordinator
cporter@phhp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/273-6068, fax: 352/273-6075
University of Florida
Department of Health Services Administration
Location: 101 Newell Drive, Rm. 4148
US Mail: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

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

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

Date: Thu, 15 Jan 2004 21:02:19 -0500
Reply-To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>
Subject: Re: Teaching & Texts
Comments: To: aapor <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Unlike the message below from Andrew Beveridge, I do not think a group survey project as part of teaching is "silly."

At the graduate level (but often with interested undergraduates participating) the Detroit Area Study (DAS) survey practicum has been going on at the University of Michigan for half a century. Four AAPOR Presidents in the last decade had part of their training through DAS, as did many others now active in the Association. At the same time, DAS has been responsible for a large number of important publications over the years, since it is also a vehicle for serious research by both faculty and students. Those interested can write to DAS for a list of publications, some of which describe the structure of the unit and the reasons for its success, though acknowledging also obstacles along the way. Of course, DAS has had significant advantages not easily duplicated elsewhere, notably some limited funding from the University and the availability of expert survey researchers in the U of M Survey Research Center, but the results have contributed significantly to the development of survey research in the United States.

Can something similar be done with an undergraduate course? Yes, if adapted to the exigencies of such a course, including the interests of the students themselves. First, a relevant and important population is readily available: the undergraduate student body itself. This allows obtaining a good list for systematic random sampling by the students in the course. Second, there are a number of important issues to study that have a direct relation to student life and therefore will interest both students in the course and respondents. Third, face to face interviewing is possible at no monetary cost by having student interviewers meet with respondents on campus, especially if the survey instrument is kept short (I tried to limit it 20 minutes, easily done between two classes). Each student interviewer also wrote a short qualitative paper on their personal interviewing experience, usually showing their surprise and learning from contact with a sample of students outside their own circle of friends. Fourth, with current computing it is not all that difficult to produce a useful data set for analysis in the last third of the course, with emphasis on basic techniques that most students can handle as part of writing a final paper. It is even possible (though not necessary or usual) to end up with publishable research, in my case an article on the relation of academic effort (amount of study) to GPA, co-authored with three of the stronger students in the course.

Admittedly such a practicum takes a good deal of work but it is rewarding for many of the students and for the instructor. As to textbooks, there are many good articles and chapters one can put together in addition to or instead of a conventional text.

Andrew A Beveridge wrote:

>Dear All:

>

>First, when I teach methods I agree that trying to do a survey in class either as a group project or for each student is very silly. It gives exactly the wrong idea to students of what methods consists of. On the other hand having students do a few exercises or assignments that highlight aspects of methods (e.g. observation, surveys, data analysis, qualitative, even historical) is possible. For example, they can write a questionnaire (open ended) and ask questions of a few people. In science students are not expected to collect original data and analyze it for a grade.

>

>But one of the greatest problems in undergraduate methods is the textbooks, and the fact that they are written by people who have not done in serious research work for years and years.

>

>The category leader in this area should be known by everyone on this list, so I am not going to name it. It is shot through with inaccuracies. One of my favorite examples:

>

>Response rates on mail questionnaires are acceptable if they are 50 percent.

>

>Maybe someone actually involved in survey research should try to write a text book for undergrads. It will be hard to displace the market leader, I fear.

>

>Andy

>

>Andrew A. Beveridge
>Professor of Sociology
>Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY
>Suite 233 Powdermaker Hall
>65-30 Kissena Blvd
>Flushing, NY 11367-1597
>Phone: 718-997-2837
>FAX: 718-997-2820
>email: beveridg@optonline.net
>web: www.sociaexplorer.com

>

>-----

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

>

>

>-----

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

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

Date: Thu, 15 Jan 2004 19:31:34 -0800
Reply-To: "Dr. Thomas Lamatsch" <lamatsch@UNLV.NEVADA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Dr. Thomas Lamatsch" <lamatsch@UNLV.NEVADA.EDU>
Subject: Re: Teaching & Texts
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <4007462B.2020601@umich.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I agree with Howard. I teach survey research as well as regular methods classes here at UNLV and my methods class includes a survey practicum. It is towards the end of the class in order for the students to learn the proper methods and give them a chance to include some of their own questions.

Unlike the Peterson survey where students were asked to do it at home my students have to report to the research center and use our CATI facility and they are supervised by either a regular supervisor, one of my graduate assistants, or in the beginning of the project myself.

The students are "free labor" in this case but I believe they also gain a lot of experience and many of my students only understand after the practicum why questions should be short and why the language has to be simple. I also offer the data to all students in that class and several of them managed to write papers based on the data. Some of those were accepted by AAPOR or MAPOR for presentation.

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.nevada.edu

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Howard Schuman
Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2004 6:02 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Teaching & Texts

Unlike the message below from Andrew Beveridge, I do not think a group survey project as part of teaching is "silly."

At the graduate level (but often with interested undergraduates

participating) the Detroit Area Study (DAS) survey practicum has been going on at the University of Michigan for half a century. Four AAPOR Presidents in the last decade had part of their training through DAS, as did many others now active in the Association. At the same time, DAS has been responsible for a large number of important publications over the years, since it is also a vehicle for serious research by both faculty and students. Those interested can write to DAS for a list of publications, some of which describe the structure of the unit and the reasons for its success, though acknowledging also obstacles along the way. Of course, DAS has had significant advantages not easily duplicated elsewhere, notably some limited funding from the University and the availability of expert survey researchers in the U of M Survey Research Center, but the results have contributed significantly to the development of survey research in the United States.

Can something similar be done with an undergraduate course? Yes, if adapted to the exigencies of such a course, including the interests of the students themselves. First, a relevant and important population is readily available: the undergraduate student body itself. This allows obtaining a good list for systematic random sampling by the students in the course. Second, there are a number of important issues to study that have a direct relation to student life and therefore will interest both students in the course and respondents. Third, face to face interviewing is possible at no monetary cost by having student interviewers meet with respondents on campus, especially if the survey instrument is kept short (I tried to limit it 20 minutes, easily done between two classes). Each student interviewer also wrote a short qualitative paper on their personal interviewing experience, usually showing their surprise and learning from contact with a sample of students outside their own circle of friends. Fourth, with current computing it is not all that difficult to produce a useful data set for analysis in the last third of the course, with emphasis on basic techniques that most students can handle as part of writing a final paper. It is even possible (though not necessary or usual) to end up with publishable research, in my case an article on the relation of academic effort (amount of study) to GPA, co-authored with three of the stronger students in the course.

Admittedly such a practicum takes a good deal of work but it is rewarding for many of the students and for the instructor. As to textbooks, there are many good articles and chapters one can put together in addition to or instead of a conventional text.

Andrew A Beveridge wrote:

>Dear All:

>

>First, when I teach methods I agree that trying to do a survey in class
>either as a group project or for each student is very silly. It gives
>exactly the wrong idea to students of what methods consists of. On the
>other hand having students do a few exercises or assignments that
highlight
>aspects of methods (e.g. observation, surveys, data analysis,

qualitative,
>even historical) is possible. For example, they can write a
questionnaire
>(open ended) and ask questions of a few people. In science students
are not
>expected to collect original data and analyze it for a grade.
>
>But one of the greatest problems in undergraduate methods is the
textbooks,
>and the fact that they are written by people who have not done in
serious
>research work for years and years.
>
>The category leader in this area should be known by everyone on this
list,
>so I am not going to name it. It is shot through with inaccuracies.
One of
>my favorite examples:
>
>Response rates on mail questionnaires are acceptable if they are 50
percent.
>
>Maybe someone actually involved in survey research should try to write
a
>text book for undergrads. It will be hard to displace the market
leader, I
>fear.
>
>Andy
>
>Andrew A. Beveridge
>Professor of Sociology
>Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY
>Suite 233 Powdermaker Hall
>65-30 Kissena Blvd
>Flushing, NY 11367-1597
>Phone: 718-997-2837
>FAX: 718-997-2820
>email: beveridg@optonline.net
>web: www.socialexplorer.com
>
>-----
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
>

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

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

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

Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 05:58:37 -0500
Reply-To: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
Subject: Teaching & Texts
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear All:

The Detroit Area Study is one thing. But it is part of a graduate requirement for the Ph.D. in sociology. I still maintain that having students spend a large amount of time carrying out their own survey or carrying out the professor's survey takes time away from learning methods, unless you are only teaching survey methods. Even there it is questionable.

I think data analysis is better taught using "real" data rather than the sort of small scale survey that can be carried out in a class setting.

Indenturing undergraduate students to a survey lab for a few hours, it seems to me, is the equivalent of the psychology experiments that I had to put up with to get a grade in psychology.

But I think social science would be better served with the equivalent of laboratory work for undergrads, ala some of the things that say Bill Frey has created, rather than the pretense of a full-blown research project done in the context of a methods class.

I know people will differ on this, but I still think that trying to make students do a project from start to finish in the context of a undergraduate class is "kind of silly." Though I admit that it is better than making them carrying out a survey unsupervised from their home or dorm room so their Prof can testify in court.

Andy Beveridge

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

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

Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 08:07:29 -0500
Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Students in Surveys
Comments: To: Colleen Porter <cporter@HP.UFL.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

Granted there's nothing magical in paying people for work. I'm just one of those old curmudgeons who insists that the definition of a person who works for nothing is "slave", and when you use slave labor you can expect problems. Careful monitoring of an employee is a way to reduce the likelihood of those problems; a volunteer can't be fired.

If one is conducting research and using students as workers in that project, it strikes me as questionable on ethical grounds to use those students without treating them as professionals, i.e. paying them for the work that they do. Getting credit for the course they're taking is problematic. Let's say that a student enrolls in a course [undergraduate or graduate, DAS or whatever] and is indentured as a worker in a survey. Midway through the course, for whatever reason, that student drops the course. The student has not been compensated for the work done; it was 'volunteer' or 'slave' labor, and the project director's degree of control over the quality of the data was less than it might have been. Similarly, I can envision a student becoming disenchanted with the professor running the course, or experiencing a feeling of being ripped off [as the students did in the Peterson case] and falsifying data.

One final point: Dr. Mitofsky suggested that the judge in the case should have been more knowledgeable or demanding about the survey. I disagree: I believe the judge had a reasonable expectation of professional quality work based on the status of the institution hired to do the work. Ultimately, it is up to us, professional survey researchers, to agree on standards of conduct and police ourselves.

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.

Research Specialist

Michigan State University

Institute for Public Policy and Social Research

517-355-6672

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

From: Colleen Porter [mailto:cporter@HP.UFL.EDU]

Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2004 8:45 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Students in Surveys

>>> "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU> 1/12/2004 3:06:20 PM >>>

> With all due respect, I have to disagree. Using interviewers who are trained

> well, carefully monitored, and paid for the work they do constitutes a

> minimal set of specifications for valid work.

Nat, I'm with you on the training and monitoring, which was the real problem in this case.

But I'm not sure there is anything magical about being paid for work that makes the product more reliable than the efforts of an earnest volunteer. I think many of us have donated our time and expertise to worthy causes now and then, and still gave the same professional effort for which clients will pay megabucks (or at least bucks). When we lived in Brazil for a semester, I taught a graduate seminar without being

paid, but the grades for the students still counted on their university transcripts :)

More seriously, I had the privilege of taking a graduate course in survey research from Pam Shoemaker at the University of Texas. We graduate students functioned as the survey management team, and conducted a real survey. We designed and programmed the questionnaire, pulled the sample, and trained and supervised an undergraduate class which provided the interviewing. It was required that they work two shifts as part of their course requirement in an undergraduate research course. (But this was in a CATI lab, with no opportunity nor incentive for falsification of data.)

For us graduate students, it didn't seem like the "whirlwind" some have described, because we had the entire semester to go through the various steps.

I found that it was a marvelous experience to walk through the process of what doing a survey is like--to meet with clients, talk about their expectations, prepare a report and ultimately present findings to the client. (I remember obsessing and having long discussions with other students about what to wear on the day we presented our findings; I've never worried about that since.)

When I interviewed for my first paid survey management job, I had the report our class had produced tucked under my arm, and I had experienced every step in the process. My new co-workers were so impressed that I could just take charge and plan out what to do next.

I had worked at the survey lab for more than a year prior to that class, but the level of responsibility in the class was different. We weren't just helping; we were in charge. Instead of seeing one piece of it, we could view the big picture. The responsibility was ours, and we had to step up to the plate and handle it. The professor functioned as a great coach.

This experience is fresh in my mind because recently I've gotten lots of questions about that "hands on" survey course, as the department where I currently work is considering how to expand their offerings in research methods. I think it would be a shame if universities shied away from letting students do real research like that as part of their training, because I know how invaluable it was for me, and shaped my career and research interests.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter
Senior Project Coordinator
cporter@php.ufl.edu
phone: 352/273-6068, fax: 352/273-6075
University of Florida
Department of Health Services Administration
Location: 101 Newell Drive, Rm. 4148
US Mail: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

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

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

Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 08:10:48 -0500
Reply-To: "Lavrakas, Paul" <Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>
Subject: Survey research practicums and students
Comments: To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

From 1980 through 1989, I taught a three-week unit on public opinion polling to undergraduate journalism students at the Northwestern U. Medill School of Journalism each quarter (three times per year). The class met twice per week for 90 minutes. I provided the students lectures and readings on sampling, questionnaire design, and nonresponse. I focused on teaching them the strengths and limitations of data gathered via good quality surveys vs. bad quality surveys, and how as journalists to try to discern the difference. I trained the students about standardized survey interviewing. The students and instructors chose a manageable and newsworthy topic of local interest to gather survey data from the public; typically Evanston IL citizens. I devised the 15-20 item questionnaire within input from students and generated the RDD sampling pool. Then I supervised approximately 12-15 hrs of interviewing done by the students (classes ranged from 25-35 students) from the NU Survey Lab telephone center during a Friday-Sunday time frame. I key punched the data myself and did the analyses for the class focusing mostly on frequencies and crosstabs. I reported the data back to the class in a "news briefing format" similar to what a pollster for a newspaper might do with reporters. The students then wrote "on deadline" news stories about the findings, some of which would get published in the local weekly newspaper.

These mini-survey practicums were neither silly nor did they generate low quality data. In fact, one of these surveys on gun control was used by Evanston City Council as part of their decision making process to ban the ownership of handguns in the city. Some of the surveys also were used in AAPOR and MAPOR papers. Several of the students went on to include public opinion as a "beat" they later covered in their careers and a few still keep in touch with me when they encounter thorny methodological problems in survey/polling stories they are covering.

PJL

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

signoff aapornet

Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 08:39:20 -0500
Reply-To: Paul Braun <pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Paul Braun <pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Re: Students in Surveys
Comments: To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>,
AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <C5E0665BB776D311868400805FF5603A04A061EE@sscintex.ssc.msu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Princeton Survey Research firm:

Seeks student telephone interviewers for busy survey research firm. Responsibilities includes learning research techniques, executing surveys at our CATI equipped facility in Princeton. We will train you in the proper execution of surveys. We will train you how best to avoid refusals, client expectations on sample management and the proper coding of responses. There is no pay, but you will learn a lot.

Please respond to Braun Research in Princeton NJ.

It is one thing to teach people in a course what you know and want to pass along. It is clearly another to take the fruits of the labor of people you obtained for free and sell it. That is exploitation. If people pay for a course, they should expect to be taught. If they are put to work in a learning environment, it should be relevant to their being taught. If they're work has value beyond the course work, then everyone deserves to benefit.

Paul Braun

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Ehrlich, Nathaniel
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2004 8:07 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Students in Surveys

Granted there's nothing magical in paying people for work. I'm just one of those old curmudgeons who insists that the definition of a person who works for nothing is "slave", and when you use slave labor you can expect problems. Careful monitoring of an employee is a way to reduce the likelihood of those problems; a volunteer can't be fired. If one is conducting research and using students as workers in that project, it strikes me as questionable on ethical grounds to use those students without treating them as professionals, i.e. paying them for the work that they do. Getting credit for the course they're taking is problematic. Let's say that a student enrolls in a course [undergraduate or graduate, DAS or whatever] and is indentured as a worker in a survey. Midway through the course, for whatever reason, that student drops the

course. The student has not been compensated for the work done; it was 'volunteer' or 'slave' labor, and the project director's degree of control over the quality of the data was less than it might have been. Similarly, I can envision a student becoming disenchanted with the professor running the course, or experiencing a feeling of being ripped off [as the students did in the Peterson case] and falsifying data. One final point: Dr. Mitofsky suggested that the judge in the case should have been more knowledgeable or demanding about the survey. I disagree: I believe the judge had a reasonable expectation of professional quality work based on the status of the institution hired to do the work. Ultimately, it is up to us, professional survey researchers, to agree on standards of conduct and police ourselves. Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D. Research Specialist Michigan State University Institute for Public Policy and Social Research 517-355-6672

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

From: Colleen Porter [mailto:cporter@HP.UFL.EDU]
Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2004 8:45 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Students in Surveys

>>> "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU> 1/12/2004 3:06:20 PM >>> > With all due respect, I have to disagree. Using interviewers who are trained > well, carefully monitored, and paid for the work they do constitutes a > minimal set of specifications for valid work.

Nat, I'm with you on the training and monitoring, which was the real problem in this case.

But I'm not sure there is anything magical about being paid for work that makes the product more reliable than the efforts of an earnest volunteer. I think many of us have donated our time and expertise to worthy causes now and then, and still gave the same professional effort for which clients will pay megabucks (or at least bucks). When we lived in Brazil for a semester, I taught a graduate seminar without being paid, but the grades for the students still counted on their university transcripts :)

More seriously, I had the privilege of taking a graduate course in survey research from Pam Shoemaker at the University of Texas. We graduate students functioned as the survey management team, and conducted a real survey. We designed and programmed the questionnaire, pulled the sample, and trained and supervised an undergraduate class which provided the interviewing. It was required that they work two shifts as part of their course requirement in an undergraduate research course. (But this was in a CATI lab, with no opportunity nor incentive for falsification of data.)

For us graduate students, it didn't seem like the "whirlwind" some have described, because we had the entire semester to go through the various steps.

I found that it was a marvelous experience to walk through the process of what doing a survey is like--to meet with clients, talk about their expectations, prepare a report and ultimately present findings to the client. (I remember obsessing and having long discussions with other students about what to wear on the day we presented our findings; I've never worried about that since.)

When I interviewed for my first paid survey management job, I had the report our class had produced tucked under my arm, and I had experienced every step in the process. My new co-workers were so impressed that I could just take charge and plan out what to do next.

I had worked at the survey lab for more than a year prior to that class, but the level of responsibility in the class was different. We weren't just helping; we were in charge. Instead of seeing one piece of it, we could view the big picture. The responsibility was ours, and we had to step up to the plate and handle it. The professor functioned as a great coach.

This experience is fresh in my mind because recently I've gotten lots of questions about that "hands on" survey course, as the department where I currently work is considering how to expand their offerings in research methods. I think it would be a shame if universities shied away from letting students do real research like that as part of their training, because I know how invaluable it was for me, and shaped my career and research interests.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter
Senior Project Coordinator
cporter@phhp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/273-6068, fax: 352/273-6075
University of Florida
Department of Health Services Administration
Location: 101 Newell Drive, Rm. 4148
US Mail: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

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

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

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

=====
Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 09:19:03 -0500

Reply-To: Ward Kay <wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ward Kay <wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM>
Organization: Adirondack Communications
Subject: Re: Teaching & Texts
Comments: To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <4007462B.2020601@umich.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I just wanted to say that I got into this field because this course. I was an undergraduate Statistics student who took Howard's undergraduate Research Methods sociology course because it fulfilled a writing requirement and I knew the statistical aspects would be easy for me. What I found was an application for statistical analysis that was a lot more interesting than actuarial tables and I have made my career from taking that "silly" class.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Howard Schuman
Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2004 9:02 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Teaching & Texts

Unlike the message below from Andrew Beveridge, I do not think a group survey project as part of teaching is "silly."

At the graduate level (but often with interested undergraduates participating) the Detroit Area Study (DAS) survey practicum has been going on at the University of Michigan for half a century. Four AAPOR Presidents in the last decade had part of their training through DAS, as did many others now active in the Association. At the same time, DAS has been responsible for a large number of important publications over the years, since it is also a vehicle for serious research by both faculty and students. Those interested can write to DAS for a list of publications, some of which describe the structure of the unit and the reasons for its success, though acknowledging also obstacles along the way. Of course, DAS has had significant advantages not easily duplicated elsewhere, notably some limited funding from the University and the availability of expert survey researchers in the U of M Survey Research Center, but the results have contributed significantly to the development of survey research in the United States.

Can something similar be done with an undergraduate course? Yes, if adapted to the exigencies of such a course, including the interests of the students themselves. First, a relevant and important population is readily available: the undergraduate student body itself. This allows obtaining a good list for systematic random sampling by the students in the course. Second, there are a number of important issues to study that have a direct relation to student life and therefore will interest both students in the course and respondents. Third, face to face interviewing is possible at no monetary cost by having student interviewers meet with respondents on campus, especially if the survey

instrument is kept short (I tried to limit it 20 minutes, easily done between two classes). Each student interviewer also wrote a short qualitative paper on their personal interviewing experience, usually showing their surprise and learning from contact with a sample of students outside their own circle of friends. Fourth, with current computing it is not all that difficult to produce a useful data set for analysis in the last third of the course, with emphasis on basic techniques that most students can handle as part of writing a final paper. It is even possible (though not necessary or usual) to end up with publishable research, in my case an article on the relation of academic effort (amount of study) to GPA, co-authored with three of the stronger students in the course.

Admittedly such a practicum takes a good deal of work but it is rewarding for many of the students and for the instructor. As to textbooks, there are many good articles and chapters one can put together in addition to or instead of a conventional text.

Andrew A Beveridge wrote:

>Dear All:

>

>First, when I teach methods I agree that trying to do a survey in class
>either as a group project or for each student is very silly. It gives
>exactly the wrong idea to students of what methods consists of. On the
>other hand having students do a few exercises or assignments that
highlight
>aspects of methods (e.g. observation, surveys, data analysis,
qualitative,
>even historical) is possible. For example, they can write a
questionnaire
>(open ended) and ask questions of a few people. In science students
are not
>expected to collect original data and analyze it for a grade.

>

>But one of the greatest problems in undergraduate methods is the
textbooks,
>and the fact that they are written by people who have not done in
serious
>research work for years and years.

>

>The category leader in this area should be known by everyone on this
list,
>so I am not going to name it. It is shot through with inaccuracies.
One of
>my favorite examples:

>

>Response rates on mail questionnaires are acceptable if they are 50
percent.

>

>Maybe someone actually involved in survey research should try to write
a
>text book for undergrads. It will be hard to displace the market

leader, I
>fear.
>
>Andy
>
>Andrew A. Beveridge
>Professor of Sociology
>Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY
>Suite 233 Powdermaker Hall
>65-30 Kissena Blvd
>Flushing, NY 11367-1597
>Phone: 718-997-2837
>FAX: 718-997-2820
>email: beveridg@optonline.net
>web: www.sociaexplorer.com
>

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

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

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

=====
Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 10:13:01 -0500
Reply-To: elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Betsy Martin <elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV>
Subject: FW: Teaching & Texts
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Now that DAS has come up--I have to tell you how much I disagree with your view that "having students spend a large amount of time carrying out [a] survey ... takes time away from learning methods..."

Speaking as a former student and DAS teaching fellow, DAS was among the most formative and valuable educational experiences in my graduate career at Michigan, even though we all grumbled about it at the time. In fact, it hooked me on survey research, and I wasn't alone, judging from the large number of former DAS students and TAs who are prominent in the field (Bob Groves, Diane Colasanto, Larry Bobo, among others).

It didn't take time away from learning methods. It was a way of learning about methods that provided a very different and intimate perspective on how surveys are actually carried out in the field that supplemented other forms of learning. It's an experience that I still carry with me and draw on, 32 (gulp?!) years later.

FYI, DAS was an MA requirement.

I think it is very interesting that it's the pedagogical aspects of the student survey required by the criminology prof. that have stimulated the most discussion on AAPORNet. It would be a good topic for a roundtable or panel discussion at this year's AAPOR conference.

Betsy

----- Message from "Andrew A Beveridge" <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU> on Fri, 16 Jan 2004 03:58:37 -0700 -----

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Subject: Teaching & Texts

Dear All:

The Detroit Area Study is one thing. But it is part of a graduate requirement for the Ph.D. in sociology. I still maintain that having students spend a large amount of time carrying out their own survey or carrying out the professor's survey takes time away from learning methods, unless you are only teaching survey methods. Even there it is questionable.

I think data analysis is better taught using "real" data rather than the sort of small scale survey that can be carried out in a class setting.

Indenturing undergraduate students to a survey lab for a few hours, it seems to me, is the equivalent of the psychology experiments that I had to put up with to get a grade in psychology.

But I think social science would be better served with the equivalent of laboratory work for undergrads, ala some of the things that say Bill Frey has created, rather than the pretense of a full-blown research project done in the context of a methods class.

I know people will differ on this, but I still think that trying to make students do a project from start to finish in the context of a undergraduate class is "kind of silly." Though I admit that it is better than making them carrying out a survey unsupervised from their home or dorm room so their Prof can testify in court.

Andy Beveridge

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

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

Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 09:55:07 -0600
Reply-To: Cynthia Nelson <cnelson@NIU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Cynthia Nelson <cnelson@NIU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Students in Surveys
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <[001e01c3dc36\\$25248180\\$6700a8c0@braunresearch.com](mailto:001e01c3dc36$25248180$6700a8c0@braunresearch.com)>
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1

I have read all the postings on this topic with interest, and I do not want to discount the fact that many students involved in interviewing in classes have had valuable experiences. I would not want to see any blanket recommendation, such as that students should *never* do something that can be defined as work in the context of their education/training, or even that there should *never* be payment to an organization when student training is involved (every doctor and paraprofessional treated patients as a student, the patients were billed). The issue is one of professional standards and supervision.

But I do think there is another issue:
Do people actually believe that working as an interviewer is an integral aspect of training to be a survey researcher?

I have worked in survey research for the last 15 years, starting as a grad assistant. Although I have assisted in an advanced undergrad course in which undergrads did carry out surveys (including phone interviews), have trained interviewers, monitored phone calls, and made verification/problem solving/and irate respondent call backs I actually have never worked as an interviewer. I never felt that there was any deficit in my training because I wasn't required to 'work the phones' for some period of time.

Since I assume University students are not training to become interviewers, what place, really, does actually doing interviewing have in the curriculum?

Cynthia Nelson

Cynthia Nelson
Center for Governmental Studies
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL 60115
Voice 815.753.1918
Fax 815.753.2305
email cnelson@niu.edu

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

Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 11:29:59 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Survey trouble in Wisconsin
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Casino ads running at full tilt
11:03 PM 1/15/04
Lesley Rogers Barrett County reporter
<http://www.madison.com/wisconsinstatejournal/local/65377.php>

Selected highlights:

SNIP

The Ho-Chunk-sponsored Coalition for Fair Indian Gaming and Revenue Sharing Agreements is conducting a telephone poll among voters that some call a "push poll" - a polling practice that advertises one point of view rather than conducting legitimate research. The practice is legal but often condemned by professional pollsters.

Lisa Pugh, spokeswoman for the pro-casino group, said a small poll is being conducted to gauge sentiment among residents. The group won't share the results of the poll, and the results will be used internally to help shape the strategy of the campaign.

"It's definitely not a push poll," Pugh said.

Ann Kleinhans, a town of Dunn resident, called the State Journal to complain after she received a call. <

After telling the poller she planned to vote no on the referendum, Kleinhans said the poller continued a line of questioning, asking if she would support the casino if she knew County Executive Kathleen Falk was in favor of it or

if she knew several unions supported the referendum.

"It's just wrong in so many ways," Kleinhans said. "They're calling this research, but it's advertising. They're trying to influence voters."

Charles Franklin, a UW-Madison political science professor, said such polls are not legitimate polling for research.

"This sort of overt polling bothers public opinion pollsters a lot," Franklin said.

Under the new telemarketing rules and the do-not-call list, surveys and political campaign calls are exempt, which makes the casino poll legal. But it could make citizens cynical of legitimate polling, Franklin said.

"Most polls will generally just ask your opinion," Franklin said. "They don't ask, 'What if Kathleen Falk supports it?'"

SNIP

The pro-casino group also is mailing surveys to "tens of thousands" of likely voters, Pugh said. The survey results will be shared with county leaders and the public.

UW-Madison statistics professor Rick Chappell called the State Journal on Thursday to complain about the mailing.

He's still undecided about how he'll vote Feb. 17, but the glossy mailer has him angry at the pro-casino group.

"They claim to be conducting a survey, but it's misleading," Chappell said. "To a scientist who relies on surveys, I'm outraged."

The mailer states "How \$91 million in new revenue could benefit our communities," and includes pictures depicting education, human services, public safety and property tax relief. The mailer includes a letter from the pro-casino group and a list of supporters.

The outside of the mailer reads, "Please take a moment to complete the attached survey and mail it back today? Thank you."

The survey inside asks how the money from Ho-Chunk should be spent by the city and county. The box to support a yes vote is checked.

"This betrays the trust needed for real surveys," Chappell said. "This has pushed a hot button for me."

Franklin said such "surveys" are perfectly legal, but harmful to scientific research.

SNIP

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC

6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

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

Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 12:27:44 -0500
Reply-To: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
Subject: FW: Teaching & Texts
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

For undergrads, there is no where near the committment to learning anything that one can expect from highly selected graduate students at UMich.

If people don't understand this, I have nothing to say. But remember there are about 100,000 students (undergrads) registered in social research methods in the US in a given year. These course generally meet for 3 hours per week for 14 weeks, assuming 5 hours per week of homework, etc, this gives one 102 hours of time spent on instruction. To eat up a vast amount of this with either a Prof designed data collection project, ala the one now making headlines, or by a small individual survey that each student supposedly carries out (and which I think is even worse) undercuts learning methods in general and what it can be used for. Making things even worse, as far as we can tell at Queens College (we have one of the largest number of Sociology majors in the US) many schools relegate methods to one course that is supposed to include statistics. We have a methods course, a statistics course, and a course in research design. Still doing one type of data collection eats up any course at the undergrad level. For advanced undergraduate or graduate students it is an entirely different matter.

How many undergrads will turn out to be Betsy Martin? I don't think undergraduate curriculum can be designed for such as her alone!

Betsy writes:

"Speaking as a former student and DAS teaching fellow, DAS was among the most formative and valuable educational experiences in my graduate career at Michigan, even though we all grumbled about it at the time. In fact, it hooked me on survey research, and I wasn't alone. . ."

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

Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 12:23:55 -0500
Reply-To: mindy anderson-knott <mja10@PSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: mindy anderson-knott <mja10@PSU.EDU>
Subject: Job Opening
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Announcement:

With the growth of the Survey Research Center (www.ssri.psu.edu/survey) and the amount of demand for research services from faculty researchers at Penn State there is a critical need for a non-tenure track research associate with skills in study design and survey methodology. The person in this position will assist the Director and Assistant Director in working directly with Penn State researchers to integrate SRC services into their projects and grant submissions. Tasks will involve helping the researchers choose an appropriate survey method and design, help plan sample sizes and power analyses, and provide estimates for the cost of conducting the research. Other tasks would include some time devoted to management of projects funded through the SRC, and assisting with the training of students and researchers in recent developments in survey research through workshops and other related formats.

The qualifications for this position include a doctor's degree or its equivalent in an area closely related to survey research and either evidence of training in survey research procedures and methods or two or more years of experience working in the area of survey research.

Please send cover letter and resume by February 1 to:

Mindy Anderson-Knott
N248 Burrowes Building
University Park, PA 16802
FAX (814) 865-3098
email: mja10@psu.edu

Penn State is committed to affirmative action, equal opportunity and the diversity of its workforce.

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

=====
Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 13:41:38 -0500
Reply-To: Steve Farkas <sfarkas@PUBLICAGENDA.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Steve Farkas <sfarkas@PUBLICAGENDA.ORG>
Subject: job opening
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

January 2004

IMMEDIATE OPENING: PUBLIC OPINION ANALYST

Public Agenda, a nonprofit, nonpartisan research organization, seeks an experienced survey research professional for its research department.

Public Agenda is a nationally recognized nonprofit, nonpartisan research organization located in New York City. It was founded in 1975 by social scientist Dan Yankelovich and Secretary of State Cyrus Vance. Public Agenda conducts original public opinion research on social policy issues it is not a market research firm.

Candidate should be experienced in both quantitative and qualitative research methods, including questionnaire design and data analysis as well as focus groups and one-on-one interviewing.

Specifically, candidates should have:

=B7 3-4 years of professional survey research experience, including writing questionnaires, reviewing CATI scripts, designing sample frames, fielding telephone surveys, writing tab and banner plans, analyzing cross-tabs, coding open-ended responses and checking numbers.

=B7 Strong organizational skills and an ability to handle multiple projects and anticipate scheduling needs.

=B7 Familiarity with focus group recruiting and moderating, and conducting in-depth interviews.

=B7 Excellent Internet skills and familiarity with public opinion research organizations and Web sites.

=B7 A background in public policy or the social sciences.=20

=B7 SPSS skills a plus.

Send cover letter (required) and resume to:

positions@publicagenda.org

Or=20

Job Search/AD

Public Agenda

6 East 39th Street

New York, NY 10016

(No phone calls, please.)

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

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

signoff aapornet

=====
Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 14:32:24 -0500
Reply-To: John Gorman <jgorman@OPINIONDYNAMICS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: John Gorman <jgorman@OPINIONDYNAMICS.COM>
Subject: Re: Survey trouble in Wisconsin
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: quoted-printable

As the president of the firm that conducted the referenced poll, I am in the process of objecting to any characterization of the poll as a "push poll". Asking 400 people if they might feel differently about a measure if they knew that elected officials, civic groups and labor unions had endorsed it is not push polling in any sense of the word. If we can no longer ask people how they =

John W. Gorman
President
Opinion Dynamics Corporation
1030 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138

Phone: 617.492.1400
Fax: 617.497.7944

www.opiniondynamics.com
react to information, we all may as well close up shop and go home.

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

From: Leo G. Simonetta [mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM]
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2004 11:30 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Survey trouble in Wisconsin

Casino ads running at full tilt
11:03 PM 1/15/04
Lesley Rogers Barrett County reporter
<http://www.madison.com/wisconsinstatejournal/local/65377.php>

Selected highlights:

SNIP

The Ho-Chunk-sponsored Coalition for Fair Indian Gaming and Revenue =
Sharing
Agreements is conducting a telephone poll among voters that some call a
"push poll" - a polling practice that advertises one point of view =
rather

than conducting legitimate research. The practice is legal but often condemned by professional pollsters.

Lisa Pugh, spokeswoman for the pro-casino group, said a small poll is = being conducted to gauge sentiment among residents. The group won't share the results of the poll, and the results will be used internally to help = shape the strategy of the campaign.

"It's definitely not a push poll," Pugh said.

Ann Kleinhans, a town of Dunn resident, called the State Journal to = complain after she received a call. <

After telling the poller she planned to vote no on the referendum, = Kleinhans said the poller continued a line of questioning, asking if she would = support the casino if she knew County Executive Kathleen Falk was in favor of it = or if she knew several unions supported the referendum.

"It's just wrong in so many ways," Kleinhans said. "They're calling this research, but it's advertising. They're trying to influence voters."

Charles Franklin, a UW-Madison political science professor, said such = polls are not legitimate polling for research.

"This sort of overt polling bothers public opinion pollsters a lot," Franklin said.

Under the new telemarketing rules and the do-not-call list, surveys and political campaign calls are exempt, which makes the casino poll legal. = But it could make citizens cynical of legitimate polling, Franklin said.

"Most polls will generally just ask your opinion," Franklin said. "They don't ask, 'What if Kathleen Falk supports it?'"

SNIP

The pro-casino group also is mailing surveys to "tens of thousands" of likely voters, Pugh said. The survey results will be shared with county leaders and the public.

UW-Madison statistics professor Rick Chappell called the State Journal = on Thursday to complain about the mailing.

He's still undecided about how he'll vote Feb. 17, but the glossy mailer = has

him angry at the pro-casino group.

"They claim to be conducting a survey, but it's misleading," Chappell =
said.

"To a scientist who relies on surveys, I'm outraged."

The mailer states "How \$91 million in new revenue could benefit our
communities," and includes pictures depicting education, human services,
public safety and property tax relief. The mailer includes a letter from =
the
pro-casino group and a list of supporters.

The outside of the mailer reads, "Please take a moment to complete the
attached survey and mail it back today? Thank you."

The survey inside asks how the money from Ho-Chunk should be spent by =
the
city and county. The box to support a yes vote is checked.

"This betrays the trust needed for real surveys," Chappell said. "This =
has
pushed a hot button for me."

Franklin said such "surveys" are perfectly legal, but harmful to =
scientific
research.

SNIP

--

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

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

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

=====
Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 13:38:14 -0600
Reply-To: Rick Weil <fweil@COX.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Rick Weil <fweil@COX.NET>
Subject: Fw: Teaching methods
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I think this is a valuable discussion on teaching methods. To me, it's reinforcing two things that I already felt were true - there's more than one way to do things well, and you can't teach students everything you might like to in methods: there simply isn't time, and some things will be left over for on-the-job training.

A further question is whether it's only good and/or advanced students who benefit from more hands-on experience and less formal training. I feel that this does not have to be the case. I taught at Harvard and the U of Chicago before coming to LSU, and I've always tried to teach the same content at a large public university that I taught at elite private schools. I had to change the approach somewhat (they don't have the background for side references to Nietzsche in my classical sociological theory classes), but I feel I can cover the same material and capture their interest in much the same way.

I felt we could design, conduct, and analyze a real, general population RDD survey (N = ca. 400) of our parish (county) within the confines of a methods class, without detracting too much from other tasks. When I designed the class, I floated a query on AAPORNET and got 15-20 very helpful replies and cautions. Several people were already doing this sort of project at the undergrad level - in addition to the granddaddy DAS at the grad level.

Maybe a description of my class design will illustrate (see <http://members.cox.net/fweil/s2211guide.html>). We have three 1-hour meetings a week, all held in a computer lab with internet connection and a room-level LAN. Wednesdays are devoted to lectures and textbook reading and general coverage of various methods (including comparative-historical, ethnography, experimental, etc.). Mondays are spent mostly in doing data analysis of GSS data, using a workbook. By the time we've collected our own data, the students are quite familiar with basic data analysis. Fridays, we work on our own survey. We fit in some other, smaller web-based projects along the way.

For the survey, I break the students into 5 groups of about 7 each, each of which select a topic. The students select their own topic and survey questions, some replicated, and some original, if they want. Each student brings in 5 questions from the GSS/NES, discuss them as a group, and select 2 for the group; then they do the same thing, with questions from any source, including self written. This yields four questions per module and a questionnaire of 20 questions (5 times 4), plus a few standards I put in and "face sheet" questions. The students practice a few times on each other, then go to the phones. We buy a real sample, and interviews average about 12 minutes; each student has to do 12 completes, but gets extra credit for more completes. Along the way, they are quizzed on technical aspects, and we answer questions that come up.

When the dataset is cleaned and ready, the students analyze it, as they had analyzed the GSS. They are guided by hypotheses they've developed along the way. They have to write short reports on a topic we approve, and they can give extra-credit presentations to the class. I try to get a "real-life" visitor for them to report to, and we've been lucky enough to get the mayor

interested; and this increases class interest enormously. This gives them an experience of reporting to a "client." For instance, the mayor and the class were intensely interested in issues surrounding the south Louisiana serial killer last year: fear of crime spiked (we had a time series), but the mayor and police were not blamed at that stage. The mayor, a moderate Republican, also interpreted one report differently than the presenter, pointing out that African-Americans gave him a greater degree of support than might be expected from general voting tendencies.

This class has to be planned carefully, and we have to meet deadlines, but I've been happy with it, and my feedback from students has been very good.

A couple keys here. We're doing "real" research which the students initiate and conduct themselves, with guidance from me, and this increases student interest and morale tremendously: they become increasingly invested in the process as the semester goes on. It's also worth noting that since they depend on each other for the dataset, they have an increased incentive to have high standards. A few - and only a few - students go on to use survey research in their careers, and of course, they find this helpful. Most students don't go into survey research, and the class has to serve them, too. My feedback from former students has been very good in this regard: they sometimes tell me that the survey is the thing they've remembered best and learned most from.

Finally, it's worth noting that this class required considerably more than average preparation by me the first time I taught it, but as I go into my 5th time, continuing the class only takes slightly above-average effort to teach.

Again, I don't claim that this is somehow perfect or ideal, simply that it's one way of running an effective class. If I thought it were possible to teach them everything they need to know about methods (or even most) in a single class, I'd do it. But I don't see how I can, so I take the classical alternative strategy of giving broad background coverage, plus specialization/experience in one topic. Those students who enter the field will continue learning as professionals, as I think most of us do.

Rick Weil, Sociology, LSU

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

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

Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 14:52:11 -0500

Reply-To: Melissa Riba <mriba@PSCINC.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Melissa Riba <mriba@PSCINC.COM>

Subject: Re: Survey trouble in Wisconsin

Comments: To: John Gorman <jgorman@OPINIONDYNAMICS.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The issue of "push polling" seems to be coming up quite a bit in the =
media. I am struck at how often the story begins with someone who was =
called objecting because they believe it to be a push poll. I agree that =
push polling is clearly something to be concerned with, but from what I =
see the media and public are confused as to the difference between a =
push-poll and legitimate survey research that is "message testing" for a =
client.=20

I think this demonstrates that AAPOR and it's members (myself included) =
have more work to do to better educate both the general public, but most =
importantly the media, on this very important distinction.

Melissa Riba
Senior Consultant
Evaluation and Survey Research
Public Sector Consultants
Lansing, MI
517/484-4954
=20
www.pscinc.com <<http://www.pscinc.com>>=20

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

From: John Gorman [mailto:jgorman@OPINIONDYNAMICS.COM]
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2004 2:32 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Survey trouble in Wisconsin

As the president of the firm that conducted the referenced poll, I am in =
the process of objecting to any characterization of the poll as a "push =
poll". Asking 400 people if they might feel differently about a measure =
if they knew that elected officials, civic groups and labor unions had =
endorsed it is not push polling in any sense of the word. If we can no =
longer ask people how they =

John W. Gorman
President
Opinion Dynamics Corporation
1030 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138

Phone: 617.492.1400
Fax: 617.497.7944

www.opiniondynamics.com
react to information, we all may as well close up shop and go home.

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

From: Leo G. Simonetta [mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM]
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2004 11:30 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Survey trouble in Wisconsin

Casino ads running at full tilt
11:03 PM 1/15/04
Lesley Rogers Barrett County reporter
<http://www.madison.com/wisconsinstatejournal/local/65377.php>

Selected highlights:

SNIP

The Ho-Chunk-sponsored Coalition for Fair Indian Gaming and Revenue =
Sharing
Agreements is conducting a telephone poll among voters that some call a
"push poll" - a polling practice that advertises one point of view =
rather
than conducting legitimate research. The practice is legal but often
condemned by professional pollsters.

Lisa Pugh, spokeswoman for the pro-casino group, said a small poll is =
being
conducted to gauge sentiment among residents. The group won't share the
results of the poll, and the results will be used internally to help =
shape
the strategy of the campaign.

"It's definitely not a push poll," Pugh said.

Ann Kleinhans, a town of Dunn resident, called the State Journal to =
complain
after she received a call. <

After telling the poller she planned to vote no on the referendum, =
Kleinhans
said the poller continued a line of questioning, asking if she would =
support
the casino if she knew County Executive Kathleen Falk was in favor of it =
or
if she knew several unions supported the referendum.

"It's just wrong in so many ways," Kleinhans said. "They're calling this
research, but it's advertising. They're trying to influence voters."

Charles Franklin, a UW-Madison political science professor, said such =
polls
are not legitimate polling for research.

"This sort of overt polling bothers public opinion pollsters a lot,"
Franklin said.

Under the new telemarketing rules and the do-not-call list, surveys and

political campaign calls are exempt, which makes the casino poll legal. =
But
it could make citizens cynical of legitimate polling, Franklin said.

"Most polls will generally just ask your opinion," Franklin said. "They don't ask, 'What if Kathleen Falk supports it?'"

SNIP

The pro-casino group also is mailing surveys to "tens of thousands" of likely voters, Pugh said. The survey results will be shared with county leaders and the public.

UW-Madison statistics professor Rick Chappell called the State Journal =
on
Thursday to complain about the mailing.

He's still undecided about how he'll vote Feb. 17, but the glossy mailer =
has
him angry at the pro-casino group.

"They claim to be conducting a survey, but it's misleading," Chappell =
said.
"To a scientist who relies on surveys, I'm outraged."

The mailer states "How \$91 million in new revenue could benefit our communities," and includes pictures depicting education, human services, public safety and property tax relief. The mailer includes a letter from =
the
pro-casino group and a list of supporters.

The outside of the mailer reads, "Please take a moment to complete the attached survey and mail it back today? Thank you."

The survey inside asks how the money from Ho-Chunk should be spent by =
the
city and county. The box to support a yes vote is checked.

"This betrays the trust needed for real surveys," Chappell said. "This =
has
pushed a hot button for me."

Franklin said such "surveys" are perfectly legal, but harmful to =
scientific
research.

SNIP

--

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

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

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

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

Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 12:26:35 -0800
Reply-To: Richard <rmaullin@FMMA.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Richard <rmaullin@FMMA.ORG>
Subject: Re: Survey trouble in Wisconsin
Comments: To: John Gorman <jgorman@OPINIONDYNAMICS.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

John Gorman is absolutely correct. This silliness that condemns any "if you knew" question with the dreaded "P" word is not helpful or necessary for identifying polling meant to propagandize rather than inquire about opinions and effects. Try this one: "If you knew that your favorite candy bar's wrapper was going to reveal the fat content of the candy bar, would you be more inclined or less inclined to buy it, or would knowing this not have any effect, one way or the other, on whether you would buy this candy?"

Richard Maullin
Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates
2425 Colorado Ave. Suite 180
Santa Monica, CA 90404
310-828-1183
=20

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

From: John Gorman [<mailto:jgorman@OPINIONDYNAMICS.COM>]=20
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2004 11:32 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Survey trouble in Wisconsin

As the president of the firm that conducted the referenced poll, I am in the process of objecting to any characterization of the poll as a "push poll". Asking 400 people if they might feel differently about a measure if they knew that elected officials, civic groups and labor unions had endorsed it is not push polling in any sense of the word. If we can no longer ask people how they

John W. Gorman
President
Opinion Dynamics Corporation
1030 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138

Phone: 617.492.1400
Fax: 617.497.7944

www.opiniondynamics.com
react to information, we all may as well close up shop and go home.

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

From: Leo G. Simonetta [mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM]
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2004 11:30 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Survey trouble in Wisconsin

Casino ads running at full tilt
11:03 PM 1/15/04
Lesley Rogers Barrett County reporter
<http://www.madison.com/wisconsinstatejournal/local/65377.php>

Selected highlights:

SNIP

The Ho-Chunk-sponsored Coalition for Fair Indian Gaming and Revenue Sharing Agreements is conducting a telephone poll among voters that some call a "push poll" - a polling practice that advertises one point of view rather than conducting legitimate research. The practice is legal but often condemned by professional pollsters.

Lisa Pugh, spokeswoman for the pro-casino group, said a small poll is being conducted to gauge sentiment among residents. The group won't share the results of the poll, and the results will be used internally to help shape the strategy of the campaign.

"It's definitely not a push poll," Pugh said.

Ann Kleinhans, a town of Dunn resident, called the State Journal to complain after she received a call. <

After telling the poller she planned to vote no on the referendum,

Kleinhans

said the poller continued a line of questioning, asking if she would support the casino if she knew County Executive Kathleen Falk was in favor of it or if she knew several unions supported the referendum.

"It's just wrong in so many ways," Kleinhans said. "They're calling this research, but it's advertising. They're trying to influence voters."

Charles Franklin, a UW-Madison political science professor, said such polls are not legitimate polling for research.

"This sort of overt polling bothers public opinion pollsters a lot," Franklin said.

Under the new telemarketing rules and the do-not-call list, surveys and political campaign calls are exempt, which makes the casino poll legal. But it could make citizens cynical of legitimate polling, Franklin said.

"Most polls will generally just ask your opinion," Franklin said. "They don't ask, 'What if Kathleen Falk supports it?'"

SNIP

The pro-casino group also is mailing surveys to "tens of thousands" of likely voters, Pugh said. The survey results will be shared with county leaders and the public.

UW-Madison statistics professor Rick Chappell called the State Journal on Thursday to complain about the mailing.

He's still undecided about how he'll vote Feb. 17, but the glossy mailer has him angry at the pro-casino group.

"They claim to be conducting a survey, but it's misleading," Chappell said.

"To a scientist who relies on surveys, I'm outraged."

The mailer states "How \$91 million in new revenue could benefit our communities," and includes pictures depicting education, human services, public safety and property tax relief. The mailer includes a letter from the pro-casino group and a list of supporters.

The outside of the mailer reads, "Please take a moment to complete the attached survey and mail it back today? Thank you."

The survey inside asks how the money from Ho-Chunk should be spent by the

city and county. The box to support a yes vote is checked.

"This betrays the trust needed for real surveys," Chappell said. "This has pushed a hot button for me."

Franklin said such "surveys" are perfectly legal, but harmful to scientific research.

SNIP

--

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

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

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

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

Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 14:29:43 -0600
Reply-To: "Charles H. Franklin" <franklin@POLISCI.WISC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Charles H. Franklin" <franklin@POLISCI.WISC.EDU>
Subject: Re: Survey trouble in Wisconsin
Comments: To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <[00c901c3dc4d\\$fbdf3e10\\$d00a010a@LEO](mailto:00c901c3dc4d$fbdf3e10$d00a010a@LEO)>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Alas, I think both reports of push polling and of my views are considerably misconstrued in this newspaper story.

The poll was done by Opinion Dynamics, certainly a reputable firm. And the questions about endorsements and their effect on the vote are entirely legitimate. Unfortunately, a citizen took them badly, provoking the story.

As for my quotes, the story makes it sound like I was characterizing this particular poll as a push poll when in fact I was explaining to the reporter

what a push poll was. The second quote from me is completely wrong:

"Most polls will generally just ask your opinion," Franklin said. "They don't ask, 'What if Kathleen Falk supports it?'"

What I ACTUALLY said was that the above quote was an example of a LEGITIMATE question. I followed it by saying a push poll would ask something like "Would you still support it if you knew an ax murderer was supporting it."

I've emailed the paper with a clarification and offered the following op-ed piece in hopes of clarifying the difference between push polls and legitimate surveys, and in the process make my position clear.

I regret this misconstruction of what I had to say to the reporter. Charges of push polling become a campaign weapon, just as the push polls themselves. In this case I think the charge is unfounded.

Here is the submitted op-ed piece:

Legitimate survey or push poll: How do you know?

Charles H. Franklin

One of the more disturbing political campaign tactics is the use of telemarketing calls masquerading as legitimate opinion surveys. These "push polls" are not polls at all but calls that attempt to persuade a voter, usually by claiming particularly horrible consequences of a vote or by alleging character defects in a candidate.

A legitimate survey is much more interested in what people think than in persuading them. This doesn't mean, however, that a survey won't provide information as part of the questions. This week a poll by the Ho-Chunk sponsored Coalition for Fair Indian Gaming and Revenue Sharing Agreements was featured in a news story in the Wisconsin State Journal ("Casino ads running at full tilt", January 16th, page B1). Apparently the survey asked whether voters favored or opposed the Dane county casino referendum. It then asked if the voter knew that County Executive Kathleen Falk was in favor or that several unions were supporting the measure. This struck some as evidence that this was a push poll. However, these questions could be entirely legitimate in a survey. A key question for campaigns is to know if endorsements help them and whether knowing the positions of Falk or unions makes voters more supportive. If this was all the poll asked, then that would not make it a push poll.

The push poll, in contrast, is seldom subtle. In the 2000 South Carolina Republican presidential primary push polls called voters and asked if they would be less likely to vote for Senator John McCain if they knew he was mentally imbalanced due to his experience as a prisoner of war. Other calls claimed that he had fathered a black child with a prostitute. Not

surprisingly, the sponsors of push polls are not anxious to have their role mentioned and so we seldom get an honest answer when we ask who is paying for the push poll.

In fact, a "push poll" isn't even a poll in the usual sense. It is telemarketing. A legitimate survey samples a few hundred telephone numbers, selected at random, in order to create a statistically reliable sample of public opinion. The survey questions are carefully written to avoid bias and the data are collected for analysis by the campaign to find out where their support is strong or weak and what issues matter the most to voters. A "push poll" does none of these things. A push poll calls thousands of voters, sometimes targeting particular groups. There is no pretense of random sampling and indeed, the push poll never even records the opinions of the people called. The point is to persuade voters, not to collect opinions.

Push polls often start with legitimate sounding questions before they unload their real, and usually nasty, message. Indeed, the deception is part of the idea. A voter who doesn't realize they are being targeted for a persuasive message may be more easily influenced by it.

So the problem arises, how does a citizen know the difference between a push poll and a legitimate survey? Unfortunately, it isn't always easy. Negative information about a candidate may be a legitimate part of a survey. For example, asking if Clinton's affair with Monica Lewinsky changed your view of Clinton would not seem unusual in a legitimate survey. In the last week of the 2000 campaign news stories reported that George Bush had been arrested for driving under the influence some years earlier. Surveys quickly included this in their questionnaires to find out what influence this had on people's votes. In both cases, supporters of the candidates might well feel that these were illegitimate smears on their candidates, and so construe this as a push poll. Unfortunately, much of the perception of these questions depends on where we stand. A legitimate survey may thus be blasted as a push poll.

Still, there are some clues. If the poll quickly moves to giving the voter damaging information in the guise of a question and especially if the information is of a particularly flagrant sort, then the odds of a push poll rise. Opinion surveys almost always end with some demographic questions such as age, education and perhaps income. Push polls don't bother because they don't want to waste the time on the phone once they've delivered their persuasive message. Legitimate pollsters are willing to identify themselves including giving a phone number you can contact if you have questions. A push poll's sponsors wish to remain very anonymous.

In the case of the casino survey, we unfortunately find that what appeared to some as a push poll may very well have been a legitimate survey for the campaign. The questions quoted in the Wisconsin State Journal news story appear to be well within the normal bounds of appropriate survey practice.

Push polls have been condemned by the American Association for Public Opinion Research. By confusing telemarketing with legitimate opinion research, push polls undermine the ability of scientific surveys to inform campaigns and citizens about the true state of public opinion. In a mass society where each side of any issue claims to have the "support of the

people" surveys of public opinion are one of the most important ways we have to know what the citizenry really thinks. Legitimate opinion surveys provide a vital connection between citizens and elected officials. Push polls poison that relationship.

Charles H. Franklin is a Professor of Political Science at the University of Wisconsin. His specialty is electoral politics and survey research methods.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of Leo G. Simonetta
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2004 10:30 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Survey trouble in Wisconsin

Casino ads running at full tilt

11:03 PM 1/15/04

Lesley Rogers Barrett County reporter

<http://www.madison.com/wisconsinstatejournal/local/65377.php>

Selected highlights:

SNIP

The Ho-Chunk-sponsored Coalition for Fair Indian Gaming and Revenue Sharing Agreements is conducting a telephone poll among voters that some call a "push poll" - a polling practice that advertises one point of view rather than conducting legitimate research. The practice is legal but often condemned by professional pollsters.

Lisa Pugh, spokeswoman for the pro-casino group, said a small poll is being conducted to gauge sentiment among residents. The group won't share the results of the poll, and the results will be used internally to help shape the strategy of the campaign.

"It's definitely not a push poll," Pugh said.

Ann Kleinhans, a town of Dunn resident, called the State Journal to complain after she received a call. <

After telling the poller she planned to vote no on the referendum, Kleinhans said the poller continued a line of questioning, asking if she would support the casino if she knew County Executive Kathleen Falk was in favor of it or if she knew several unions supported the referendum.

"It's just wrong in so many ways," Kleinhans said. "They're calling this research, but it's advertising. They're trying to influence voters."

Charles Franklin, a UW-Madison political science professor, said such polls

are not legitimate polling for research.

"This sort of overt polling bothers public opinion pollsters a lot," Franklin said.

Under the new telemarketing rules and the do-not-call list, surveys and political campaign calls are exempt, which makes the casino poll legal. But it could make citizens cynical of legitimate polling, Franklin said.

"Most polls will generally just ask your opinion," Franklin said. "They don't ask, 'What if Kathleen Falk supports it?'"

SNIP

The pro-casino group also is mailing surveys to "tens of thousands" of likely voters, Pugh said. The survey results will be shared with county leaders and the public.

UW-Madison statistics professor Rick Chappell called the State Journal on Thursday to complain about the mailing.

He's still undecided about how he'll vote Feb. 17, but the glossy mailer has him angry at the pro-casino group.

"They claim to be conducting a survey, but it's misleading," Chappell said. "To a scientist who relies on surveys, I'm outraged."

The mailer states "How \$91 million in new revenue could benefit our communities," and includes pictures depicting education, human services, public safety and property tax relief. The mailer includes a letter from the pro-casino group and a list of supporters.

The outside of the mailer reads, "Please take a moment to complete the attached survey and mail it back today? Thank you."

The survey inside asks how the money from Ho-Chunk should be spent by the city and county. The box to support a yes vote is checked.

"This betrays the trust needed for real surveys," Chappell said. "This has pushed a hot button for me."

Franklin said such "surveys" are perfectly legal, but harmful to scientific research.

SNIP

--

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

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

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

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

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

=====
Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 12:41:43 -0800

Reply-To: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>

Organization: Competitive Edge Research & Comm.

Subject: Re: Survey trouble in Wisconsin

Comments: To: John Gorman <jgorman@OPINIONDYNAMICS.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To:

<DC6DA75F7C4DDE4CAA48A7F9C5A130CB65EAC9@odcexchange.opiniondynamics.com>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Amen.

This is exactly why we need a crystal clear statement on push polls from AAPOR. I'm not saying the current one is bad, but we must improve it so that everyone -- the press, AAPOR's own members, potential respondents -- know what push polls are and are not. Though it may be tough, coming up with a new name for "push polls" would probably help a lot.

Another disturbing part of this is that those who do the complaining about push polls that are really research are typically just out to make a political statement. They disagree with the characterization in the legitimate poll of their candidate or position and they make a stink about it to get some ink. Nine times out of ten I'll bet they KNOW it's not really a push poll but they want to blacken the eye of the other side and a reporter, seeing a story, gives them a platform. In the process it's the research profession which gets the black eye as respondents become further confused.

John E. Nienstedt, Sr.

john@cerc.net

Get the edge at www.cerc.net

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of John Gorman

Sent: Friday, January 16, 2004 11:32 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Survey trouble in Wisconsin

As the president of the firm that conducted the referenced poll, I am in the process of objecting to any characterization of the poll as a "push poll". Asking 400 people if they might feel differently about a measure

if they knew that elected officials, civic groups and labor unions had endorsed it is not push polling in any sense of the word. If we can no longer ask people how they

John W. Gorman
President
Opinion Dynamics Corporation
1030 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138

Phone: 617.492.1400
Fax: 617.497.7944

www.opiniondynamics.com
react to information, we all may as well close up shop and go home.

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

From: Leo G. Simonetta [mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM]
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2004 11:30 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Survey trouble in Wisconsin

Casino ads running at full tilt
11:03 PM 1/15/04
Lesley Rogers Barrett County reporter
<http://www.madison.com/wisconsinstatejournal/local/65377.php>

Selected highlights:

SNIP

The Ho-Chunk-sponsored Coalition for Fair Indian Gaming and Revenue Sharing Agreements is conducting a telephone poll among voters that some call a "push poll" - a polling practice that advertises one point of view rather than conducting legitimate research. The practice is legal but often condemned by professional pollsters.

Lisa Pugh, spokeswoman for the pro-casino group, said a small poll is being conducted to gauge sentiment among residents. The group won't share the results of the poll, and the results will be used internally to help shape the strategy of the campaign.

"It's definitely not a push poll," Pugh said.

Ann Kleinhans, a town of Dunn resident, called the State Journal to complain

after she received a call. <

After telling the poller she planned to vote no on the referendum, Kleinhans said the poller continued a line of questioning, asking if she would support the casino if she knew County Executive Kathleen Falk was in favor of it or if she knew several unions supported the referendum.

"It's just wrong in so many ways," Kleinhans said. "They're calling this research, but it's advertising. They're trying to influence voters."

Charles Franklin, a UW-Madison political science professor, said such polls are not legitimate polling for research.

"This sort of overt polling bothers public opinion pollsters a lot," Franklin said.

Under the new telemarketing rules and the do-not-call list, surveys and political campaign calls are exempt, which makes the casino poll legal. But it could make citizens cynical of legitimate polling, Franklin said.

"Most polls will generally just ask your opinion," Franklin said. "They don't ask, 'What if Kathleen Falk supports it?'"

SNIP

The pro-casino group also is mailing surveys to "tens of thousands" of likely voters, Pugh said. The survey results will be shared with county leaders and the public.

UW-Madison statistics professor Rick Chappell called the State Journal on Thursday to complain about the mailing.

He's still undecided about how he'll vote Feb. 17, but the glossy mailer has him angry at the pro-casino group.

"They claim to be conducting a survey, but it's misleading," Chappell said. "To a scientist who relies on surveys, I'm outraged."

The mailer states "How \$91 million in new revenue could benefit our communities," and includes pictures depicting education, human services, public safety and property tax relief. The mailer includes a letter from the pro-casino group and a list of supporters.

The outside of the mailer reads, "Please take a moment to complete the attached survey and mail it back today? Thank you."

The survey inside asks how the money from Ho-Chunk should be spent by the city and county. The box to support a yes vote is checked.

"This betrays the trust needed for real surveys," Chappell said. "This has pushed a hot button for me."

Franklin said such "surveys" are perfectly legal, but harmful to scientific research.

SNIP

--

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

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

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

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

=====

Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 16:24:38 -0500
Reply-To: "Beatty, Paul C." <pbb5@CDC.GOV>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Beatty, Paul C." <pbb5@CDC.GOV>
Subject: Re: Students in Surveys
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Clearly, there are many good ways to learn about survey research and many valuable experiences that can be a part of survey training-- but I do think that interviewing experience is one of the best. For me, it was probably the most valuable part of the DAS. I can't think of any other experience that so well illustrates where our data come from, what their limitations are, and the challenges involved in collecting them. This appreciation can help you do a better job whether you're a

statistician working with data files, a questionnaire designer, a field manager attempting to maximize response rates, or one of the many consumers of survey data.

We may not remember a lot of the technical details we learn in the classroom, depending upon where our interests and work assignments take us-- but experiences such as these have the potential to make lasting impressions on our mindset and the way we approach our work for many years. =20

Paul=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nelson, Cynthia <IL>

Sent: Friday, January 16, 2004 10:55 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Students in Surveys

I have read all the postings on this topic with interest, and I do not want to discount the fact that many students involved in interviewing in classes have had valuable experiences. I would not want to see any blanket recommendation, such as that students should **never** do something that can be defined as work in the context of their education/training, or even that there should **never** be payment to an organization when student training is involved (every doctor and paraprofessional treated patients as a student, the patients were billed). The issue is one of professional standards and supervision.

But I do think there is another issue:

Do people actually believe that working as an interviewer is an integral aspect of training to be a survey researcher?

I have worked in survey research for the last 15 years, starting as a grad assistant. Although I have assisted in an advanced undergrad course in which undergrads did carry out surveys (including phone interviews), have trained interviewers, monitored phone calls, and made verification/problem solving/and irate respondent call backs I actually have never worked as an interviewer. I never felt that there was any deficit in my training because I wasn't required to 'work the phones' for some period of time.

Since I assume University students are not training to become interviewers, what place, really, does actually doing interviewing have in the curriculum?

Cynthia Nelson

Cynthia Nelson
Center for Governmental Studies
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL 60115

Voice 815.753.1918
Fax 815.753.2305
email cnelson@niu.edu

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

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

Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 16:34:38 -0500
Reply-To: nancybelden@brspoll.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>
Subject: Congressional Contacts Grid
Comments: To: "AAPORNet (E-mail)" <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear AAPOR Members:

AAPOR is collaborating with other survey research organizations in an effort to be prepared to lobby Congress (the Research Industry Alliance or RIA), should the case pending in federal court of appeals open up the possibility of including survey research telephone calls on the Do Not Call List. While we are all very hopeful that this will not come to pass, we want to be ready. Mark Schulman and I are representing AAPOR on the RIA.

Below is a message from Jim Robinson, who is coordinating the lobbying effort, asking each of us to let him know of contacts we have on Capital Hill that we would be willing to contact if this it becomes an issue. We would very much appreciate having contact names back from you that meet his criteria. Thanks very much, and call me if you have any questions. --

Nancy Belden
AAPOR VP/Pres. Elect
Nancy Belden
Belden Russonello & Stewart
1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

202.822.6090

jimr@rma-inc.com

Attached is a Congressional Grid that being sent out members of the Associations in the Research Industry Alliance. It lists every Member of Congress by state AND the Chief of Staff of those members. The number next to the party designation for Representatives is the Congressional District

number. Instructions are as follows:

Put an "X" in the appropriate box next to the name of any Member or Chief of Staff that with whom you have a personal or business relationship with that would allow you to get in and speak with that person.

There is also an "other" column for people to write in the name of a staff member that they know. This could be the State or District Director (SD in Senate or DD in House), the Legislative Director (LD) or a Legislative Assistant (LA) who works on commerce or telecom issues. Next to the name written in put the abbreviation of the above titles if known.

In addition to Congressional Staff--also include "political" folks, such as campaign managers, finance directors, consultants, advisors, etc. IF YOU are a political consultant (Pollster) to these people, please make that notation. Add as much as you need to any record. Do not be constrained by the space. For example, you might put "was his/her pollster in 94 election" or "served ason his/her political/congressional staff" or multiple variations. If you have been a large donor to this Member's campaigns please mention this also.

After each person has completed this "inventory" have them attach their name, company name, association belonged to and their personal contact information and return these grids to me.

We will be building our Resource Database from this information. Jim asks for only grid information back from those people who feel that their knowledge of these people fit the following criteria:

*Do you know this person well enough to be comfortable personally lobbying them as part of the Research Industry Alliance efforts?

*Do you think your name or association with these people will allow you entry to them personally?

THANK YOU ALL!

Jim Robinson
DNC Operations Group
Research Industry Alliance

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

Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 15:41:10 -0600
Reply-To: SMITH-TOM <smitht@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: SMITH-TOM <smitht@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU>
Subject: Re: Students in Surveys
Comments: To: Cynthia Nelson <cnelson@NIU.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Phil Converse tells of having developed his non-attitudes theory based =
on his experience as an interviewer.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Cynthia Nelson
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2004 9:55 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Students in Surveys

I have read all the postings on this topic with interest, and I do not =
want to discount the fact that many students involved in interviewing in =
classes have had valuable experiences. I would not want to see any =
blanket recommendation, such as that students should *never* do =
something that can be defined as work in the context of their =
education/training, or even that there should *never* be payment to an =
organization when student training is involved (every doctor and =
paraprofessional treated patients as a student, the patients were =
billed). The issue is one of professional standards and supervision.

But I do think there is another issue:
Do people actually believe that working as an interviewer
is an integral aspect of training to be a survey researcher?

I have worked in survey research
for the last 15 years, starting as a grad assistant. Although I have =
assisted in an advanced undergrad course in which undergrads did carry =
out surveys (including phone interviews), have trained interviewers, =
monitored phone calls, and made verification/problem solving/and irate =
respondent call backs I actually have never worked as an interviewer. I =
never felt that there was any deficit in my training because I wasn't =
required to 'work the phones' for some period of time.

Since I assume University students are not training to become =
interviewers, what place, really, does actually doing interviewing have =
in the curriculum?

Cynthia Nelson

Cynthia Nelson
Center for Governmental Studies
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL 60115
Voice 815.753.1918
Fax 815.753.2305
email cnelson@niu.edu

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

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

=====
Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 16:46:07 -0500
Reply-To: Scott Keeter <skeeter@GMU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Scott Keeter <skeeter@GMU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Survey trouble in Wisconsin
Comments: To: "Charles H. Franklin" <franklin@POLISCI.WISC.EDU>,
aapornet@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <PDEMINECFJGAIJGDGKGOCEDAEOAA.franklin@polisci.wisc.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Thanks to Charles Frankling for writing this op-ed... hope it gets published.

Another graf in the story caught my eye:
"The pro-casino group also is mailing surveys to "tens of thousands" of likely voters, Pugh said. The survey results will be shared with county leaders and the public."

THIS is the real push-poll, or, more generically, "campaigning under the guise of surveying." The Standards Committee of AAPOR has found it very difficult to stop non-profit organizations from fund-raising under the guise of surveying (FRUGing); campaign "surveys" like this one -- even if the sponsors really are going to tabulate the few responses they get -- are even worse but probably will be equally difficult to stop.

Charles H. Franklin wrote:

>Alas, I think both reports of push polling and of my views are considerably
>misconstrued in this newspaper story.
>
>SNIP
>
>

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

=====
Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 16:48:14 -0500
Reply-To: nancybelden@brspoll.com

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>
Subject: Corresponding with about Do Not Call
Comments: To: "AAPORNet (E-mail)" <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I forgot to ask that those of you sending Congressional contact information send it to Jim Robinson (his email is jimr@rma-inc.com) and to me. Thanks.

Nancy Belden
Belden Russonello & Stewart
1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

202.822.6090

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

=====
Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 16:52:28 -0500
Reply-To: Larry Shiman <lshiman@OPINIONDYNAMICS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Larry Shiman <lshiman@OPINIONDYNAMICS.COM>
Subject: Re: Students in Surveys
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Everything Paul Beatty mentioned about the educational benefits of =
interviewing is true, but I believe you can get just as good an =
education from monitoring calls as you can from doing the interviews =
yourself. In some ways, monitoring calls can be even better than =
interviewing - monitoring allows you to focus on how respondents are =
answering to questions, while inexperienced interviewers may be more =
focused just on getting the questions out right. Interviewing =
experience may be helpful, but it is not the only way to learn this =
information. =20

Larry Shiman
Opinion Dynamics Corporation

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

From: Beatty, Paul C. [<mailto:pbb5@CDC.GOV>]
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2004 4:25 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Students in Surveys

Clearly, there are many good ways to learn about survey research and

many valuable experiences that can be a part of survey training-- but I do think that interviewing experience is one of the best. For me, it was probably the most valuable part of the DAS. I can't think of any other experience that so well illustrates where our data come from, what their limitations are, and the challenges involved in collecting them. This appreciation can help you do a better job whether you're a statistician working with data files, a questionnaire designer, a field manager attempting to maximize response rates, or one of the many consumers of survey data.

We may not remember a lot of the technical details we learn in the classroom, depending upon where our interests and work assignments take us-- but experiences such as these have the potential to make lasting impressions on our mindset and the way we approach our work for many years. =20

Paul=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nelson, Cynthia <IL>

Sent: Friday, January 16, 2004 10:55 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Students in Surveys

I have read all the postings on this topic with interest, and I do not want to discount the fact that many students involved in interviewing in classes have had valuable experiences. I would not want to see any blanket recommendation, such as that students should **never** do something that can be defined as work in the context of their education/training, or even that there should **never** be payment to an organization when student training is involved (every doctor and paraprofessional treated patients as a student, the patients were billed). The issue is one of professional standards and supervision.

But I do think there is another issue:

Do people actually believe that working as an interviewer is an integral aspect of training to be a survey researcher?

I have worked in survey research for the last 15 years, starting as a grad assistant. Although I have assisted in an advanced undergrad course in which undergrads did carry out surveys (including phone interviews), have trained interviewers, monitored phone calls, and made verification/problem solving/and irate respondent call backs I actually have never worked as an interviewer. I never felt that there was any deficit in my training because I wasn't required to 'work the phones' for some period of time.

Since I assume University students are not training to become interviewers, what place, really, does actually doing interviewing have in the curriculum?

Cynthia Nelson

Cynthia Nelson
Center for Governmental Studies
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL 60115
Voice 815.753.1918
Fax 815.753.2305
email cnelson@niu.edu

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

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

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

=====
Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 14:06:41 -0800
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Students in Surveys
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Okay, my two bits:

I was a TA for a survey research class, and also did some of the =
telephone interviews. I found first hand how difficult it is to call =
people and ask them to do something they have no need to do, and I think =
this humbling experience has given me empathy and appreciation for =
interviewers.

Now, as someone who writes and fields surveys, I find that monitoring =
gives me a different appreciation of my limitations, and is also =
humbling. I still distinctly remembering hearing an interviewer =
mispronounce an acronym I'd long taken for granted. =20

My sense from these discussions is that=20

(1) Using students to do the data collection for your consulting work =
and even underwrite your costs, and giving them inadequate training and =
no real supervision is abuse. =20

(2) Having students methodically learn the processes and quirks of =
survey research is education. =20

(3) Expecting anyone to learn (or teach) 3+ courses worth of material =
(statistics, survey=20
research methods, and research design) in 12 weeks is educational =
foolery. =20

Leora

Leora Lawton, Ph.D.
Director of Consumer & Demographic Research
Population Research Systems, LLC
A Member of the FSC Group
100 Spear, Suite 1700
San Francisco, CA 94105
v: 415 777-0707, ex. 117; f: 415 777-2420;
m: 510 928-7572
www.populationresearchsystems.com

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

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

> From: Larry Shiman [mailto:lshiman@OPINIONDYNAMICS.COM]

> Sent: Friday, January 16, 2004 1:52 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Students in Surveys

>=20

>=20

> Everything Paul Beatty mentioned about the educational=20
> benefits of interviewing is true, but I believe you can get=20
> just as good an education from monitoring calls as you can=20
> from doing the interviews yourself. In some ways, monitoring=20
> calls can be even better than interviewing - monitoring=20
> allows you to focus on how respondents are answering to=20
> questions, while inexperienced interviewers may be more=20
> focused just on getting the questions out right. =20
> Interviewing experience may be helpful, but it is not the=20
> only way to learn this information. =20

>=20

> Larry Shiman

> Opinion Dynamics Corporation

>=20

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

> From: Beatty, Paul C. [mailto:pbb5@CDC.GOV]

> Sent: Friday, January 16, 2004 4:25 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Students in Surveys

>=20

>=20

> Clearly, there are many good ways to learn about survey research and

> many valuable experiences that can be a part of survey=20

> training-- but I

> do think that interviewing experience is one of the best. For me, it

> was probably the most valuable part of the DAS. I can't think of any

> other experience that so well illustrates where our data come=20

> from, what

> their limitations are, and the challenges involved in collecting them.

> This appreciation can help you do a better job whether you're a

> statistician working with data files, a questionnaire=20

> designer, a field

> manager attempting to maximize response rates, or one of the many

> consumers of survey data.

>=20

> We may not remember a lot of the technical details we learn in the

> classroom, depending upon where our interests and work=20

> assignments take

> us-- but experiences such as these have the potential to make lasting

> impressions on our mindset and the way we approach our work for many

> years. =20

>=20

> Paul=20

>=20

>=20

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Nelson, Cynthia

> <IL>

> Sent: Friday, January 16, 2004 10:55 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Students in Surveys

>=20

>=20

> I have read all the postings on this topic with interest, and I do not

> want to discount the fact that many students involved in=20

> interviewing in

> classes have had valuable experiences. I would not want to see any

> blanket recommendation, such as that students should *never* do

> something that can be defined as work in the context of their

> education/training, or even that there should *never* be payment to an

> organization when student training is involved (every doctor and

> paraprofessional treated patients as a student, the patients were

> billed). The issue is one of professional standards and supervision.

>=20

> But I do think there is another issue:

> Do people actually believe that working as an interviewer

> is an integral aspect of training to be a survey researcher?

>=20

> I have worked in survey research

> for the last 15 years, starting as a grad assistant. Although I have

> assisted in an advanced undergrad course in which undergrads did carry
> out surveys (including phone interviews), have trained interviewers,
> monitored phone calls, and made verification/problem solving/and irate
> respondent call backs I actually have never worked as an=20
> interviewer. I
> never felt that there was any deficit in my training because I wasn't
> required to 'work the phones' for some period of time.
>=20
> Since I assume University students are not training to become
> interviewers, what place, really, does actually doing=20
> interviewing have
> in the curriculum?
>=20
> Cynthia Nelson
>=20
> Cynthia Nelson
> Center for Governmental Studies
> Northern Illinois University
> DeKalb, IL 60115
> Voice 815.753.1918
> Fax 815.753.2305
> email cnelson@niu.edu
>=20

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

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

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

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

Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 17:37:50 -0500
Reply-To: Brian Vargus <igem100@IUPUI.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Brian Vargus <igem100@IUPUI.EDU>
Subject: Students in surveys
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

While I find merit in doing something such as a DAS---we did one in my graduate training also. But, that was before IRB's and also before real attention to integrity in research. I know of at least five student run studies that were curb stoned by some people. When it was pointed out to the PIs, who wanted to publish from them, they frequently said--I'll adjust for it.

My biggest fear is always verification--and real verification. It costs money and time and I fear few student surveys do it. IRB's are supposed to pass on student surveys also. They frequently are very explicit about verification.

Brian Vargus

Former Director, Indiana University Public Opinion Lab.
Professor, Political Science

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

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

=====
Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 17:55:09 -0500
Reply-To: "DeBell, Matthew" <MDeBell@AIR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "DeBell, Matthew" <MDeBell@AIR.ORG>
Subject: Re: Retropoll
Comments: To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@comcast.net>, aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Marc Sapir wrote:

>All that said, nowhere does DeBell try to explain why 39% in the=20
>survey and 72% of those who realize there is no Al Qaeda--Saddam=20
>connection said yes to the question: Is misleading the Congress=20
>and the Public grounds for impeachment? =20

There is no way to know what a respondent thinks when he or she answers =
Yes to question 31.=20

Dr. Sapir expresses a desire to control for "forces in the background," =
-- the effects of news media and government and others on public opinion =
-- and one of the ways Retro Poll apparently attempted to do this is =
with biased questions ("making it easier to say yes"). I am not sure =
this is kind of control is possible at all, but biased questions don't =
do it. The effects of these "background" stimuli on many specific =
opinions are unknown and there is no way to calibrate a countervailing =
bias in a questionnaire to match those effects. =20

If researchers want to describe public opinion with attention to the =
effects of public discourse, propaganda, and cultural hegemony, they =
should attempt to measure those effects, to measure the effects of =
question wording on response, or to do message testing. Looking at what =
people know (as Retro Poll is trying to do) may be helpful too, but =
writing biased questions just makes results uninterpretable.=20

I'm not sure what to make of the charge that I made an ad hominem = argument when I said Retro Poll questions were biased without making a = question-by-question critique. That's not what ad hominem means. = Anyway, potential problems of question order and priming and biased = wording will jump out at anyone who cares to look at the questionnaire. = Two examples: describing torture as "outlawed" and opening with a number = of factual questions likely to underscore mistrust in government before = asking about government agents entering your home "without cause."

--

Matthew DeBell, Ph.D.
Research Analyst
Education Statistics Services Institute
American Institutes for Research
1990 K St., NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20006
tel. 202-654-6503; fax 202-737-4918
mdebell@air.org

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

From: Marc Sapir [mailto:marcsapir@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2004 7:48 PM
To: DeBell, Matthew; aapornet@asu.edu
Cc: Warren Gold; Al Vallecillo; Diego Kusnir; James True; Laura Harper; mickeyhuff@mac.com; Peter Phillips; Suzanne Grady
Subject: RE: Retropoll

Re: comment of Matthew DeBell

I see no title for DeBell so I do not know his affiliation--such information would be helpful in responding. Actually I think DeBell makes our case fairly well. It is a fact that Mr. Bush misled the public, not an opinion. We weren't interested in what people's opinion on that may be for this question. Public opinions on how it happened vary from those who think it was overexhuberance and shoddy information to those who ask why the CIA assessments were disregarded and believe it was part of what former Treasury Secretary O'Neill has suggested was a rather devious plan of action set in motion within hours or days of the Supreme Court ending the vote recount in Florida. We weren't interested in those opinions either because the fact still is that Bush misled the public and made a very big deal of it in the 2003 State of the Union. And sometimes people forget that war is a very big deal when they sit in a country never invaded in the modern era.=20

If survey researchers do not have the right and responsibility to provide such background facts in some of their questionnaires then they will serve as little more than flaks for the government-media consensus on what is prevailing and legitimate opinion and discourse, and on what is truth. I completely agree with DeBell that if survey researchers made a big deal about something like the disappearance of fissionable material from Russia they could scare people into voicing more paranoid

opinions about nuclear threats, terrorism and Russia. This is precisely our point: whoever controls the assumptions and background information on discourse creates public opinion, whether or not the facts they present are true (and whether or not they weight reality with their own personal biases). To imagine that opinion research can be meaningful to a democracy means imagining/developing methods to unbias the self-serving spin of corporate media, particular TV and government flacks, experts, pundits. Otherwise the whole effort is fraudulent for it only measures what those with the most influence and power over discourse/media content tell people is true. In this way polling becomes a form of market or rat behavioral research for the inventors of realities that suit their needs. They say blah blah blah therefore we must invade Iraq. Then pollsters are paid to go out and find out what percentage of people are able to spout back blah, blah, therefore we must invade Iraq. The results, unless the percentage is very small, provide help for the cause: invasion of Iraq.=20

Although I'm a physician, I've worked on some community needs assessment surveys in public health and education before I got involved in this politically charged effort. The assumptions of the work were different. We tried to find out what people think are the needs of their community, their families, themselves etc. There were no forces in the background controlling assumptions, discourse and "truth", other than cultural and personal beliefs, which are the relevant parameters. But with political policy polling, objectivity is a pretense, covering up the controlling influences of TV etc. Perhaps if we (Retro Poll) do some in depth face to face interviews in the future we might have some questions in a format: ..."so and so says this, but influential critics say the contrary. Given this controversy what do you think?" But my point is that public opinion research that tries to eliminate context is unintentionally promoting bias. =20

All that said, nowhere does DeBell try to explain why 39% in the survey and 72% of those who realize there is no Al Qaeda--Saddam connection said yes to the question: Is misleading the Congress and the Public grounds for impeachment? This continues the line that our methods are so bad that the result can be ignored. But such results should not be ignored. They should be shown, by further research, to be either true or false representations of public opinion. =20

DeBell does one thing that particularly annoys. He's taken our admission that we "made it easy for people to say yes" on the "grounds for impeachment" question and used it to attack the findings of public support for international war crimes tribunals, against torture and so forth. But he doesn't bother to critique the wording of those questions he says are biased. That's an ad hominem argument and not worthy of response. =20
=20

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director
Retro Poll
www.retropoll.org

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

From: DeBell, Matthew [mailto:MDeBell@air.org]=20

Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2004 1:01 PM

To: Marc Sapir; AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: RE: Retropoll

Marc Sapir wrote, "Those who know there isn't evidence on an Al Qaeda link to Saddam think that George W Bush's misleading the public on WMD is 'grounds for impeachment' (by 72% yes)." Later Dr. Sapir referred to "39 percent support for impeachment" and wrote, "39% said that Bush's behavior in misleading the public and Congress are 'grounds for impeachment.'"

From what I see in the questionnaire, the data cannot support these statements. The questions were as follows:

6. Is there evidence that Saddam Hussein work [sic] with Al Queda [sic]?

31. 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?=20

A Yes response to #31 does not demonstrate that the respondent thinks Bush misled the public, and it does not demonstrate that the respondent wants Bush impeached. The question doesn't ask these things, and it is not valid to conclude that respondents think Bush misled the public or that anything he has done warrants impeachment.=20

Marc Sapir wrote: "We'll admit that we made it easier for people to say=20 yes by stating the facts, but they still had to decide if this behavior=20 "is grounds for impeachment." "=20

Your poll does more than state the facts. The point of view of the pollster is strongly evident throughout the questionnaire, and the facts are selected to support that point of view. This is a bias likely to skew the measurement of opinion, which defeats the purpose of descriptive polling. =20

The topic of the relationship between what people think is true and what they think of policy is fascinating, but the Retropoll questionnaire would tell us more about that without the bias.=20

>[....]

>On the other hand we have shown that, overwhelmingly, Americans,=20

>even the misinformed, have strong democratic instincts when it comes

> to supporting international war crimes tribunals, to opposing torture=20

> of prisoners and indeterminate detentions and when it comes to=20

> intrusions into rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution and the=20

> Bill of Rights. These views are consistently in opposition to the=20

> current policies and practices of the U.S. government, but are not=20

> being revealed by major public opinion research organizations. [....]

Unfortunately, the expression of these views is contingent on the wording of your questionnaire. "Making it easier for people to say yes" works both ways. Just try biasing your questions the other way in your next poll. It will not be hard to "show" that the American public has strong anti-democratic views. Remind them of September 11, state some facts about how many atom bombs-worth of fissile material have been lost or stolen in Russia, and you can probably scare them enough to support any number of police-state policies.

--

Matthew DeBell

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

Date: Fri, 16 Jan 2004 18:21:41 -0500
Reply-To: nancybelden@brspoll.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>
Subject: Do Not Call -- sending in information
Comments: To: "AAPORNet (E-mail)" <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Comments: cc: Jim Robinson <jimr@rma-inc.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear Friends:

Re my earlier messages, I belatedly remembered that AAPORNet doesn't support attachments. So I would ask please if you want to be part of the effort to educate Congress about the importance of protecting the right to interview by telephone, send directly to Jim Robinson the following:

-- The name of any member of the US House or Senate
-- The name and title of any staff member in a House or Senate office --
including committee staff --

of people whom you would feel comfortable contacting should Do Not Call legislation emerge in the next few weeks or months. Please include your name and how to reach you and email this to me and to Jim Robinson [jimr@rma-inc.com].

Thank you and my apologies for my incomplete earlier missives. -- Nancy

Nancy Belden
Belden Russonello & Stewart
1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

202.822.6090

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

Date: Sat, 17 Jan 2004 08:03:56 -0500
Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Retropoll
Comments: To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

Dr. Sapir,

You wrote that "It is a fact that Mr. Bush misled the public, not an opinion" and that "there is no Al Qaeda--Saddam connection". Are these truths that you have received from Divine illumination? I have not been so blessed, so I confess to not knowing what was in the minds of Bush and Hussein. What we who are not in the upper echelons of government do not know is vast. From my limited experience in forensic psychiatry, however, I can assure you that what gets out to the public is far less than 50% of what gets said [in criminal proceedings, between lawyers, judges, police] and frequently amounts to nothing more substantial than something that satisfies the public's curiosity. As time advances and the perceived need for secrecy evaporates, we learn more and more about what "really" happened during such interesting times as the Cuban missile crisis, the decision to use nuclear weapons in WWII, the JFK assassinations. But the whole truth is, and will be forever, lost to history.

Ultimately, there is a difference between belief and knowledge. You believe that Bush misled the public, and that there is, or was, no connection between Saddam and Al Qaeda -- of at least you wrote that these are truth, and I infer that you believe them. But I do not KNOW whether you believe them or not, nor do I KNOW whether Bush misled the public or whether a Saddam-Al Qaeda connection exists. Nor do you KNOW these things.

Belief is a state of mind that requires a "leap of faith", a lack of questioning, readiness to act in the absence of hard evidence. Your training is in medicine, mine is in mathematics, psychology, and statistics. If you have indications that a patient is in danger of dying from atherosclerosis, you're trained to take action that you believe will prevent, or at least lower the odds of, that patient's dying of an MI.

In the absence of knowledge, I, as a statistician, am left with a "best guess" as to what really, REALLY goes on in areas where I will never have a chance to know. Personally, my best guess is that Bush is a believer, a born-again Crusader who sees himself as embodied with Goodness and chosen by his Creator to lead his nation in a struggle against the Evildoers of the world, like Saddam, whom he believes tried to kill his father. But that's just a guess. Not knowledge, and far short of a belief. And not something I'd try to promulgate as "fact" or "truth".

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.

Research Specialist

Michigan State University

Institute for Public Policy and Social Research

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

From: Marc Sapir [mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET]

Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2004 7:48 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Retropoll

Re: comment of Matthew DeBell

I see no title for DeBell so I do not know his affiliation--such information would be helpful in responding. Actually I think DeBell makes our case fairly well. It is a fact that Mr. Bush misled the public, not an opinion. We weren't interested in what people's opinion on that may be for this question. Public opinions on how it happened vary from those who think it was overexhuberance and shoddy information to those who ask why the CIA assessments were disregarded and believe it was part of what former Treasury Secretary O'Neill has suggested was a rather devious plan of action set in motion within hours or days of the Supreme Court ending the vote recount in Florida. We weren't interested in those opinions either because the fact still is that Bush misled the public and made a very big deal of it in the 2003 State of the Union. And sometimes people forget that war is a very big deal when they sit in a country never invaded in the modern era.

If survey researchers do not have the right and responsibility to provide such background facts in some of their questionnaires then they will serve as little more than flaks for the government-media consensus on what is prevailing and legitimate opinion and discourse, and on what is truth. I completely agree with DeBell that if survey researchers made a big deal about something like the disappearance of fissionable material from Russia they could scare people into voicing more paranoid opinions about nuclear threats, terrorism and Russia. This is precisely our point: whoever controls the assumptions and background information on discourse creates public opinion, whether or not the facts they present are true (and whether or not they weight reality with their own personal biases). To imagine that opinion research can be meaningful to a democracy means imagining/developing methods to unbias the self-serving spin of corporate media, paricularly TV and government flaks, experts, pundits. Otherwise the whole effort is fraudulent for it only measures what those with the most influence and power over discourse/media content tell people is true. In this way polling becomes a form of market or rat behavioral research for the inventors of realities that suit their needs. They say blah blah blah therefore we must invade Iraq. Then pollsters are paid to go out and find out what percentage of people are able to spout back blah, blah, therefore we must invade Iraq. The results, unless the percentage is very small, provide help for the cause: invasion of Iraq.

Although I'm a physician, I've worked on some community needs assessment surveys in public health and education before I got involved in this politically charged effort. The assumptions of the work were different. We tried to find out what people think are the needs of their community,

their families, themselves etc. There were no forces in the background controlling assumptions, discourse and "truth", other than cultural and personal beliefs, which are the relevant parameters. But with political policy polling, objectivity is a pretense, covering up the controlling influences of TV etc. Perhaps if we (Retro Poll) do some in depth face to face interviews in the future we might have some questions in a format: ..."so and so says this, but influential critics say the contrary. Given this controversy what do you think?" But my point is that public opinion research that tries to eliminate context is unintentionally promoting bias.

All that said, nowhere does DeBell try to explain why 39% in the survey and 72% of those who realize there is no Al Qaeda--Saddam connection said yes to the question: Is misleading the Congress and the Public grounds for impeachment? This continues the line that our methods are so bad that the result can be ignored. But such results should not be ignored. They should be shown, by further research, to be either true or false representations of public opinion.

DeBell does one thing that particularly annoys. He's taken our admission that we "made it easy for people to say yes" on the "grounds for impeachment" question and used it to attack the findings of public support for international war crimes tribunals, against torture and so forth. But he doesn't bother to critique the wording of those questions he says are biased. That's an ad hominem argument and not worthy of response.

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director
Retro Poll
www.retropoll.org

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

From: DeBell, Matthew [mailto:MDeBell@air.org]
Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2004 1:01 PM
To: Marc Sapir; AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: RE: Retropoll

Marc Sapir wrote, "Those who know there isn't evidence on an Al Qaeda link to Saddam think that George W Bush's misleading the public on WMD is 'grounds for impeachment' (by 72% yes)." Later Dr. Sapir referred to "39 percent support for impeachment" and wrote, "39% said that Bush's behavior in misleading the public and Congress are 'grounds for impeachment.'"

From what I see in the questionnaire, the data cannot support these statements. The questions were as follows:

6. Is there evidence that Saddam Hussein work [sic] with Al Qaeda [sic]?

31. 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?

A Yes response to #31 does not demonstrate that the respondent thinks Bush misled the public, and it does not demonstrate that the respondent wants Bush impeached. The question doesn't ask these things, and it is not valid to conclude that respondents think Bush misled the public or that anything he has done warrants impeachment.

Marc Sapir wrote: "We'll admit that we made it easier for people to say yes by stating the facts, but they still had to decide if this behavior "is grounds for impeachment.""

Your poll does more than state the facts. The point of view of the pollster is strongly evident throughout the questionnaire, and the facts are selected to support that point of view. This is a bias likely to skew the measurement of opinion, which defeats the purpose of descriptive polling.

The topic of the relationship between what people think is true and what they think of policy is fascinating, but the Retropoll questionnaire would tell us more about that without the bias.

>[...]

>On the other hand we have shown that, overwhelmingly, Americans, >even the misinformed, have strong democratic instincts when it comes > to supporting international war crimes tribunals, to opposing torture > of prisoners and indeterminate detentions and when it comes to > intrusions into rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution and the > Bill of Rights. These views are consistently in opposition to the > current policies and practices of the U.S. government, but are not > being revealed by major public opinion research organizations. [...]

Unfortunately, the expression of these views is contingent on the wording of your questionnaire. "Making it easier for people to say yes" works both ways. Just try biasing your questions the other way in your next poll. It will not be hard to "show" that the American public has strong anti-democratic views. Remind them of September 11, state some facts about how many atom bombs-worth of fissile material have been lost or stolen in Russia, and you can probably scare them enough to support any number of police-state policies.

--
Matthew DeBell

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

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

=====

Date: Sun, 18 Jan 2004 15:28:01 -0500
Reply-To: "Gerald M. Kosicki" <Kosicki.1@OSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Gerald M. Kosicki" <Kosicki.1@OSU.EDU>
Subject: WinCati 4.2 multimode users
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I am trying to find some users of WinCATI 4.2 with Multimode who might =
be interested in comparing notes about implementation and use issues. =
Please respond to me directly at kosicki.1@osu.edu.=20
Thanks. Best. -- Jerry

Gerald Kosicki, Ph.D.
Director
Center for Survey Research
Ohio State University
www.csr.ohio-state.edu
Tel.: 614-292-6672

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

=====
Date: Mon, 19 Jan 2004 19:24:42 -0800
Reply-To: Albert & Susan Cantril <ascantril@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Albert & Susan Cantril <ascantril@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

We share the concern of many that the networks could well alter the story they are covering if they report on their entrance poll in the early stages of the Iowa caucuses tonight.

Some participants will still be undecided when the caucuses get started. Others will find their preferred candidate is not viable and have to decide on another candidate or join an "uncommitted" group in the second round. Reports from entrance polls of one candidate's unexpected strength or weakness could affect these decisions.

Even without releasing actual percentages, the networks disclose a lot by saying something like "things can change, but this may be a good night for X." This might be important "news" for almost half of those arriving at the caucuses with a preferred candidate but who, according to the Des Moines Register Poll, could change their mind.

The entrance poll will be more influential than the pre-caucus polls because, by definition, it does not have to screen for likely

caucus-goers. In this sense, its results cannot be read as just the last in a series of comparable measures.

At least one news executive has suggested that caucus participants should simply turn off their cell phones and ignore television. That is not realistic. But more important, it is a tacit admission that news about the entrance poll could affect candidate preference decisions made during the caucuses.

Until there is solid evidence that entrance polls don't influence caucus outcomes, news organizations should hold off for an hour or so tonight while the caucuses are still at work. Otherwise they may end up violating one of their own basic rules by becoming part of the story they are reporting.

Albert H. Cantril
Susan Davis Cantril

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

=====
Date: Mon, 19 Jan 2004 21:19:50 -0500
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Warning - POQ mailing list infected by Bagel worm
Comments: To: AAPORNET <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The POQ mailing list at the University of Chicago Press appears to have been infected by the Bagel (or Beagle) worm.

If you get a message from POQ with an attachment, DELETE IT WITHOUT OPENING THE ATTACHMENT.

The header will probably include the word "hi" and the message body will be something like this:

```
Test =)
iyvlgv
--
Test, yep.
```

For information on this worm and how to remove it if you have already been infected, see:

<http://www.sarc.com/avcenter/venc/data/w32.beagle.a@mm.html>

Jan Werner
jwerner@jwdp.com

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

=====
Date: Mon, 19 Jan 2004 23:46:18 -0500
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Iowa Caucuses
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Congratulations to Selzer & Company!

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 with this text:
signoff aapornet

=====
Date: Tue, 20 Jan 2004 00:58:22 -0500
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses
Comments: To: Albert & Susan Cantril <ascantril@mindspring.com>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <400C9F7A.D10@mindspring.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Tad,
I am really disappointed that you would take this knee-jerk position. It ignores the way the caucuses operate. Nothing was reported until caucus goers were in their caucuses and the doors locked. What happens in those rooms is a process that allows people to lobby others in the room to join them in support of their candidate. Why you think an entrance poll is more influential in that lobbying effort than say the Iowa poll the day before escapes me. The Iowa poll was available for 36 hours for campaigns to plot what ever it is you think they plot. The entrance poll was likely not available at all to people locked in their caucus sites. And if it was,

whose responsibility is that? You seem to think it was the messengers sole responsibility. I for one, do not like information that is closely held and available only to elites. I think the public is capable of handling it in a responsible way. Or are you saying we really do not need to know who supported each candidate, or what issues were important, or what were the dynamics of the caucuses. The result comes with that information, which was responsibly held until the doors closed on the caucus meetings.

warren mitofsky

At 10:24 PM 1/19/2004, you wrote:

>We share the concern of many that the networks could well alter the
>story they are covering if they report on their entrance poll in the
>early stages of the Iowa caucuses tonight.

>
>Some participants will still be undecided when the caucuses get
>started. Others will find their preferred candidate is not viable and
>have to decide on another candidate or join an "uncommitted" group in
>the second round. Reports from entrance polls of one candidate's
>unexpected strength or weakness could affect these decisions.

>
>Even without releasing actual percentages, the networks disclose a lot
>by saying something like "things can change, but this may be a good
>night for X." This might be important "news" for almost half of those
>arriving at the caucuses with a preferred candidate but who, according
>to the Des Moines Register Poll, could change their mind.

>
>The entrance poll will be more influential than the pre-caucus polls
>because, by definition, it does not have to screen for likely
>caucus-goers. In this sense, its results cannot be read as just the
>last in a series of comparable measures.

>
>At least one news executive has suggested that caucus participants
>should simply turn off their cell phones and ignore television. That is
>not realistic. But more important, it is a tacit admission that news
>about the entrance poll could affect candidate preference decisions made
>during the caucuses.

>
>Until there is solid evidence that entrance polls don't influence caucus
>outcomes, news organizations should hold off for an hour or so tonight
>while the caucuses are still at work. Otherwise they may end up
>violating one of their own basic rules by becoming part of the story
>they are reporting.

>
>
>Albert H. Cantril
>Susan Davis Cantril

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

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

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

Date: Tue, 20 Jan 2004 08:55:02 -0600
Reply-To: Cynthia Nelson <cnelson@NIU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Cynthia Nelson <cnelson@NIU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <6.0.1.1.2.20040120004423.01fb7580@pop.mindspring.com>
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Although I very much appreciate the idea that the public is capable of handling information in a responsible way as well as the idea of information being public rather than closely held or available only to elites, I have some concerns.

If there is credible evidence that the public release of public opinion polls changes voter behavior (for example a bandwagon effect, staying home on election day because your candidate is so far ahead or so far behind, strategic voting in a primary) wouldn't this present a challenge to these ideas?

It is my impression that polling data has taken an increased percentage of the time and an increased role in news reporting on the candidates. Does anyone know if this is the case?

regards, Cynthia Nelson

Cynthia Nelson
Center for Governmental Studies
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL 60115
Voice 815.753.1918
Fax 815.753.2305
email cnelson@niu.edu

***** REPLY SEPARATOR *****

On 1/20/2004 at 12:58 AM Warren Mitofsky wrote:

>Tad,
>I am really disappointed that you would take this knee-jerk position. It
>ignores the way the caucuses operate. Nothing was reported until caucus

>goers were in their caucuses and the doors locked. What happens in those
>rooms is a process that allows people to lobby others in the room to join
>them in support of their candidate. Why you think an entrance poll is more
>influential in that lobbying effort than say the Iowa poll the day before
>escapes me. The Iowa poll was available for 36 hours for campaigns to plot
>what ever it is you think they plot. The entrance poll was likely not
>available at all to people locked in their caucus sites. And if it was,
>whose responsibility is that? You seem to think it was the messengers sole
>responsibility. I for one, do not like information that is closely held
>and available only to elites. I think the public is capable of handling it
>in a responsible way. Or are you saying we really do not need to know who
>supported each candidate, or what issues were important, or what were the
>dynamics of the caucuses. The result comes with that information, which
was

>responsibly held until the doors closed on the caucus meetings.

>warren mitofsky

>

>

>At 10:24 PM 1/19/2004, you wrote:

>>We share the concern of many that the networks could well alter the
>>story they are covering if they report on their entrance poll in the
>>early stages of the Iowa caucuses tonight.

>>

>>Some participants will still be undecided when the caucuses get
>>started. Others will find their preferred candidate is not viable and
>>have to decide on another candidate or join an "uncommitted" group in
>>the second round. Reports from entrance polls of one candidate's
>>unexpected strength or weakness could affect these decisions.

>>

>>Even without releasing actual percentages, the networks disclose a lot
>>by saying something like "things can change, but this may be a good
>>night for X." This might be important "news" for almost half of those
>>arriving at the caucuses with a preferred candidate but who, according
>>to the Des Moines Register Poll, could change their mind.

>>

>>The entrance poll will be more influential than the pre-caucus polls
>>because, by definition, it does not have to screen for likely
>>caucus-goers. In this sense, its results cannot be read as just the
>>last in a series of comparable measures.

>>

>>At least one news executive has suggested that caucus participants
>>should simply turn off their cell phones and ignore television. That is
>>not realistic. But more important, it is a tacit admission that news
>>about the entrance poll could affect candidate preference decisions made
>>during the caucuses.

>>

>>Until there is solid evidence that entrance polls don't influence caucus
>>outcomes, news organizations should hold off for an hour or so tonight
>>while the caucuses are still at work. Otherwise they may end up
>>violating one of their own basic rules by becoming part of the story
>>they are reporting.

>>

>>

>>Albert H. Cantril

>>Susan Davis Cantril

>>

>>-----

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

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

>>signoff aapornet

>

>-----

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

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

>signoff aapornet

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

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

signoff aapornet

=====

Date: Tue, 20 Jan 2004 09:02:34 -0600

Reply-To: Frank_Newport@GALLUP.COM

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Frank Newport <Frank_Newport@GALLUP.COM>

Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses

Comments: To: cnelson@NIU.EDU, AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

I think it's important to note on this issue that the consequences in the second paragraph below are reasonable uses of poll data by responsible voters. Making a decision on one's vote based on knowledge of how one's neighbors are intending to vote is as rational as the use of any other source of information.

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

From: Cynthia Nelson [<mailto:cnelson@NIU.EDU>]

Sent: Tuesday, January 20, 2004 9:55 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses

Although I very much appreciate the idea that the public is capable of handling information in a responsible way as well as the idea of information

being public rather than closely held or available only to elites, I have some concerns.

If there is credible evidence that the public release of public opinion polls

changes voter behavior (for example a bandwagon effect, staying home on election day because your candidate is so far ahead or so far behind,

strategic

voting in a primary) wouldn't this present a challenge to these ideas?

It is my impression that polling data has taken an increased percentage of the

time and an increased role in news reporting on the candidates. Does

anyone
know if this is the case?

regards, Cynthia Nelson

Cynthia Nelson
Center for Governmental Studies
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL 60115
Voice 815.753.1918
Fax 815.753.2305
email cnelson@niu.edu

***** REPLY SEPARATOR *****

On 1/20/2004 at 12:58 AM Warren Mitofsky wrote:

>Tad,
>I am really disappointed that you would take this knee-jerk position. It
>ignores the way the caucuses operate. Nothing was reported until caucus
>goers were in their caucuses and the doors locked. What happens in those
>rooms is a process that allows people to lobby others in the room to join
>them in support of their candidate. Why you think an entrance poll is more
>influential in that lobbying effort than say the Iowa poll the day before
>escapes me. The Iowa poll was available for 36 hours for campaigns to plot
>what ever it is you think they plot. The entrance poll was likely not
>available at all to people locked in their caucus sites. And if it was,
>whose responsibility is that? You seem to think it was the messengers sole
>responsibility. I for one, do not like information that is closely held
>and available only to elites. I think the public is capable of handling it
>in a responsible way. Or are you saying we really do not need to know who
>supported each candidate, or what issues were important, or what were the
>dynamics of the caucuses. The result comes with that information, which
was
>responsibly held until the doors closed on the caucus meetings.
>warren mitofsky

>
>
>At 10:24 PM 1/19/2004, you wrote:

>>We share the concern of many that the networks could well alter the
>>story they are covering if they report on their entrance poll in the
>>early stages of the Iowa caucuses tonight.
>>
>>Some participants will still be undecided when the caucuses get
>>started. Others will find their preferred candidate is not viable and
>>have to decide on another candidate or join an "uncommitted" group in
>>the second round. Reports from entrance polls of one candidate's
>>unexpected strength or weakness could affect these decisions.
>>

>>>Even without releasing actual percentages, the networks disclose a lot
>>>by saying something like "things can change, but this may be a good
>>>night for X." This might be important "news" for almost half of those
>>>arriving at the caucuses with a preferred candidate but who, according
>>>to the Des Moines Register Poll, could change their mind.

>>>The entrance poll will be more influential than the pre-caucus polls
>>>because, by definition, it does not have to screen for likely
>>>caucus-goers. In this sense, its results cannot be read as just the
>>>last in a series of comparable measures.

>>>At least one news executive has suggested that caucus participants
>>>should simply turn off their cell phones and ignore television. That is
>>>not realistic. But more important, it is a tacit admission that news
>>>about the entrance poll could affect candidate preference decisions made
>>>during the caucuses.

>>>Until there is solid evidence that entrance polls don't influence caucus
>>>outcomes, news organizations should hold off for an hour or so tonight
>>>while the caucuses are still at work. Otherwise they may end up
>>>violating one of their own basic rules by becoming part of the story
>>>they are reporting.

>>>Albert H. Cantril
>>>Susan Davis Cantril

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

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

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

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

Date: Tue, 20 Jan 2004 09:14:48 -0600
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Organization: Market Shares Corporation
Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To: <200401200855020359.66CB472F@corn.cso.NIU.EDU>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Setting the aside the issue of the entrance polls because once the meetings begin, the idea for caucus participants is to change "voter behavior".

Re: "If there is credible evidence that the public release of public opinion polls changes voter behavior".

My favorite answer to this is that if the release of poll results did in fact change behavior, why are they generally so accurate? Public polls would self-destruct.

Accuracy in 2002 appears here:

<http://www.ncpp.org/2002SenGovPoll/2002SenGovPolls.html>

Nick Panagakis

Cynthia Nelson wrote:

>Although I very much appreciate the idea that the public is capable
>of handling information in a responsible way as well as the idea of
>information
>being public rather than closely held or available only to elites, I have
>some concerns.
>
>If there is credible evidence that the public release of public opinion
>polls
>changes voter behavior (for example a bandwagon effect, staying home on
>election day because your candidate is so far ahead or so far behind,
>strategic
>voting in a primary) wouldn't this present a challenge to these ideas?
>
>It is my impression that polling data has taken an increased percentage of
>the
>time and an increased role in news reporting on the candidates. Does
>anyone
>know if this is the case?
>
>regards, Cynthia Nelson
>
>Cynthia Nelson
>Center for Governmental Studies
>Northern Illinois University
>DeKalb, IL 60115
>Voice 815.753.1918
>Fax 815.753.2305
>email cnelson@niu.edu
>

>
>
>
>
>
>
>***** REPLY SEPARATOR *****

>On 1/20/2004 at 12:58 AM Warren Mitofsky wrote:

>>Tad,
>>I am really disappointed that you would take this knee-jerk position. It
>>ignores the way the caucuses operate. Nothing was reported until caucus
>>goers were in their caucuses and the doors locked. What happens in those
>>rooms is a process that allows people to lobby others in the room to join
>>them in support of their candidate. Why you think an entrance poll is more
>>influential in that lobbying effort than say the Iowa poll the day before
>>escapes me. The Iowa poll was available for 36 hours for campaigns to plot
>>what ever it is you think they plot. The entrance poll was likely not
>>available at all to people locked in their caucus sites. And if it was,
>>whose responsibility is that? You seem to think it was the messengers sole
>>responsibility. I for one, do not like information that is closely held
>>and available only to elites. I think the public is capable of handling it
>>in a responsible way. Or are you saying we really do not need to know who
>>supported each candidate, or what issues were important, or what were the
>>dynamics of the caucuses. The result comes with that information, which

>>>was
>>>responsibly held until the doors closed on the caucus meetings.
>>>warren mitofsky

>>>At 10:24 PM 1/19/2004, you wrote:

>>>>We share the concern of many that the networks could well alter the
>>>>story they are covering if they report on their entrance poll in the
>>>>early stages of the Iowa caucuses tonight.

>>>>Some participants will still be undecided when the caucuses get
>>>>started. Others will find their preferred candidate is not viable and
>>>>have to decide on another candidate or join an "uncommitted" group in
>>>>the second round. Reports from entrance polls of one candidate's
>>>>unexpected strength or weakness could affect these decisions.

>>>>Even without releasing actual percentages, the networks disclose a lot
>>>>by saying something like "things can change, but this may be a good
>>>>night for X." This might be important "news" for almost half of those
>>>>arriving at the caucuses with a preferred candidate but who, according
>>>>to the Des Moines Register Poll, could change their mind.

>>>
>>>The entrance poll will be more influential than the pre-caucus polls
>>>because, by definition, it does not have to screen for likely
>>>caucus-goers. In this sense, its results cannot be read as just the
>>>last in a series of comparable measures.
>>>
>>>At least one news executive has suggested that caucus participants
>>>should simply turn off their cell phones and ignore television. That is
>>>not realistic. But more important, it is a tacit admission that news
>>>about the entrance poll could affect candidate preference decisions made
>>>during the caucuses.
>>>
>>>Until there is solid evidence that entrance polls don't influence caucus
>>>outcomes, news organizations should hold off for an hour or so tonight
>>>while the caucuses are still at work. Otherwise they may end up
>>>violating one of their own basic rules by becoming part of the story
>>>they are reporting.
>>>
>>>
>>>Albert H. Cantril
>>>Susan Davis Cantril
>>>

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

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

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

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

Date: Tue, 20 Jan 2004 11:00:32 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: CMOR speaks out on the Peterson survey
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

http://biz.yahoo.com/prnews/040119/clm017_1.html

Partnership of Research Professionals Concerned About Peterson Survey
Monday January 19, 8:44 pm ET

CINCINNATI, Jan. 19 /PRNewswire/ -- The following statement was issued today by the Council for Marketing and Opinion Research on behalf of a partnership of research professionals:

As a partnership of research professionals representing a significant portion of the research profession, we cannot state strongly enough that what has reportedly been done at Cal State Stanislaus on the change of venue survey for the Scott Peterson case does not represent the research profession. We fully support American Association of Public Opinion Research's (AAPOR) statement: "Interviewer falsification is a form of scientific misconduct. All reputable surveys monitor or check for the possibility of falsification by directly observing or by calling back a sample of cases to ensure interviews were done."

--

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

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

=====
Date: Tue, 20 Jan 2004 11:24:44 -0500
Reply-To: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>
Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses
Comments: To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <400D45E8.6050807@marketsharescorp.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Think about it! The Iowa caucuses are immoral, because attendees are allowed to talk to each other and those conversations could change votes. In fact, they are structured to achieve this effect by having a second vote after the initial one lets everyone see which way the bandwagon is rolling. What we need is a pure, information-free environment, so that voters can make their decisions unencumbered by

journalism, polls, or deliberation.

(I know most on this list will recognize sarcasm. This disclaimer is for the rest.)

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

On Tue, 20 Jan 2004, Nick Panagakis wrote:

> Date: Tue, 20 Jan 2004 09:14:48 -0600
> From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses
>
> Setting the aside the issue of the entrance polls because once the
> meetings begin, the idea for caucus participants is to change "voter
> behavior".
>
> Re: "If there is credible evidence that the public release of public
> opinion polls changes voter behavior".
>
> My favorite answer to this is that if the release of poll results did in
> fact change behavior, why are they generally so accurate? Public polls
> would self-destruct.
>
> Accuracy in 2002 appears here:
>
> <http://www.ncpp.org/2002SenGovPoll/2002SenGovPolls.html>
>
> Nick Panagakis
>
>
> Cynthia Nelson wrote:
>
>> Although I very much appreciate the idea that the public is capable
>> of handling information in a responsible way as well as the idea of
>> information
>> being public rather than closely held or available only to elites, I have
>> some concerns.
>>
>> If there is credible evidence that the public release of public opinion
>> polls
>> changes voter behavior (for example a bandwagon effect, staying home on
>> election day because your candidate is so far ahead or so far behind,
>> strategic
>> voting in a primary) wouldn't this present a challenge to these ideas?
>>
>> It is my impression that polling data has taken an increased percentage of

>>the
>>time and an increased role in news reporting on the candidates. Does
>>anyone
>>know if this is the case?

>>
>>regards, Cynthia Nelson

>>
>>Cynthia Nelson
>>Center for Governmental Studies
>>Northern Illinois University
>>DeKalb, IL 60115
>>Voice 815.753.1918
>>Fax 815.753.2305
>>email cnelson@niu.edu

>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>***** REPLY SEPARATOR *****

>>
>>On 1/20/2004 at 12:58 AM Warren Mitofsky wrote:

>>
>>
>>
>>>Tad,
>>>I am really disappointed that you would take this knee-jerk position. It
>>>ignores the way the caucuses operate. Nothing was reported until caucus
>>>goers were in their caucuses and the doors locked. What happens in those
>>>rooms is a process that allows people to lobby others in the room to join
>>>them in support of their candidate. Why you think an entrance poll is more
>>>influential in that lobbying effort than say the Iowa poll the day before
>>>escapes me. The Iowa poll was available for 36 hours for campaigns to plot
>>>what ever it is you think they plot. The entrance poll was likely not
>>>available at all to people locked in their caucus sites. And if it was,
>>>whose responsibility is that? You seem to think it was the messengers sole
>>>responsibility. I for one, do not like information that is closely held
>>>and available only to elites. I think the public is capable of handling it
>>>in a responsible way. Or are you saying we really do not need to know who
>>>supported each candidate, or what issues were important, or what were the
>>>dynamics of the caucuses. The result comes with that information, which

>>>
>>>
>>was
>>
>>
>>>responsibly held until the doors closed on the caucus meetings.
>>>warren mitofsky

>>>
>>>At 10:24 PM 1/19/2004, you wrote:
>>>
>>>

>>>>We share the concern of many that the networks could well alter the
>>>>story they are covering if they report on their entrance poll in the
>>>>early stages of the Iowa caucuses tonight.
>>>>
>>>>Some participants will still be undecided when the caucuses get
>>>>started. Others will find their preferred candidate is not viable and
>>>>have to decide on another candidate or join an "uncommitted" group in
>>>>the second round. Reports from entrance polls of one candidate's
>>>>unexpected strength or weakness could affect these decisions.
>>>>
>>>>Even without releasing actual percentages, the networks disclose a lot
>>>>by saying something like "things can change, but this may be a good
>>>>night for X." This might be important "news" for almost half of those
>>>>arriving at the caucuses with a preferred candidate but who, according
>>>>to the Des Moines Register Poll, could change their mind.
>>>>
>>>>The entrance poll will be more influential than the pre-caucus polls
>>>>because, by definition, it does not have to screen for likely
>>>>caucus-goers. In this sense, its results cannot be read as just the
>>>>last in a series of comparable measures.
>>>>
>>>>At least one news executive has suggested that caucus participants
>>>>should simply turn off their cell phones and ignore television. That is
>>>>not realistic. But more important, it is a tacit admission that news
>>>>about the entrance poll could affect candidate preference decisions made
>>>>during the caucuses.
>>>>
>>>>Until there is solid evidence that entrance polls don't influence caucus
>>>>outcomes, news organizations should hold off for an hour or so tonight
>>>>while the caucuses are still at work. Otherwise they may end up
>>>>violating one of their own basic rules by becoming part of the story
>>>>they are reporting.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Albert H. Cantril
>>>>Susan Davis Cantril
>>>>
>>>>-----
>>>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>>>Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>>>>signoff aapornet
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>-----
>>>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>>>Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>>>>signoff aapornet
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>-----
>>>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>>>Unsubscribe? Send email to listserv@asu.edu with this text:
>>>>signoff aapornet

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

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

Date: Tue, 20 Jan 2004 12:25:01 -0500
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Re: CMOR speaks out on the Peterson survey
Comments: To: AAPOR@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Why does any intelligent and unbiased person in our profession refer to =
this as the "Peterson survey?"

One would like to think the point has universal applicability. =20

Repeatedly associating the scandal with the defendant does him a =
disservice and has already led to one unfortunate remark on this list.

Call it the "Stephen Schoenthaler survey." =20

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

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

From: Leo G. Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Date: Tuesday, January 20, 2004 11:33 AM
Subject: CMOR speaks out on the Peterson survey

http://biz.yahoo.com/prnews/040119/clm017_1.html

Partnership of Research Professionals Concerned About Peterson Survey
Monday January 19, 8:44 pm ET

CINCINNATI, Jan. 19 /PRNewswire/ -- The following statement was issued =
today
by the Council for Marketing and Opinion Research on behalf of a =

partnership
of research professionals:

As a partnership of research professionals representing a significant portion of the research profession, we cannot state strongly enough that what has reportedly been done at Cal State Stanislaus on the change of venue

survey for the Scott Peterson case does not represent the research profession. We fully support American Association of Public Opinion Research's (AAPOR) statement: "Interviewer falsification is a form of scientific misconduct. All reputable surveys monitor or check for the possibility of falsification by directly observing or by calling back a sample of cases to ensure interviews were done."

--

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

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

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

=====
Date: Tue, 20 Jan 2004 10:19:21 -0700
Reply-To: Mike O'Neil <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike O'Neil <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>
Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses
Comments: To: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <Pine.A41.4.44+UNC.0401201118270.39398-100000@login5.isis.unc.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Cheers to Phil!

I have never understood what all the fuss about alleged poll influences is all about. The electorate is influenced by thousands of things, advertising (truthful and otherwise), neighbors, discussions, all media, every action taken by every candidate in every election etc. Many of these are deliberate attempts to influence voters (which is what all campaigns are about).

If we wanted to focus our concern on something more important, I would nominate the focus on the horse-race aspects of polling to the near exclusion of substantive discussion of issues. If pre-election polling has a negative impact, I think this is more significant and than any (most likely random) tendency to advantage one candidate over another, (Case in point, Iowa. If there had been NO pre-election polling, the sub-heading (after Kerry/Edwards victory) would have been "Unknown Dean a surprising third". But so what! Dean did surge and then drop, so it is legitimate analysis and reporting-and more accurate than the "surprising third" story would have been. Do journalists worry about whether their accurate reports influence voters? I think not. But we should both be concerned about whether our work is accurate. If it is accurate, whether it has an impact on voters out to be of no concern.

Mike O'Neil
www.oneilresearch.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU]On Behalf Of Philip Meyer
Sent: Tuesday, January 20, 2004 9:25 AM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses

Think about it! The Iowa caucuses are immoral, because attendees are allowed to talk to each other and those conversations could change votes. In fact, they are structured to achieve this effect by having a second vote after the initial one lets everyone see which way the bandwagon is rolling. What we need is a pure, information-free environment, so that voters can make their decisions unencumbered by journalism, polls, or deliberation.

(I know most on this list will recognize sarcasm. This disclaimer is for the rest.)

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

On Tue, 20 Jan 2004, Nick Panagakis wrote:

> Date: Tue, 20 Jan 2004 09:14:48 -0600
> From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses
>
> Setting the aside the issue of the entrance polls because once the
> meetings begin, the idea for caucus participants is to change "voter
> behavior".
>

>>
>>
>>
>>>Tad,
>>>I am really disappointed that you would take this knee-jerk position. It
>>>ignores the way the caucuses operate. Nothing was reported until caucus
>>>goers were in their caucuses and the doors locked. What happens in those
>>>rooms is a process that allows people to lobby others in the room to
join
>>>them in support of their candidate. Why you think an entrance poll is
more
>>>influential in that lobbying effort than say the Iowa poll the day
before
>>>escapes me. The Iowa poll was available for 36 hours for campaigns to
plot
>>>what ever it is you think they plot. The entrance poll was likely not
>>>available at all to people locked in their caucus sites. And if it was,
>>>whose responsibility is that? You seem to think it was the messengers
sole
>>>responsibility. I for one, do not like information that is closely held
>>>and available only to elites. I think the public is capable of handling
it
>>>in a responsible way. Or are you saying we really do not need to know
who
>>>supported each candidate, or what issues were important, or what were
the
>>>dynamics of the caucuses. The result comes with that information, which
>>>
>>>
>>was
>>
>>
>>>responsibly held until the doors closed on the caucus meetings.
>>>warren mitofsky
>>>
>>>At 10:24 PM 1/19/2004, you wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>We share the concern of many that the networks could well alter the
>>>>story they are covering if they report on their entrance poll in the
>>>>early stages of the Iowa caucuses tonight.
>>>>
>>>>Some participants will still be undecided when the caucuses get
>>>>started. Others will find their preferred candidate is not viable and
>>>>have to decide on another candidate or join an "uncommitted" group in
>>>>the second round. Reports from entrance polls of one candidate's
>>>>unexpected strength or weakness could affect these decisions.
>>>>
>>>>Even without releasing actual percentages, the networks disclose a lot
>>>>by saying something like "things can change, but this may be a good
>>>>night for X." This might be important "news" for almost half of those
>>>>arriving at the caucuses with a preferred candidate but who, according
>>>>to the Des Moines Register Poll, could change their mind.

>>>>
>>>>The entrance poll will be more influential than the pre-caucus polls
>>>>because, by definition, it does not have to screen for likely
>>>>caucus-goers. In this sense, its results cannot be read as just the
>>>>last in a series of comparable measures.
>>>>
>>>>At least one news executive has suggested that caucus participants
>>>>should simply turn off their cell phones and ignore television. That
is
>>>>not realistic. But more important, it is a tacit admission that news
>>>>about the entrance poll could affect candidate preference decisions
made
>>>>during the caucuses.
>>>>
>>>>Until there is solid evidence that entrance polls don't influence
caucus
>>>>outcomes, news organizations should hold off for an hour or so tonight
>>>>while the caucuses are still at work. Otherwise they may end up
>>>>violating one of their own basic rules by becoming part of the story
>>>>they are reporting.

>>>>Albert H. Cantril
>>>>Susan Davis Cantril

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Date: Tue, 20 Jan 2004 09:32:45 -0800
Reply-To: jebeling <jebeling@MAIL.CSUCHICO.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: jebeling <jebeling@MAIL.CSUCHICO.EDU>
Subject: Re: Warning - POQ mailing list infected by Bagel worm
Comments: To: jwerner@JWDP.COM
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Yes I received that worm, but I never open an attachment when there is this sort of non sense associated with it.

I'm very suspicious of things that come in that form.

jon ebeling

Jan Werner wrote:

> The POQ mailing list at the University of Chicago Press appears to have
> been infected by the Bagel (or Beagle) worm.
>
> If you get a message from POQ with an attachment, DELETE IT WITHOUT
> OPENING THE ATTACHMENT.
>
> The header will probably include the word "hi" and the message body will
> be something like this:
>
>
> Test =)
> iyvlgv
> --
> Test, yep.
>
>
> For information on this worm and how to remove it if you have already
> been infected, see:
>
> <http://www.sarc.com/avcenter/venc/data/w32.beagle.a@mm.html>
>
>
> Jan Werner
> jwerner@jwdp.com
>

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

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

Date: Tue, 20 Jan 2004 12:58:37 -0600
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Two Job Postings
Comments: To: AAPORNet@asu.edu
Comments: cc: ZAGATSY-MARIA@norc.net
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Position 1: Survey Operations Analyst (04-1N-JK-01)

Location: Chicago, IL

=20

NORC, a national organization for research associated with the =
University of Chicago, is seeking a highly motivated and effective =
individual to join its Centralized Operations and Methodology group. =
This group is responsible for phone, web and mail surveys, as well as =
data processing.

=20

Reporting to and working closely with the VP of Centralized Operations =
and Methodology, this newly created position has involvement in a broad =
range of critical management functions, including:=20

* Financial analysis and reporting=20

* Productivity analysis and reporting=20

* Quality assurance, and=20

* Methodological improvement.

=20

Because it is a new position in a rapidly expanding area, the position =
will have an evolving nature and shifting focus. The type of work =
envisaged over the first 12 months includes: * Budget monitoring and =
financial analysis assistance to senior operations management. =20

* Development work on performance metrics: research and evaluation of potential measures, then develop and test standardized reports, and work with programming staff to automate the production of such reports, verify that the reports are accurate.=20

* As reports are produced, analyze content, highlight relevant issues, and make recommendations. Working with the rest of senior operations management, develop strategies to address problems revealed through the reports. Participate in implementation of strategies.=20

* Undertake and/or lead special projects as required, for example, preparation of training materials, documentation of processes, auditing compliance with certain procedures, literature reviews of methodological issues.

=20

A degree with a substantial quantitative component, and very high marks in that component, is required, or its equivalent in experience, as is at least four years significant experience in related roles. The successful candidate is a person with sound business acumen, superior analytical skills and a proven track record for identifying and solving problems, along with excellent project management and communication skills. Drives for successful results and brings issues to closure; persists despite obstacles and opposition. Experience in survey research would be an advantage. Must have significant experience with Excel; experience with Access desirable.

=20

=20

Position 2: Operations Methodologist (04-1N-LS-01)

Location: Chicago, IL

=20

NORC, a national organization for research associated with the University of Chicago, is seeking a highly motivated and effective individual to fill the newly created role of Operations Methodologist for our telephone centers.

=20

We are currently upgrading and expanding our telephone interviewing capabilities, and we have a unique opportunity for professional growth in the field of telephone survey methodology.

=20

At NORC our mission is to conduct high quality social science research in the public interest. Working closely with the Telephone Center =

Director, the Operations Methodologist will be expected to make = significant contributions to our continuing development of high quality = telephone methodology by undertaking diagnostic analyses and testing = candidate solutions. The successful candidate will therefore have = proven analytical skills, advanced survey methodology knowledge and = experience in telephone surveys. To facilitate a complete understanding = of all influences on survey methodology, responsibilities will also = include all aspects of managing some telephone projects, and associated = staff responsibilities.

=20

A degree in Social Sciences, Survey Methodology or Business Management = or its equivalent in experience is required with a minimum of four (4) = years of significant experience in survey research. The successful = candidate will also have demonstrated skills in leadership, staff = development and client relations.

=20

=20

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

=20

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

=20

For immediate consideration, send a brief letter of interest and = electronic resume to: norc-recruiter@norc.net=20

=20

Or mail to:

=20

NORC Human Resources

1155 E. 60th Street

Chicago, IL 60637

www.norc.org

=20

Electronic submissions preferred.=20

=20

=20

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

=====
Date: Tue, 20 Jan 2004 16:12:51 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Re: CMOR speaks out on the Peterson survey
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <[008401c3df7a\\$57011a00\\$d6e4c3d1@default](mailto:008401c3df7a$57011a00$d6e4c3d1@default)>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I am pretty sure that when I have referred to the survey in question as the Peterson survey I have been paraphrasing or quoting a headline, news story or press release.

Despite this more than adequate personal defense, I do not think it either unreasonable or biased to refer to this survey as the Peterson survey. AAPORnet is a closed email list of survey professionals and I doubt any of them are laboring under the impression that Scott Peterson had anything to do with the methodology of the survey.

While it would be more precise to refer to this as the Schoenthaler survey on pretrial publicity in the Peterson case that phrase is too wordy for a headline. According to press reports Schoenthaler has done numerous change of venue surveys including at least one other that is currently in the courts in California. Apparently not all of these change of venue surveys used the same methodology.

--
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 James P. Murphy
> Sent: Tuesday, January 20, 2004 12:25 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Re: CMOR speaks out on the Peterson survey
>
> Why does any intelligent and unbiased person in our profession refer to
> this as the "Peterson survey?"
>
> One would like to think the point has universal applicability.
>
> Repeatedly associating the scandal with the defendant does him a
> disservice and has already led to one unfortunate remark on this list.
>
> Call it the "Stephen Schoenthaler survey."
>
> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> Voice (610) 408-8800
> Fax (610) 408-8802
> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Leo G. Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
> Date: Tuesday, January 20, 2004 11:33 AM
> Subject: CMOR speaks out on the Peterson survey
>
>
> http://biz.yahoo.com/prnews/040119/clm017_1.html
>
> Partnership of Research Professionals Concerned About Peterson Survey
> Monday January 19, 8:44 pm ET
>
> CINCINNATI, Jan. 19 /PRNewswire/ -- The following statement was issued
> today
> by the Council for Marketing and Opinion Research on behalf of a
> partnership
> of research professionals:
>
> As a partnership of research professionals representing a significant
> portion of the research profession, we cannot state strongly enough that
> what has reportedly been done at Cal State Stanislaus on the change of
> venue
> survey for the Scott Peterson case does not represent the research
> profession. We fully support American Association of Public Opinion
> Research's (AAPOR) statement: "Interviewer falsification is a form of
> scientific misconduct. All reputable surveys monitor or check for the
> possibility of falsification by directly observing or by calling back a
> sample of cases to ensure interviews were done."
>
>
> --
> Leo G. Simonetta
> Art & Science Group, LLC
> 6115 Falls Road Suite 101
> Baltimore, MD 21209
> 410-377-7880 ext. 14
> 410-377-7955 fax

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

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

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

=====
Date: Tue, 20 Jan 2004 17:09:39 -0500
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Re: CMOR speaks out on the Peterson survey
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: quoted-printable

The thing that bothered me was the use of "Peterson survey" in press =
releases ("official statements") issued by both CMOR and AAPOR. Maybe =
the headlines/framing were done by the media. I just wouldn't write =
anything that plays into that, as -- one hopes unintentionally -- has =
been done here.

"Too wordy for a headline" . . .???

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

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

From: Leo G. Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Date: Tuesday, January 20, 2004 4:10 PM
Subject: Re: CMOR speaks out on the Peterson survey

I am pretty sure that when I have referred to the survey in question as =
the
Peterson survey I have been paraphrasing or quoting a headline, news =
story
or press release.

Despite this more than adequate personal defense, I do not think it =
either

unreasonable or biased to refer to this survey as the Peterson survey.
AAPORnet is a closed email list of survey professionals and I doubt any =
of
them are laboring under the impression that Scott Peterson had anything =
to
do with the methodology of the survey.

While it would be more precise to refer to this as the Schoenthaler =
survey
on pretrial publicity in the Peterson case that phrase is too wordy for =
a
headline. According to press reports Schoenthaler has done numerous =
change
of venue surveys including at least one other that is currently in the
courts in California. Apparently not all of these change of venue =
surveys
used the same methodology.

--

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 James P. Murphy

> Sent: Tuesday, January 20, 2004 12:25 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: CMOR speaks out on the Peterson survey

>

> Why does any intelligent and unbiased person in our profession refer =

to

> this as the "Peterson survey?"

>

> One would like to think the point has universal applicability.

>

> Repeatedly associating the scandal with the defendant does him a

> disservice and has already led to one unfortunate remark on this list.

>

> Call it the "Stephen Schoenthaler survey."

>

> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

> Voice (610) 408-8800

> Fax (610) 408-8802

> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

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

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

> Date: Tuesday, January 20, 2004 11:33 AM

> Subject: CMOR speaks out on the Peterson survey

>

>
> http://biz.yahoo.com/prnews/040119/clm017_1.html
>
> Partnership of Research Professionals Concerned About Peterson Survey
> Monday January 19, 8:44 pm ET
>
> CINCINNATI, Jan. 19 /PRNewswire/ -- The following statement was issued
> today
> by the Council for Marketing and Opinion Research on behalf of a
> partnership
> of research professionals:
>
> As a partnership of research professionals representing a significant
> portion of the research profession, we cannot state strongly enough =
> that
> what has reportedly been done at Cal State Stanislaus on the change of
> venue
> survey for the Scott Peterson case does not represent the research
> profession. We fully support American Association of Public Opinion
> Research's (AAPOR) statement: "Interviewer falsification is a form of
> scientific misconduct. All reputable surveys monitor or check for the
> possibility of falsification by directly observing or by calling back =
> a

> sample of cases to ensure interviews were done."

>
>
> --

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

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

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

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

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

signoff aapornet

Date: Tue, 20 Jan 2004 17:05:40 -0500
Reply-To: elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Betsy Martin <elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV>
Subject: Re: FW: CMOR speaks out on the Peterson survey
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

FYI--the AAPOR press release made reference to "a survey introduced as evidence in the Scott Peterson murder trial" not to "the Peterson survey."

----- Message from "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM> on Tue, 20 Jan 2004 15:09:39 -0700 -----

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Subject: Re: CMOR speaks out on the Peterson survey

The thing that bothered me was the use of "Peterson survey" in press releases ("official statements") issued by both CMOR and AAPOR. Maybe the headlines/framing were done by the media. I just wouldn't write anything that plays into that, as -- one hopes unintentionally -- has been done here.

"Too wordy for a headline" . . .???

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

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

From: Leo G. Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Date: Tuesday, January 20, 2004 4:10 PM
Subject: Re: CMOR speaks out on the Peterson survey

I am pretty sure that when I have referred to the survey in question as the Peterson survey I have been paraphrasing or quoting a headline, news story or press release.

Despite this more than adequate personal defense, I do not think it either unreasonable or biased to refer to this survey as the Peterson survey. AAPORnet is a closed email list of survey professionals and I doubt any of them are laboring under the impression that Scott Peterson had anything to do with the methodology of the survey.

While it would be more precise to refer to this as the Schoenthaler survey on pretrial publicity in the Peterson case that phrase is too wordy for a headline. According to press reports Schoenthaler has done numerous change of venue surveys including at least one other that is currently in the courts in California. Apparently not all of these change of venue surveys used the same methodology.

--

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 James P. Murphy

> Sent: Tuesday, January 20, 2004 12:25 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: CMOR speaks out on the Peterson survey

>

> Why does any intelligent and unbiased person in our profession refer to
> this as the "Peterson survey?"

>

> One would like to think the point has universal applicability.

>

> Repeatedly associating the scandal with the defendant does him a
> disservice and has already led to one unfortunate remark on this list.

>

> Call it the "Stephen Schoenthaler survey."

>

> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

> Voice (610) 408-8800

> Fax (610) 408-8802

> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

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

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

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

> Date: Tuesday, January 20, 2004 11:33 AM

> Subject: CMOR speaks out on the Peterson survey

>

>

> http://biz.yahoo.com/prnews/040119/clm017_1.html

>

> Partnership of Research Professionals Concerned About Peterson Survey

> Monday January 19, 8:44 pm ET

>

> CINCINNATI, Jan. 19 /PRNewswire/ -- The following statement was issued

> today

> by the Council for Marketing and Opinion Research on behalf of a

> partnership

> of research professionals:

>
> As a partnership of research professionals representing a significant
> portion of the research profession, we cannot state strongly enough that
> what has reportedly been done at Cal State Stanislaus on the change of
> venue
> survey for the Scott Peterson case does not represent the research
> profession. We fully support American Association of Public Opinion
> Research's (AAPOR) statement: "Interviewer falsification is a form of
> scientific misconduct. All reputable surveys monitor or check for the
> possibility of falsification by directly observing or by calling back a
> sample of cases to ensure interviews were done."

>
>
> --

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

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

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

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

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

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

Date: Wed, 21 Jan 2004 10:13:44 -0500
Reply-To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: Iowa Caucuses
Comments: To: jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Thank you. I think the secret of our success was I invested the right amount of worry. JAS

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

visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

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

In a message dated 1/19/2004 10:30:16 PM Central Standard Time, jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM writes:
Congratulations to Selzer & Company!

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 with this text:
signoff aapornet

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

=====
Date: Wed, 21 Jan 2004 10:27:22 -0500
Reply-To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I'm feeling a bit more sanguine about the influence of the media on caucus-goers' decisions, based solely on reports from people I know who were unaware of the characterizations networks were making based on the entrance poll.

However, the one difference I just want to be sure we all understand between this and general election or primary exit polls is the the measurement is taken BEFORE caucus-goers announce either an initial or final preference. Of course, they see pretty quickly how their own caucus is shaping up. What they

don't know is whether their site reflects the state. So, potentially, as they are in the process of realigning--persuading supporters of other candidates or undecideds to change their preference--a powerful argument could be that the Howard Dean campaign is imploding and you're the only ones thinking this guy has a chance.

The question is, whether that information should or should not be a factor. It's something most voters never know--how the state is trending. A few who vote late might be influenced if exit polls are reported before polls close. But that's unlike the potential for all caucus-goers to learn of the state trend when there is still time for them to realign and change their preference.

My sanguineness also comes from the observation that caucus preferences were not really as fluid as they appeared. Caucus-goers' final preferences reflected what we learned in polling the week leading up to the caucuses and stayed reasonably firm over the weekend when we were no longer polling. I'm not ready to say "no harm, no foul," however. <smile>

JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Director of the Iowa Poll
Des Moines, Iowa 50312
515.271.5700

visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

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

In a message dated 1/20/2004 11:54:51 AM Central Standard Time, mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU writes:
Cheers to Phil!

I have never understood what all the fuss about alleged poll influences is all about. The electorate is influenced by thousands of things, advertising (truthful and otherwise), neighbors, discussions, all media, every action taken by every candidate in every election etc. Many of these are deliberate attempts to influence voters (which is what all campaigns are about).

If we wanted to focus our concern on something more important, I would nominate the focus on the horse-race aspects of polling to the near exclusion of substantive discussion of issues. If pre-election polling has a negative impact, I think this is more significant and than any (most likely random) tendency to advantage one candidate over another, (Case in point, Iowa. If there had been NO pre-election polling, the sub-heading (after Kerry/Edwards victory) would have been "Unknown Dean a surprising

third". But so what! Dean did surge and then drop, so it is legitimate analysis and reporting-and more accurate than the "surprising third" story would have been. Do journalists worry about whether their accurate reports influence voters? I think not. But we should both be concerned about whether our work is accurate. If it is accurate, whether it has an impact on voters out to be of no concern.

Mike O'Neil
www.oneilresearch.com

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

visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

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

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

Date: Wed, 21 Jan 2004 10:49:05 -0500
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses
Comments: To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <11e.29d4af04.2d3ff45a@aol.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Ann,
Tell us do you feel your poll on Sunday may have created a Kerry bandwagon at the caucuses?
warren

At 10:27 AM 1/21/2004, J. Ann Selzer wrote:
>I'm feeling a bit more sanguine about the influence of the media on
>caucus-goers' decisions, based solely on reports from people I know who
>were unaware of
>the characterizations networks were making based on the entrance poll.
>
>However, the one difference I just want to be sure we all understand between
>this and general election or primary exit polls is the the measurement is
>taken BEFORE caucus-goers announce either an initial or final preference. Of
>course, they see pretty quickly how their own caucus is shaping up. What they
>don't know is whether their site reflects the state. So, potentially, as
>they are
>in the process of realigning--persuading supporters of other candidates or
>undecideds to change their preference--a powerful argument could be that the
>Howard Dean campaign is imploding and you're the only ones thinking this

>guy has
>a chance.
>
>The question is, whether that information should or should not be a factor.
>It's something most voters never know--how the state is trending. A few who
>vote late might be influenced if exit polls are reported before polls close.
>But that's unlike the potential for all caucus-goers to learn of the state
>trend when there is still time for them to realign and change their
>preference.
>
>My sanguineness also comes from the observation that caucus preferences were
>not really as fluid as they appeared. Caucus-goers' final preferences
>reflected what we learned in polling the week leading up to the caucuses
>and stayed
>reasonably firm over the weekend when we were no longer polling. I'm not
>ready
>to say "no harm, no foul," however. <smile>
>
>JAS
>
>
>J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
>Selzer & Company, Inc.
>Director of the Iowa Poll
>Des Moines, Iowa 50312
>515.271.5700
>
>visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com
>
>E-mail address for purposes of this list: JAnnSelzer@aol.com; otherwise,
>contact JASelzer@SelzerCo.com.
>
>In a message dated 1/20/2004 11:54:51 AM Central Standard Time,
>mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU writes:
>Cheers to Phil!
>
>I have never understood what all the fuss about alleged poll influences is
>all about. The electorate is influenced by thousands of things, advertising
>(truthful and otherwise), neighbors, discussions, all media, every action
>taken by every candidate in every election etc. Many of these are deliberate
>attempts to influence voters (which is what all campaigns are about).
>
>If we wanted to focus our concern on something more important, I would
>nominate the focus on the horse-race aspects of polling to the near
>exclusion of substantive discussion of issues. If pre-election polling has
>a negative impact, I think this is more significant and than any (most
>likely random) tendency to advantage one candidate over another, (Case in
>point, Iowa. If there had been NO pre-election polling, the sub-heading
>(after Kerry/Edwards victory) would have been "Unknown Dean a surprising
>third". But so what! Dean did surge and then drop, so it is legitimate
>analysis and reporting-and more accurate than the "surprising third" story
>>would have been. Do journalists worry about whether their accurate reports
>influence voters? I think not. But we should both be concerned about
>whether our work is accurate. If it is accurate, whether it has an impact

>on voters out to be of no concern.

>

>Mike O'Neil

>www.oneilresearch.com

>

>J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.

>Selzer & Company, Inc.

>Des Moines, Iowa 50312

>515.271.5700

>

>visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

>

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

>contact JASelzer@SelzerCo.com.

>

>-----

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

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

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

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

Date: Wed, 21 Jan 2004 11:13:35 -0500

Reply-To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>

Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

CREATED? No. REFLECTED? Yes. REINFORCED? Yes. CREATED? No.

In a message dated 1/21/2004 9:49:39 AM Central Standard Time,

mitofsky@mindspring.com writes:

Ann,

Tell us do you feel your poll on Sunday may have created a Kerry bandwagon at the caucuses?

warren

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.

Selzer & Company, Inc.

Des Moines, Iowa 50312

515.271.5700

visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

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

contact JASelzer@SelzerCo.com.

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

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

Date: Wed, 21 Jan 2004 12:17:48 -0500
Reply-To: Angell Beza <abeza@IRSS.UNC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Angell Beza <abeza@IRSS.UNC.EDU>
Subject: Survey of Elites
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; CHARSET=US-ASCII

For a proposed internet survey of legislators in national parliaments in various parts of the world, we would appreciate any available references, descriptions of recent experiences, and suggestions. If you have had experience with other modes of international data collection such as mail or telephone, we also would appreciate your suggestions. Please send to:

Angell G. Beza
Senior Associate Director
The Odum Institute
for Research in Social Science
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3355 USA

Voice: 919-966-2450
Fax: 919-962-IRSS (4777)
Email: abeza@irss.unc.edu

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

Date: Wed, 21 Jan 2004 10:37:52 -0800
Reply-To: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>
Organization: Competitive Edge Research & Comm.
Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses
Comments: To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu
Comments: cc: Todd Luce <Todd@cerc.net>, Kenyon Luce <ken@cerc.net>, James Kipp <james@cerc.net>
In-Reply-To: <6.207f5db8.2d3fff2f@aol.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

While the Iowa caucus entrance poll may be a different kettle of fish (as my Dad would say), if bandwagon effects were real, Howard Dean would have won big in Iowa. Under the poll-leader bandwagon theory, Dean's support would have increased as the polls one month out showed him in command. And where in the world would John Kerry (let alone John Edwards!) have picked up the traction necessary to come from behind. Indeed, all the comeback kid stories (Clinton in '92, Kerry now) could

not have been written if pre-election polls really produced significant and reliable bandwagon effects.

John E. Nienstedt, Sr.
john@cerc.net
Get the edge at www.cerc.net

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of J. Ann Selzer
Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2004 8:14 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses

CREATED? No. REFLECTED? Yes. REINFORCED? Yes. CREATED? No.

In a message dated 1/21/2004 9:49:39 AM Central Standard Time, mitofsky@mindspring.com writes:

Ann,
Tell us do you feel your poll on Sunday may have created a Kerry bandwagon at the caucuses?
warren

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

visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

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

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

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

Date: Wed, 21 Jan 2004 14:06:35 -0500
Reply-To: Phillip Downs <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Phillip Downs <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>
Subject: CAN SPAM LAW
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Can someone provide a clear interpretation of how CAN SPAM affects email

surveys? For example, if a client provides a list of email addresses, can a researcher send surveys to these email addresses without risk? Does it matter whether or not the client obtained these email addresses through an express opt-in method? Do "commercial" emails as defined in CAN SPAM include surveys that do not purport to sell anything? If not, is there a category or label under which email surveys fit under CAN SPAM? thanks, Phillip

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

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

Date: Wed, 21 Jan 2004 14:49:53 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <[000001c3e04d\\$ae2f1290\\$1a01a8c0@CERC2.cerc.net](mailto:000001c3e04d$ae2f1290$1a01a8c0@CERC2.cerc.net)>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

A timely article:

Polls not only predict vote, but affect it
Debate centers on whether late-breaking surveys can change outcome
Wednesday, January 21, 2004

BY JOHN FARMER
Star-Ledger Staff

DES MOINES, Iowa -- Pollster John Zogby was not a candidate in the Iowa Democratic presidential ballot and he didn't endorse any of those who were, but he appears to have played a role in the outcome. How big a role is the subject of some debate here.

See the rest at:

<http://www.nj.com/news/ledger/index.ssf?/base/news-0/1074669034139990.xml>

--
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 John Nienstedt
> Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2004 1:38 PM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses

>
> While the Iowa caucus entrance poll may be a different kettle of fish
> (as my Dad would say), if bandwagon effects were real, Howard Dean would
> have won big in Iowa. Under the poll-leader bandwagon theory, Dean's
> support would have increased as the polls one month out showed him in
> command. And where in the world would John Kerry (let alone John
> Edwards!) have picked up the traction necessary to come from behind.
> Indeed, all the comeback kid stories (Clinton in '92, Kerry now) could
> not have been written if pre-election polls really produced significant
> and reliable bandwagon effects.

>
> John E. Nienstedt, Sr.
> john@cerc.net
> Get the edge at www.cerc.net

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of J. Ann Selzer
> Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2004 8:14 AM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses

>
> CREATED? No. REFLECTED? Yes. REINFORCED? Yes. CREATED? No.

>
> In a message dated 1/21/2004 9:49:39 AM Central Standard Time,
> mitofsky@mindspring.com writes:

> Ann,
> Tell us do you feel your poll on Sunday may have created a Kerry
> bandwagon
> at the caucuses?
> warren

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

>
> visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

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

>

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

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

Date: Wed, 21 Jan 2004 14:51:04 -0500
Reply-To: mark@bisconti.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark David Richards <mark@BISCONTI.COM>
Organization: Bisconti Research, Inc.
Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <11e.29d4af04.2d3ff45a@aol.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Thoughts... I watched the caucuses that were broadcast on C-SPAN... and looked at the Internet as figures were reported by the Des Moines = Register and AP ("With 1910 precincts of 1993 counted, the results are...").

On Internet BLOGS, some very attentive observers who were going to the caucuses to participate were looking at who would be "the second choice" = if the first choice candidate couldn't qualify (and pointing out this = didn't look good for Dean); but it is hard to imagine this could impact what happened in the caucuses very much.

Assuming the other couple thousand caucuses were anything as chaotic as = the two broadcast, it would seem that the group dynamics--the on-the-spot decision-making and horse-trading ("If you join our group so we qualify = we will give you one of our delegates at the County level so you can vote = for your candidate in the next round and keep him alive;" "Dennis said to = give our votes to Edwards if we can't qualify;" etc.)--would drown out = potential influence of pre-caucus research. =20

While the caucuses looked fun, I wondered about the meaning and now appreciate more the simplicity of a one-person-one-vote primary. (I = wonder

how many delegates assigned to one candidate are actually "owned" by =
another
candidate for round two.)

As for the influence of the media polls -- the horse-race polls seem to =
have
driven coverage in the weeks before... thereby setting expectations.
Expectations have a great impact on how numbers are framed and reported.

Mark David Richards

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of J. Ann Selzer
Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2004 10:27 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses

I'm feeling a bit more sanguine about the influence of the media on
caucus-goers' decisions, based solely on reports from people I know who =
were
unaware of
the characterizations networks were making based on the entrance poll.

However, the one difference I just want to be sure we all understand =
between
this and general election or primary exit polls is the the measurement =
is
taken BEFORE caucus-goers announce either an initial or final =
preference.
Of
course, they see pretty quickly how their own caucus is shaping up. What
they
don't know is whether their site reflects the state. So, potentially, =
as
they are
in the process of realigning--persuading supporters of other candidates =
or
undecideds to change their preference--a powerful argument could be that =
the
Howard Dean campaign is imploding and you're the only ones thinking this =
guy
has
a chance.

The question is, whether that information should or should not be a =
factor.
It's something most voters never know--how the state is trending. A few =
who
vote late might be influenced if exit polls are reported before polls =
close.
But that's unlike the potential for all caucus-goers to learn of the =
state

trend when there is still time for them to realign and change their preference.

My sanguineness also comes from the observation that caucus preferences = were not really as fluid as they appeared. Caucus-goers' final preferences reflected what we learned in polling the week leading up to the caucuses = and stayed reasonably firm over the weekend when we were no longer polling. I'm = not ready to say "no harm, no foul," however. <smile>

JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company, Inc.
Director of the Iowa Poll
Des Moines, Iowa 50312
515.271.5700

visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

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

In a message dated 1/20/2004 11:54:51 AM Central Standard Time, mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU writes:
Cheers to Phil!

I have never understood what all the fuss about alleged poll influences = is all about. The electorate is influenced by thousands of things, = advertising (truthful and otherwise), neighbors, discussions, all media, every = action taken by every candidate in every election etc. Many of these are = deliberate attempts to influence voters (which is what all campaigns are about).

If we wanted to focus our concern on something more important, I would nominate the focus on the horse-race aspects of polling to the near exclusion of substantive discussion of issues. If pre-election polling = has a negative impact, I think this is more significant and than any (most likely random) tendency to advantage one candidate over another, (Case = in point, Iowa. If there had been NO pre-election polling, the sub-heading (after Kerry/Edwards victory) would have been "Unknown Dean a surprising third". But so what! Dean did surge and then drop, so it is legitimate analysis and reporting-and more accurate than the "surprising third" = story

would have been. Do journalists worry about whether their accurate = reports influence voters? I think not. But we should both be concerned about whether our work is accurate. If it is accurate, whether it has an = impact on voters out to be of no concern.

Mike O'Neil
www.oneilresearch.com

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

visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

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

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

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

Date: Wed, 21 Jan 2004 12:54:05 -0800
Reply-To: kjuffer@WESTED.ORG
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Kristin Juffer <kjuffer@WESTED.ORG>
Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses
Comments: To: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>
Comments: cc: aapornet@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <000001c3e04d\$ae2f1290\$1a01a8c0@CERC2.cerc.net>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

As a former Iowa caucus goer, District and State delegate and former President of the Iowa State Democratic Women's Caucas(in my life before Washington DC), I would be surprised that Iowans -- particularly those who would be so strongly motivated to go out on a cold winter night -- would be so malleable at the very end of the months of campaigning that they would allow an Entrance Poll -- even if they happened to hear the results (unlikely) -- change their mind.

I think the real culprit(s) lies with the press and competitors banging hard and loud of the "electability" factor, and Dean taking off his politician's hat -- even for a moment -- and talking "as a physician" to Iowans -- telling them that the high cost of America's health care was du=

e
to high costs of pharmaceuticals, etc. and the other political whipping
posts -- but ALSO due to families taking extraordinary efforts to keep th=
e
elderly alive toward the end of their lives!! Whereas this may be
objectively true, it is not "good politics" -- especially not in Iowa
where there are so many elderly, and virtually everyone has elderly famil=
y
members. When I heard Dean say that, I had the first grave doubts for hi=
s
candidacy there -- or anywhere where they hear that. Talk about shootin=
g
himself in his foot.

Kris

This approach is sure to turn off many

While the Iowa caucus entrance poll may be a different kettle of fish
> (as my Dad would say), if bandwagon effects were real, Howard Dean woul=
d

> have won big in Iowa. Under the poll-leader bandwagon theory, Dean's
> support would have increased as the polls one month out showed him in
> command. And where in the world would John Kerry (let alone John
> Edwards!) have picked up the traction necessary to come from behind.
> Indeed, all the comeback kid stories (Clinton in '92, Kerry now) could
> not have been written if pre-election polls really produced significant
> and reliable bandwagon effects.

>
> John E. Nienstedt, Sr.
> john@cerc.net
> Get the edge at www.cerc.net

>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of J. Ann Selzer
> Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2004 8:14 AM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses

>
> CREATED? No. REFLECTED? Yes. REINFORCED? Yes. CREATED? No.

>
> In a message dated 1/21/2004 9:49:39 AM Central Standard Time,
> mitofsky@mindspring.com writes:

> Ann,
> Tell us do you feel your poll on Sunday may have created a Kerry
> bandwagon
> at the caucuses?
> warren

>
> J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
> Selzer & Company, Inc.

> Des Moines, Iowa 50312
> 515.271.5700
>
> visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com
>
> E-mail address for purposes of this list: JAnnSelzer@aol.com; otherwise=
,
> contact JASelzer@SelzerCo.com.
>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:
> aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.e=](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)
du
>
>
>
>

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

Date: Wed, 21 Jan 2004 15:55:17 -0500
Reply-To: Diane Bowers <dbowers@casro.org>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Diane Bowers <dbowers@CASRO.ORG>
Organization: CASRO
Subject: Re: CAN SPAM LAW
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Phillip and everyone: CASRO is familiar with this law: it supercedes any state laws (like the more aggressive CA law), and it aligns with the provisions of CASRO's Code of Standards. The Act requires that all unsolicited commercial emails be clearly marked as advertising; offer all recipients a right to opt-out; contain a valid return email address, identification of the sender and the sender's internet location; set forth the physical address of the sender; and not be in any way false, misleading or fraudulent. The Act establishes civil and criminal penalties for violators. It requires the FTC to establish a do-not-email registry (similar to the do-not-call registry), though there will be hearings on this issue.
establish the "CAN-SPAM Act."

This law by definition, scope, and intent does not INCLUDE survey research:

we are not advertisers or solicitors; the provisions apply to advertisers or solicitors; and the purpose is to guard the public's privacy from unwanted and/or harmful solicitations. Further, the CASRO Code (internet section below) asserts an even stronger commitment to internet privacy (and a further "proof" of industry/professional self-regulation) by requiring opt-in prior to receiving any email from a researcher. The CASRO Code also requires that the "source" of opt-in permission be identified (if the source is the client, then the client must be identified); that the client (or source of any email list) provided to a researcher verify that these individuals have opted-in and have a reasonable expectation that they will be contacted for research; and that the emailed person be given an opportunity to opt-out of the research. Some list providers have asked research companies to document compliance with the CAN-SPAM Act's requirement for an "internal do-not-email list." Survey researchers need to respond to these requests by noting that legitimate survey research is EXCLUDED from this Act. An interesting point: I would argue that internet researchers do not even maintain "do-not-email" lists, since if an individual opts-out of the research that email address is probably deleted from the list, in order to prevent any "mistaken" email attempts. Here is the CASRO Internet Research Code. Diane

CASRO Code of Standards and Ethics for Survey Research

(section on Internet Research)

3. Internet Research

a. The unique characteristics of internet research require specific notice that the principle of respondent privacy applies to this new technology and data collection methodology. The general principle of this section of the Code is that survey research organizations will not use unsolicited emails to recruit respondents for surveys.

1. Research organizations are required to verify that individuals contacted for research by email have a reasonable expectation that they will receive email contact for research. Such agreement can be assumed when ALL of the following conditions exist:

a. A substantive pre-existing relationship exists between the individuals contacted and the research organization, the client or the list owners contracting the research (the latter being so identified);

b. Individuals have a reasonable expectation, based on the pre-existing relationship, that they may be contacted for research;

c. Individuals are offered the choice to be removed from future email contact in each invitation; and,

d. The invitation list excludes all individuals who have previously taken the appropriate and timely steps to request the list owner to remove them.

2. Research organizations are prohibited from using any subterfuge in obtaining email addresses of potential respondents, such as collecting email addresses from public domains, using technologies or techniques to collect email addresses without individuals' awareness, and collecting email addresses under the guise of some other activity.

3. Research organizations are prohibited from using false or misleading return email addresses when recruiting respondents over the Internet.

4. When receiving email lists from clients or list owners, research organizations are required to have the client or list provider verify that individuals listed have a reasonable expectation that they will receive email contact, as defined, in (1) above.

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

From: "Phillip Downs" <pd@KERR-DOWNS.COM>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2004 2:06 PM

Subject: CAN SPAM LAW

> Can someone provide a clear interpretation of how CAN SPAM affects email
> surveys? For example, if a client provides a list of email addresses, can
> a
> researcher send surveys to these email addresses without risk? Does it
> matter whether or not the client obtained these email addresses through an
> express opt-in method? Do "commercial" emails as defined in CAN SPAM
> include surveys that do not purport to sell anything? If not, is there a
> category or label under which email surveys fit under CAN SPAM? thanks,
> Phillip

>

> -----

> Phillip E. Downs, PhD

> Kerr & Downs Research

> 2992 Habersham Drive

> Tallahassee, FL 32309
> Phone: 850.906.3111
> Fax: 850.906.3112
> www.kerr-downs.com
>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>

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

Date: Wed, 21 Jan 2004 15:01:48 -0600
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Organization: Market Shares Corporation
Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <001301c3e057\$bdc421f0\$d00a010a@LEO>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Subject: News Coverage of Caucus Poll Accuracy

News coverage of poll accuracy in this story indicates a poor understanding of polls, of caucuses, or both. Although coverage is positive, I have seen the same expressed in other stories.

Specifically, "In the end, Zogby's final poll for MSNBC and Reuters last weekend underestimated the surge for Kerry and Edwards. Kerry won with 38 percent; the Zogby poll had him at 25 percent. Edwards finished second with 32 percent. Zogby had him at 21 percent."

This suggests that the Zogby (and Selzer) polls were supposed to **anticipate** the outcome after the caucus meetings concluded, that is, **after** participants argued the merits of their candidates and **after** supporters whose candidates failed to meet viability switched to another side.

Nick Panagakis

Leo G. Simonetta wrote:

>A timely article:
>
>Polls not only predict vote, but affect it
>Debate centers on whether late-breaking surveys can change outcome
>Wednesday, January 21, 2004
>

>
>BY JOHN FARMER
>Star-Ledger Staff
>
>DES MOINES, Iowa -- Pollster John Zogby was not a candidate in the Iowa
>Democratic presidential ballot and he didn't endorse any of those who were,
>but he appears to have played a role in the outcome. How big a role is the
>subject of some debate here.
>
>See the rest at:
>
><http://www.nj.com/news/ledger/index.ssf?/base/news-0/1074669034139990.xml>
>
>
>--

>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 John Nienstedt
>>Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2004 1:38 PM
>>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>>Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses
>>

>>While the Iowa caucus entrance poll may be a different kettle of fish
>>(as my Dad would say), if bandwagon effects were real, Howard Dean would
>>have won big in Iowa. Under the poll-leader bandwagon theory, Dean's
>>support would have increased as the polls one month out showed him in
>>command. And where in the world would John Kerry (let alone John
>>Edwards!) have picked up the traction necessary to come from behind.
>>Indeed, all the comeback kid stories (Clinton in '92, Kerry now) could
>>not have been written if pre-election polls really produced significant
>>and reliable bandwagon effects.
>>

>>John E. Nienstedt, Sr.
>>john@cerc.net
>>Get the edge at www.cerc.net
>>
>>

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

>>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of J. Ann Selzer
>>Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2004 8:14 AM
>>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>>Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses
>>

>>>CREATED? No. REFLECTED? Yes. REINFORCED? Yes. CREATED? No.
>>

>>In a message dated 1/21/2004 9:49:39 AM Central Standard Time,
>>mitofsky@mindspring.com writes:

>>Ann,
>>Tell us do you feel your poll on Sunday may have created a Kerry
>>bandwagon
>>at the caucuses?
>>warren

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

>>
>>visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

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

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

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

>>
>>
>
>-----

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

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

Date: Wed, 21 Jan 2004 16:38:39 -0500
Reply-To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: Entrance Poll at Iowa Caucuses
Comments: To: mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Actually, we had tools to assess what could happen with realignment at the caucuses. Our findings showed that whatever could happen with vote switching would not rock the dominating trends told in the rest of the poll.

That said, it's very easy afterward to say we were trying to predict what would happen, because our poll served as an accurate forecast, though we finished interviewing Friday night. Zogby's did not, though he remained in the field through Sunday night. Were I in his shoes would I be more circumspect about what we think polls can and cannot anticipate? Maybe, though we also had tools to help us assess how fluid the race was. Most important is explaining to readers why things are the way they are. Why the Kerry and Edwards surges? Why the implosion of the Dean campaign? Without polls, reporters offer anecdotes that may or may not have much explanatory power beyond the individual event or person. That can bias thinking in a different way.

JAS

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

visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

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

In a message dated 1/21/2004 3:13:21 PM Central Standard Time, mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM writes:
Subject: News Coverage of Caucus Poll Accuracy

News coverage of poll accuracy in this story indicates a poor understanding of polls, of caucuses, or both. Although coverage is positive, I have seen the same expressed in other stories.

Specifically, "In the end, Zogby's final poll for MSNBC and Reuters last weekend underestimated the surge for Kerry and Edwards. Kerry won with 38 percent; the Zogby poll had him at 25 percent. Edwards finished second with 32 percent. Zogby had him at 21 percent."

This suggests that the Zogby (and Selzer) polls were supposed to *anticipate* the outcome after the caucus meetings concluded, that is, *after* participants argued the merits of their candidates and *after* supporters whose candidates failed to meet viability switched to another side.

Nick Panagakis

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

Date: Thu, 22 Jan 2004 09:42:01 -0700
Reply-To: Mike O'Neil <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike O'Neil <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>
Subject: Web Survey Software
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Is anyone aware of anyone who has done a relatively recent comparison of web survey software? I remember something a few years ago that had features compared on a grid. Any other way and you get hopelessly confused (at least I do) with an array of conflicting claims and hype.

Mike O'Neil
www.oneilresearch.com

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

Date: Thu, 22 Jan 2004 13:40:48 -0500
Reply-To: "Feld, Karl" <kfeld@RTI.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Feld, Karl" <kfeld@RTI.ORG>
Subject: Re: Web Survey Software
Comments: To: Mike O'Neil <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

Mike,

Tim Macer in the UK does the best review I've ever seen. He puts it out annually. The last email I have for him is tim.macer@meaning.co.uk.

Regards,

Karl G. Feld, Manager
Call Center Services
Survey Research Division
RTI International
p: 919-248-4557
kfeld@rti.org

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Mike O'Neil
Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2004 11:42 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Web Survey Software

Is anyone aware of anyone who has done a relatively recent comparison of web survey software? I remember something a few years ago that had features

compared on a grid. Any other way and you get hopelessly confused (at least I do) with an array of conflicting claims and hype.

Mike O'Neil
www.oneilresearch.com

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

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

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 09:45:45 -0600
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Organization: Market Shares Corporation
Subject: Happy?
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Toward the end of last night's debate, Hume asked this question. Does anyone know which recent poll he is citing?

BRIT HUME: Well, let me ask a question to Senator Kerry. Senator, there was a recent survey, recent poll, found that 95 percent of Americans said they were either very or rather happy.

Nick

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

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 10:54:42 -0500
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Subject: Re: Happy?
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <401141A9.9050204@marketsharescorp.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Nick Panagakis wrote:

>Toward the end of last night's debate, Hume asked this question. Does
>anyone know which recent poll he is citing?
>
>BRIT HUME: Well, let me ask a question to Senator Kerry. Senator, there
>was a recent survey, recent poll, found that 95 percent of Americans
>said they were either very or rather happy.

This, perhaps? Reminds me of the old Ramones song, "Shock Treatment,"
which has the refrain, "Happy happy happy all the time/Shock
treatment, doing fine."

>POLL ANALYSES

>January 5, 2004

>
>A Nation of Happy People
>Most are happy and satisfied with their lives

>
>by Lydia Saad

>
>GALLUP NEWS SERVICE

>
>PRINCETON, NJ -- Happiness. As in, "life, liberty, and the pursuit
>of." The nation's founders considered happiness to be one of the
>ultimate objectives of life, so when Gallup asks Americans how happy
>they are it's no trivial matter.

>
>Using the happiness standard, one would have to say the country is
>thriving. A Gallup Poll conducted Dec. 11-14 found a slight majority
>of Americans saying they are "very happy" and almost everyone saying
>they are at least "fairly happy." Only 4% admit to being unhappy.

>
>[rest at <<http://www.gallup.com/poll/releases/pr040105.asp>>]

--

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 with this text:
signoff aapornet

=====
Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 09:57:06 -0600
Reply-To: Lydia_Saad@GALLUP.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Lydia Saad <Lydia_Saad@GALLUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Happy?
Comments: To: mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

Nick,

That was a recent Gallup Poll, conducted Dec. 11-14, 2003

We asked "Generally speaking, how happy would you say you are -- very happy, fairly happy, or not too happy?"

The results were

55% Very happy
40% Fairly happy
4% Not too happy
1% No opinion

Gallup first asked this in 1956, and has updated it sporadically.

Lydia

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

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

From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM]
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2004 10:46 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Happy?

Toward the end of last night's debate, Hume asked this question. Does anyone know which recent poll he is citing?

BRIT HUME: Well, let me ask a question to Senator Kerry. Senator, there was a recent survey, recent poll, found that 95 percent of Americans said they were either very or rather happy.

Nick

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

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

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

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 10:41:47 -0500
Reply-To: "Wagner, Anne" <awagner@NATIONALJOURNAL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Wagner, Anne" <awagner@NATIONALJOURNAL.COM>
Subject: Re: Happy?
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

It's from a Gallup poll conducted 12/11-14/03

Generally speaking, how happy would you say you are -- very happy, fairly happy or not too happy?

Very happy	55%
Fairly happy	40
Not too happy	4
No opinion	1

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

From: Nick Panagakis [<mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>]
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2004 10:46 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Happy?

Toward the end of last night's debate, Hume asked this question. Does anyone know which recent poll he is citing?

BRIT HUME: Well, let me ask a question to Senator Kerry. Senator, there was a recent survey, recent poll, found that 95 percent of Americans said they were either very or rather happy.

Nick

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

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

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 10:26:25 -0600
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Organization: Market Shares Corporation

Subject: Re: Happy?

Comments: To: Lydia_Saad@gallup.com, "aapornet@asu.edu" <aapornet@asu.edu>

In-Reply-To: <16D7ABF1B1E58D4CB432013854C338F902CC63C0@exchng11.gallup.com>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Hume concluded - "Are you concerned at all, sir, that this bleak portrait that those running for president, including yourself, paint of the country may not resemble the country people, by the millions, are experiencing?" - misuse of a question asking about personal happiness.

Thanks.

Lydia_Saad@gallup.com wrote:

>Nick,

>

>That was a recent Gallup Poll, conducted Dec. 11-14, 2003

>

>We asked "Generally speaking, how happy would you say you are -- very happy,

>fairly happy, or not too happy?"

>

>The results were

>

>55% Very happy

>40% Fairly happy

>4% Not too happy

>1% No opinion

>

>Gallup first asked this in 1956, and has updated it sporadically.

>

>Lydia

>

>LYDIA SAAD

>Senior Editor, The Gallup Poll

>502 Carnegie Center, Suite 300

>Princeton, NJ 08540

>(609) 924-9600

>lydia_saad@gallup.com

>

>

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

>From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM]

>Sent: Friday, January 23, 2004 10:46 AM

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Happy?

>

>

>Toward the end of last night's debate, Hume asked this question. Does

>anyone know which recent poll he is citing?

>

>BRIT HUME: Well, let me ask a question to Senator Kerry. Senator, there

>was a recent survey, recent poll, found that 95 percent of Americans
>said they were either very or rather happy.

>
>Nick

>
>-----

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

>
>
>

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

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 11:37:30 -0500
Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Playing the Numbers -The Connection
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Black cloaked Rasputean pollsters?

The art and science of polling.

Features Ed Reilly and Ed Goeas

"There's a lot of say about issues like health care on the campaign trail right now, but you won't hear much about it in the news. What you will hear is the horserace, who's up, who's down, and who's been put out to pasture. Polls, stats and strategy dominate this year's election coverage like never before, and it's not just reporters talking about these things, it's voters.

Electability has become a buzzword for Democrats who are in search of a candidate who, if nothing else, just beat Bush. Many are telling pollsters that this year, choosing a candidate who can win is more important than finding a candidate who they agree with on the issues. This hour, an insiders' look at the art and science of the political numbers game, how it works and why we listen."

http://www.theconnection.org/shows/2004/01/20040123_a_main.asp

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, LLC

6115 Falls Road Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21209
410-377-7880 ext. 14
410-377-7955 fax

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

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 11:47:32 -0500
Reply-To: Richard Morin <morinr@WASHPOST.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Richard Morin <morinr@WASHPOST.COM>
Subject: New Poll Watchers column: NH--Pollsters' Graveyard,
Zogby Zinged, Optimistic Americans and more
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Here's a link to the latest Poll Watchers column, which was just posted
on [washingtonpost.com](http://www.washingtonpost.com). In this column:

New Hampshire: The Graveyard of Pollsters
Cracking on Zogby
A Nation of Optimists
The K-Factor in Iowa

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A41186-2004Jan23.html?nav=hptop_ts

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

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 10:55:02 -0600
Reply-To: Lydia_Saad@GALLUP.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Lydia Saad <Lydia_Saad@GALLUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Happy?
Comments: To: mail@marketsharescorp.com, aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

Nick,

This seems like a pretty subjective matter.

Is personal happiness relevant to the political issues of concern the
candidates are raising?

Should one focus on the 95% of Americans who are at least "fairly" happy, or

the 45% who are less than "very" happy?

According to the field of positive psychology as I understand it, most people are indeed "happy" (although with different "set points" that they return to after dealing with positive and negative experiences). Might not many third world residents say they are happy? It seems naive to suggest that because people are "happy" that there aren't real societal problems that need to be addressed.

So to answer you, I would say Hume's use of the question may be overly simplistic, but I would not call it a "misuse."

An interesting topic for discussion however...

Lydia

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

From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]

Sent: Friday, January 23, 2004 11:26 AM

To: Lydia_Saad@gallup.com; aapornet@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Happy?

Hume concluded - "Are you concerned at all, sir, that this bleak portrait that those running for president, including yourself, paint of the country may not resemble the country people, by the millions, are experiencing?" - misuse of a question asking about personal happiness.

Thanks.

Lydia_Saad@gallup.com wrote:

>Nick,

>

>That was a recent Gallup Poll, conducted Dec. 11-14, 2003

>

>We asked "Generally speaking, how happy would you say you are -- very happy,

>fairly happy, or not too happy?"

>

>The results were

>

>55% Very happy

>40% Fairly happy

>4% Not too happy

>1% No opinion

>

>Gallup first asked this in 1956, and has updated it sporadically.

>

>Lydia

>

>LYDIA SAAD

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

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

>From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM]
>Sent: Friday, January 23, 2004 10:46 AM
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>Subject: Happy?

>Toward the end of last night's debate, Hume asked this question. Does
>anyone know which recent poll he is citing?

>BRIT HUME: Well, let me ask a question to Senator Kerry. Senator, there
>was a recent survey, recent poll, found that 95 percent of Americans
>said they were either very or rather happy.

>Nick

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

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

=====
Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 12:04:37 -0500
Reply-To: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Happy?
Comments: To: Lydia_Saad@GALLUP.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=utf-8
Content-transfer-encoding: base64

VGhpcyB0aGVvcnkgb2YgaGFwcGluZXNzIGNvbXBvcnRzIHF1aXRIIG5pY2VseSB3aXRoIGEGYmVs
aWVmIHNVbWUgby2YgdXMgaGF2ZSB0aGF0IHdoZW4gcmVzcG9uZGluZyB0byBwb3NpdG12ZSBtZXNz
YWdlcywgbW9zdCBwZW9wbGUgYXJlIGluY2xpbmVkJHRvIGFuc3dlciBpbiBhbiBhZmZpcm1hdG12
ZSBtYW5uZXIsIGZvcnNpbmVvcnRzIHF1aXRIIG5pY2VseSB3aXRoIGEGYmVs
cmRlciB0byBnZXQgYSB0cnVlIHNVbWUgby2YgdXMgaGF2ZSB0aGF0IHdoYXQgIm1vdmVzIiB2b3RlcnMuDQogDQogDQog
DQpKYXNvbG0KIA0KIA0KDQoJLS0tLS1PcmlnaW5hbCBNZNzYwdlLS0tLS0gDQoJRnJvbTogQUFQ
T1JORVQgb24gYmVoYWxmIG9mIEx5ZGhlfmVzIiB2b3RlcnMuDQogDQogDQogDQpKYXNvbG0KIA0KIA0KDQoJLS0tLS1PcmlnaW5hbCBNZNzYwdlLS0tLS0gDQoJRnJvbTogQUFQ
NSBBTSANCglUbzogQUFQT1JORVRAYXN1LmVkdSANCglDYzogDQoJU3ViamVjdDogUmU6IEhhcHB5

Lm1jaS5jb20K

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 12:18:05 -0500
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Subject: Re: Happy?
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <40114B31.8010802@marketsharescorp.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Nick Panagakis wrote:

>Hume concluded - "Are you concerned at all, sir, that this bleak
>portrait that those running for president, including yourself, paint of
>the country may not resemble the country people, by the millions, are
>experiencing?" - misuse of a question asking about personal happiness.

Is there any research into whether answers to these kinds of questions are believable? Americans report far greater happiness than anyone else, right? That's a bit hard to believe. It's almost unpatriotic to be unhappy, so people may be giving what they think to be the "right" answer. If 95% of us are happy, who's taking all the Prozac and buying all the self-help/recovery books?

--

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 with this text:
signoff aapornet

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 09:20:13 -0800
Reply-To: Wei Yen <weiyen@UCLA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Wei Yen <weiyen@UCLA.EDU>
Subject: Re: Happy?
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <69E608346AC7D21198C20008C7F99F64077F1533@CAPITOL>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

So what is the response trend to this question? Does it vary from good years of economy to bad years, and from years presidents got re-elected to

years presidents got dumped?

Wei

At 10:41 AM 1/23/2004 -0500, Wagner, Anne wrote:

>It's from a Gallup poll conducted 12/11-14/03

>

>Generally speaking, how happy would you say you are -- very happy, fairly
>happy or not too happy?

>Very happy 55%

>Fairly happy 40

>Not too happy 4

>No opinion 1

>

>

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

>From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM]

>Sent: Friday, January 23, 2004 10:46 AM

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Happy?

>

>

>Toward the end of last night's debate, Hume asked this question. Does
>anyone know which recent poll he is citing?

>

>BRIT HUME: Well, let me ask a question to Senator Kerry. Senator, there
>was a recent survey, recent poll, found that 95 percent of Americans
>said they were either very or rather happy.

>

>Nick

>

>-----

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

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

>signoff aapornet

>

>-----

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

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

>signoff aapornet

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

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

signoff aapornet

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 11:19:32 -0600

Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>

Organization: Market Shares Corporation

Subject: Re: Happy?

Comments: To: Lydia_Saad@gallup.com, "aapornet@asu.edu" <aapornet@asu.edu>

In-Reply-To: <16D7ABF1B1E58D4CB432013854C338F902CC63C3@exchn11.gallup.com>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

A measure of personal happiness is misuse in this context - characterizing the candidates' political campaigns as being out of step with the general public. And not only is it misuse or at least simplistic, it's misleading and unbecoming of a fair and balanced news anchor.

Asking (hypothetically) are you very happy/fairly happy/not too happy *with the way things are going in the country today* or *with how George Bush is handling his job* as president would yield completely different results. That would a better measure of whether the campaigns "resemble [what] the country [the] people, by the millions, are experiencing".

Nick

Lydia_Saad@gallup.com wrote:

>Nick,

>

>This seems like a pretty subjective matter.

>

>Is personal happiness relevant to the political issues of concern the candidates are raising?

>

>Should one focus on the 95% of Americans who are at least "fairly" happy, or the 45% who are less than "very" happy?

>

>According the field of positive psychology as I understand it, most people are indeed "happy" (although with different "set points" that they return to after dealing with positive and negative experiences). Might not many third world residents say they are happy? It seems naive to suggest that because people are "happy" that there aren't real societal problems that need to be addressed.

>

>So to answer you, I would say Hume's use of the question may be overly simplistic, but I would not call it a "misuse."

>

>An interesting topic for discussion however...

>

>Lydia

>

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

>From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]

>Sent: Friday, January 23, 2004 11:26 AM

>To: Lydia_Saad@gallup.com; aapornet@asu.edu

>Subject: Re: Happy?

>

>

>

>Hume concluded - "Are you concerned at all, sir, that this bleak portrait that those running for president, including yourself, paint of

>the country may not resemble the country people, by the millions, are
>experiencing?" - misuse of a question asking about personal happiness.

>
>Thanks.

>
>
>Lydia_Saad@gallup.com wrote:

>
>
>
>>Nick,

>>
>>That was a recent Gallup Poll, conducted Dec. 11-14, 2003

>>
>>We asked "Generally speaking, how happy would you say you are -- very
>>
>>
>happy,

>
>
>>fairly happy, or not too happy?"

>>
>>The results were
>>
>>55% Very happy
>>40% Fairly happy
>>4% Not too happy
>>1% No opinion

>>
>>Gallup first asked this in 1956, and has updated it sporadically.

>>
>>Lydia

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

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

>>From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM]
>>Sent: Friday, January 23, 2004 10:46 AM
>>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>>Subject: Happy?

>>
>>
>>Toward the end of last night's debate, Hume asked this question. Does
>>anyone know which recent poll he is citing?
>>
>>BRIT HUME: Well, let me ask a question to Senator Kerry. Senator, there
>>was a recent survey, recent poll, found that 95 percent of Americans
>>said they were either very or rather happy.

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

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

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 12:30:12 -0500
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Organization: Rider University
Subject: Re: Happy?
Comments: To: "Wagner, Anne" <awagner@NATIONALJOURNAL.COM>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I didn't see the debate, but I hope that Hume's point was not that Americans are judged to be happy with the administration, politics, or anything else specific for that matter. I would be interested to see the actual trends on this question also, because I suspect that barring any disastrous events (i.e. wars, 9/11, etc.) the marginals don't change that much. I recall seeing one question on a survey back in the 70s that asked "How happy is your marriage?"-- about 97% said "very happy" or "fairly happy" in the midst of a soaring divorce rate.

"Wagner, Anne" wrote:

> It's from a Gallup poll conducted 12/11-14/03
>
> Generally speaking, how happy would you say you are -- very happy, fairly
> happy or not too happy?
> Very happy 55%
> Fairly happy 40
> Not too happy 4
> No opinion 1
>
> -----Original Message-----

> From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM]
> Sent: Friday, January 23, 2004 10:46 AM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Happy?

>
> Toward the end of last night's debate, Hume asked this question. Does
> anyone know which recent poll he is citing?
>
> BRIT HUME: Well, let me ask a question to Senator Kerry. Senator, there
> was a recent survey, recent poll, found that 95 percent of Americans
> said they were either very or rather happy.

> Nick

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

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

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

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 12:59:16 -0500
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Re: Happy?
Comments: To: Wei Yen <weiyen@UCLA.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I agree that the only way to make sense out of this question would be =
time series.

Historic data appear to be available from Gallup but only to their =
paying subscribers.=20

Perhaps it could be generously donated in the service of this =
discussion?

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

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

From: Wei Yen <weiyen@UCLA.EDU>

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Date: Friday, January 23, 2004 12:28 PM
Subject: Re: Happy?

So what is the response trend to this question? Does it vary from good years of economy to bad years, and from years presidents got re-elected = to years presidents got dumped?

Wei

At 10:41 AM 1/23/2004 -0500, Wagner, Anne wrote:

>It's from a Gallup poll conducted 12/11-14/03

>

>Generally speaking, how happy would you say you are -- very happy, = fairly

>happy or not too happy?

>Very happy 55%

>Fairly happy 40

>Not too happy 4

>No opinion 1

>

>

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

>From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM]

>Sent: Friday, January 23, 2004 10:46 AM

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Happy?

>

>

>Toward the end of last night's debate, Hume asked this question. Does anyone know which recent poll he is citing?

>

>BRIT HUME: Well, let me ask a question to Senator Kerry. Senator, there was a recent survey, recent poll, found that 95 percent of Americans said they were either very or rather happy.

>

>Nick

>

>-----

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

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

>signoff aapornet

>

>-----

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

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

>signoff aapornet

>-----

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

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

signoff aapornet

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

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 11:43:00 -0600
Reply-To: Lydia_Saad@GALLUP.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Lydia Saad <Lydia_Saad@GALLUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Happy?
Comments: To: weiyen@UCLA.EDU, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

I don't know how well this table will transmit, but here is the full Gallup Poll trend (note the low % saying "very happy" in Nov. 2001, presumably a 9/11 effect):

To answer Bob Worcester, Gallup does have other measures of this dimension that follow the more contemporary approach of using balanced scales, but we like updating this annually because the trend provides some interesting reference points. Also, the results of the those are not very different from this 3-pt scale. On a four point satisfied scale 58% of Americans recently told Gallup they were very satisfied with their lives, 30% were somewhat satisfied and a total of 11% were very or somewhat dissatisfied. That data was discussed side by side with the happiness data in Gallup's Jan. 5 release of this material.

--Lydia

6. Generally speaking, how happy would you say you are -- very happy, fairly happy, or not too happy?

	VH	FH	NTH	DK
2003 Dec 11-14	55	40	4	1
2002 Dec 5-8	49	44	6	1
2001 Nov 8-11	37	52	11	*
2000 Oct 6-9	47	47	5	1
1996 Mar 8-10	49	46	5	*
1992 Feb 28-Mar 1		43	47	9 1
1991 Feb 21		44	45	10 1
1982 Dec 10		50	43	6 *
1981 Dec 11		44	51	5 *
1981 Jun 5		46	43	10 1
1977 Nov 4		42	48	10 1
1957 Mar 5 ^	53	43	3	*
1956 Sep 20 ^	53	42	5	*

^ Third response category different wording: "or not very happy"

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

From: Wei Yen [mailto:weiyen@UCLA.EDU]
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2004 12:20 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Happy?

So what is the response trend to this question? Does it vary from good years of economy to bad years, and from years presidents got re-elected to years presidents got dumped?

Wei

At 10:41 AM 1/23/2004 -0500, Wagner, Anne wrote:

>It's from a Gallup poll conducted 12/11-14/03

>

>Generally speaking, how happy would you say you are -- very happy, fairly happy or not too happy?

>Very happy 55%

>Fairly happy 40

>Not too happy 4

>No opinion 1

>

>

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

>From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM]

>Sent: Friday, January 23, 2004 10:46 AM

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Happy?

>

>

>Toward the end of last night's debate, Hume asked this question. Does anyone know which recent poll he is citing?

>

>BRIT HUME: Well, let me ask a question to Senator Kerry. Senator, there was a recent survey, recent poll, found that 95 percent of Americans said they were either very or rather happy.

>

>Nick

>

>-----

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

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

>signoff aapornet

>

>-----

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

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

>signoff aapornet

>

>-----

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

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

signoff aapornet

>

>-----

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

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

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 12:49:28 -0500
Reply-To: "Feld, Karl" <kfeld@RTI.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Feld, Karl" <kfeld@RTI.ORG>
Subject: Re: Web Survey Software
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

Given the overwhelming number of requests I've had for more info. on Tim and his web survey software list, I checked the website address I have for him and am sharing it with the list. His work can be found at <http://www.macer.co.uk/>. There is a contact webpage there which will allow you write him a message. He's very personable and responsive, so you're best bet is to use the page to contact him or give him a call in the UK.

For those who receive the UK publication "research", his material is put out annually there in the software supplement. I'm sure he also has reprints available.

Karl G. Feld, Manager
Call Center Services
Survey Research Division
RTI International
p: 919-248-4557
kfeld@rti.org

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Feld, Karl
Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2004 1:41 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Web Survey Software

Mike,

Tim Macer in the UK does the best review I've ever seen. He puts it out annually. The last email I have for him is tim.macer@meaning.co.uk.

Regards,

Karl G. Feld, Manager
Call Center Services
Survey Research Division
RTI International
p: 919-248-4557
kfeld@rti.org

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Mike O'Neil
Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2004 11:42 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

The following link is for an article Tim Macer wrote about CfMC's WebCATI system.

<http://www.macer.com/arts/88.html>

Richard Rands

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

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 14:11:13 -0500
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: Happy?
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <16D7ABF1B1E58D4CB432013854C338F902CC63C4@exchng11.gallup.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Responses to this kind of fuzzy question are meaningless out of context, both in terms of what came before in the questionnaire itself and in relation to external events at the time the question was asked.

Some external context effects seem obvious, such as the markedly lower percentage saying "Very Happy" two months after the 9/11 attacks, but otherwise, there isn't much provided here to draw useful conclusions.

Jan Werner

Lydia Saad wrote:

.....

> 6. Generally speaking, how happy would you say you are -- very happy,
> fairly happy, or not too happy?

>
>
> VH FH NTH DK
> 2003 Dec 11-14 55 40 4 1
> 2002 Dec 5-8 49 44 6 1
> 2001 Nov 8-11 37 52 11 *
> 2000 Oct 6-9 47 47 5 1
> 1996 Mar 8-10 49 46 5 *
> 1992 Feb 28-Mar 1 43 47 9 1
> 1991 Feb 21 44 45 10 1
> 1982 Dec 10 50 43 6 *
> 1981 Dec 11 44 51 5 *
> 1981 Jun 5 46 43 10 1

> 1977 Nov 4 42 48 10 1
> 1957 Mar 5 ^ 53 43 3 *
> 1956 Sep 20 ^ 53 42 5 *

> ^ Third response category different wording: "or not very happy"

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

> From: Wei Yen [mailto:weiyen@UCLA.EDU]

> Sent: Friday, January 23, 2004 12:20 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Happy?

> So what is the response trend to this question? Does it vary from good
> years of economy to bad years, and from years presidents got re-elected to
> years presidents got dumped?

> Wei

> At 10:41 AM 1/23/2004 -0500, Wagner, Anne wrote:

>>It's from a Gallup poll conducted 12/11-14/03

>>Generally speaking, how happy would you say you are -- very happy, fairly
>>happy or not too happy?

>>Very happy 55%

>>Fairly happy 40

>>Not too happy 4

>>No opinion 1

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

>>From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM]

>>Sent: Friday, January 23, 2004 10:46 AM

>>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>>Subject: Happy?

>>Toward the end of last night's debate, Hume asked this question. Does
>>anyone know which recent poll he is citing?

>>BRIT HUME: Well, let me ask a question to Senator Kerry. Senator, there
>>was a recent survey, recent poll, found that 95 percent of Americans
>>said they were either very or rather happy.

>>Nick

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

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

>>signoff aapornet

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

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

>>signoff aapornet

>

>

> -----

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

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

> signoff aapornet

>

> -----

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

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

> signoff aapornet

>

>

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

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

signoff aapornet

=====

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 15:13:37 -0500

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

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Ken Sherrill <Ken@KENSHERILL.COM>

Subject: FW: Scientists pursue happiness

Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Curiously, this report arrived on another list today.

Ken Sherrill

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

>> Scientists pursue happiness

>>

>>

>><http://www.news.harvard.edu/gazette/2004/01.15/01-happiness.html>

>>

>> Results not too cheerful

>> By William J. Cromie

>> Harvard News Office

>>

>> Happiness is never as good as you imagine it

>> will be, and it never lasts as

>> long as you think it will. But the same also

>> holds true for unhappiness.

>> That's the conclusion of scientists who

>> cheerfully study this elusive state.

>>

>> "When we try to predict what will make us happy

>> we're often wrong," says

>> Daniel Gilbert, a professor of psychology at
>> Harvard University.
>> "Researchers all over the world find the same
>> predictable errors, whether
>> the pursuit involves romance, a new car, or a
>> sumptuous meal."
>>
>> Gilbert uses the results of his study of
>> election outcomes as an example.
>> Many Democrats insist that the re-election of
>> George W. Bush would make
>> them unbearably unhappy. Many Republicans
>> maintain that the election of
>> Howard Dean would send them and the whole
>> country into a deep ditch of
>> discontent for a long time to come. Gilbert
>> compares such forecasts to a
>> 1992 campaign when Bush squared off against Ann
>> Richards for the
>> governorship of Texas. Only one month after
>> Bush won, his supporters
>> weren't as happy as they thought they would be,
>> and those who opposed him
>> weren't as sad.
>>
>> "People are wonderful rationalizers," Gilbert
>> points out. "They will
>> rearrange their view of the world so it doesn't
>> hurt as much." Anti-Bushers
>> he interviewed said things like: "The governor
>> of Texas really doesn't have
>> much power" and "He wants to be president, so
>> he's not going to do anything
>> too dumb or crazy."
>>
>> The same holds true for lovers who break up. Rationalization quickly
>> replaces devastation. "She was never right for
>> me," the spurned lover says.
>> "I recognized that when she threw the ring in
>> my face."
>>
>> Raymond Damadian is a pronounced case in point.
>> He was so enraged about not
>> receiving the 2003 Nobel Prize for medicine for
>> his work in magnetic
>> resonance imaging (MRI), he spent thousands of
>> dollars on full-page
>> newspaper ads that explained in detail why he
>> should have gotten the award.
>> That was in October. By December, he told The
>> New York Times, "I feel
>> different now. Having been through what I've
>> been through, I don't want
>> (the Nobel Prize)."

>>

>> What is happiness?

>>

>> If psychologists all over the country are studying happiness, there must be a good definition of it. Not necessarily. Gilbert compares it to defining a thing like insanity. "It's hard to say what it is, but I know it when I see it," he says.

>>

>> Philosophers often give happiness a moral meaning. Aristotle claimed that a happy life is a life of virtue. If you are sinful, you can't be happy. Psychologists don't go that far. "It simply means feeling good," Gilbert says with a smile. The feeling you get when a granddaughter runs into your arms, when you help a lost tourist find her way, when you bite into the perfect hamburger or veggie burger. It's what tickles the sweet spot in the deep part of your brain.

>>

>> In other words, every happy person experiences the same feeling, but different things bring on that feeling. When a child jumps into a lap, it may be a transcendental experience for grandma, but just a screeching, wet kid for others. Such differences, however, don't go as deep as the fact that happiness joyfully jumps over cultural and species lines.

>>

>> "We haven't found any society that doesn't laugh," notes Gilbert. "Ninety percent of what makes one person happy makes other people happy. That's no surprise. We share the same brain architecture. And dogs, cats, and other mammals probably experience feelings a lot like our happiness."

>>

>> That said, happiness is an emotion, and emotions are not meant to be held onto. Fear is an emotion, but you don't want to hold onto it very long.

>>

>> What we fear is usually clear but we're more often wrong than we are right when we try to achieve happiness. Close your eyes and try to visualize what

>> will make you happy: a luxury car, a vacation
>> in the tropics, a sumptuous
>> meal, the blond hunk in the accounting
>> department. When you project
>> yourself into the future like this, researchers
>> agree that you will make a
>> predictable set of errors.
>>
>> Gilbert and other happiness investigators have
>> asked groups of people to
>> forecast their feelings about things that will
>> make them happy. Each person
>> assigns a number to how she or he will feel,
>> like on a scale of one to 10.
>> After they obtain that car, vacation, or lover,
>> they rate their feeling again.
>>
>> "We then subtract the two numbers," explains
>> Gilbert. "If the difference is
>> zero, then they are as happy as they thought
>> they would be. But as it turns
>> out, the difference is almost never zero."
>>
>> How to be happy
>>
>> "Is there some surgery, pill, program, or
>> religion to help us avoid this
>> robust and insidious bias?" Gilbert asks. He is
>> a pleasant, talkative,
>> theatrical person, like a good stand-up
>> comedian.
>>
>> "It turns out to be both the easiest and
>> hardest thing to do," he says.
>> "It's easy because you have the information you
>> need right in front of you.
>> It's hard because people don't want to use it."
>>
>> Instead of projecting yourself into the future,
>> trying to imagine how you
>> will feel, just ask someone who has had the
>> same experience, Gilbert
>> advises. Ask the person how they enjoyed dating
>> Lynn, visiting that
>> vacation spot, or choosing that school. "It's a
>> more accurate way to get
>> information than trying to guess it yourself,"
>> he points out. "But people
>> hardly ever use it."
>>
>> In one experiment, conducted with graduate
>> student Becca Norwick, Gilbert
>> asked people to predict how they would feel
>> after getting negative feedback

>> about their personality. To help them decide,
>> they could either review
>> information about the feedback process itself,
>> or find out how someone else
>> who got such feedback felt about it. They all
>> chose more information about
>> the process. As a result, they were less able
>> to accurately forecast their
>> own feelings than they would have been had they
>> known how others reacted.
>> Gilbert compares this to relying on a brochure
>> to pick a vacation spot
>> rather than asking someone of the same age how
>> they enjoyed visiting that
>> place.

>>
>> "People believe they can predict their
>> happiness more accurately without
>> drawing on the experience of others," Gilbert
>> says. "I dare say that living
>> next door to a family with ill-behaved,
>> undisciplined kids never stopped
>> people from having their own children."

>>
>> So what are the secrets to a happy life?
>> Gilbert recommends starting with
>> the fact that happiness is not a permanent
>> possession. It's a state that
>> you move in and out of. "The fact that you're
>> not always happy is not a
>> problem," he says. "So don't look for a
>> solution when there is no problem."

>>
>> Next, develop your own philosophy of happiness.
>> Don't accept the
>> consumerism philosophy delivered in ads that
>> tout new cars, more
>> fashionable clothes, or better restaurants.
>> "Look at your own life, and ask
>> what has brought you the most joy," Gilbert
>> notes. "Most times the answer
>> lies in people, in friends and family. It comes
>> mainly from relationships,
>> not from stuff.
>> "Finally, in trying to determine what will make
>> you happiest, look to
>> others who have already made the decisions you
>> face. Try to honestly figure
>> out how happy they are."

>>
>> Copyright 2003 by the President and Fellows of
>> Harvard College

Learn how to choose, serve, and enjoy wine at Wine @ MSN.
<http://wine.msn.com/>

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

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 16:01:31 -0500
Reply-To: lindeman@BARD.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>
Subject: Re: Happy?
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <FB166154BCF1004D9510D6FD9E53273B7C8C27@EXCHANGE.mori.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

> How does the Gallup USA data compare with the USA happiness question in
> the World Values Survey, do you know?

I ran the numbers for the 1990 WVS earlier because I was curious about Doug Henwood's question. [I haven't gotten around to downloading the '95 data, and the 2000 data haven't been posted yet.] It shows the U.S. at 39% "very" happy, 50% "quite" happy, 9% "not very" happy, and 1.3% "not at all" happy. Pretty similar, allowing for some fudge between "quite" and "fairly."

U.S. respondents were less happy, in the 1990 WVS, than inhabitants of The Netherlands, Denmark, Belgium, Ireland, Sweden, Iceland, and perhaps one or two other countries depending on how we do the comparison. Folks in The Netherlands were most likely to be "very" happy (46%); folks in Iceland were least likely to be not very or not at all happy (2.3% and 0.4% respectively). In Britain, the percentages were 35% very, 56% quite, 7% not very, and 1.6% not at all. All raw percentages.

So, Doug overstated the U.S. patriotic duty of happiness, but I agree with him and others that this question [Gallup or WVS] is pretty hard to interpret. (Although it seems to me that Inglehart or someone has tried to do something interesting with the cross-national comparisons....) One thing is for sure: plenty of "happy" people have voted against incumbents before. But Hume's question is interesting even though his choice of survey data was, umm, unpersuasive.

Mark Lindeman

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

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 16:27:06 -0500

Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>
Subject: Re: Happy?
Comments: To: lindeman@BARD.EDU, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <1074891691.40118babb7a1c@webmail.bard.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Mark Lindeman wrote:

> > How does the Gallup USA data compare with the USA happiness question in
>> the World Values Survey, do you know?

>
>I ran the numbers for the 1990 WVS earlier because I was curious about Doug
>Henwood's question. [I haven't gotten around to downloading the '95 data,
and
>the 2000 data haven't been posted yet.] It shows the U.S. at 39%
>"very" happy,
>50% "quite" happy, 9% "not very" happy, and 1.3% "not at all" happy. Pretty
>similar, allowing for some fudge between "quite" and "fairly."

Maybe I was confusing my memory of "happiness" with the Pew measures
of "satisfaction" (summarized at
<<http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?ReportID=165>> - it's in
a graphic, otherwise I'd paste it). U.S.ers are among the most
satisfied in the world, outdone, perhaps a bit surprisingly, by
Canadians and Guatemalans.

--

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 with this text:
signoff aapornet

=====
Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 16:54:53 -0500
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Exit Polls
Comments: To: AAPOR@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Are we going to have exit polls for the November 2004 elections?

-----=

Democracy at Risk

By Paul Krugman
NY Times | January 23, 2004

The disputed election of 2000 left a lasting scar on the nation's psyche. A recent Zogby poll found that even in red states, which voted for George W. Bush, 32 percent of the public believes that the election was stolen. In blue states, the fraction is 44 percent.

Now imagine this: in November the candidate trailing in the polls wins an upset victory but all of the districts where he does much better than expected use touch-screen voting machines. Meanwhile, leaked internal e-mail from the companies that make these machines suggests widespread error, and possibly fraud. What would this do to the nation?

Unfortunately, this story is completely plausible. (In fact, you can tell a similar story about some of the results in the 2002 midterm elections, especially in Georgia.) Fortune magazine rightly declared paperless voting the worst technology of 2003, but it's not just a bad technology it's a threat to the republic.

First of all, the technology has simply failed in several recent elections. In a special election in Broward County, Fla., 134 voters were disenfranchised because the electronic voting machines showed no votes, and there was no way to determine those voters' intent. (The election was decided by only 12 votes.) In Fairfax County, Va., electronic machines crashed repeatedly and balked at registering votes. In the 2002 primary, machines in several Florida districts reported no votes for governor.

And how many failures weren't caught? Internal e-mail from Diebold, the most prominent maker of electronic voting machines (though not those in the Florida and Virginia debacles), reveals that programmers were frantic over the system's unreliability. One reads, "I have been waiting =

for someone to give me an explanation as to why Precinct 216 gave Al Gore a minus 16022 when it was uploaded." Another reads, "For a demonstration I suggest you fake it."

Computer experts say that software at Diebold and other manufacturers is =

full of security flaws, which would easily allow an insider to rig an election. But the people at voting machine companies wouldn't do that, would they? Let's ask Jeffrey Dean, a programmer who was senior vice president of a voting machine company, Global Election Systems, before Diebold acquired it in 2002. Bev Harris, author of "Black Box Voting" (www.blackboxvoting.com), told The A.P. that Mr. Dean, before taking that job, spent time in a Washington correctional facility for stealing

money and tampering with computer files.

Questionable programmers aside, even a cursory look at the behavior of the major voting machine companies reveals systematic flouting of the rules intended to ensure voting security. Software was modified without government oversight; machine components were replaced without being rechecked. And here's the crucial point: even if there are strong reasons to suspect that electronic machines miscounted votes, nothing can be done about it. There is no paper trail; there is nothing to recount.

So what should be done? Representative Rush Holt has introduced a bill calling for each machine to produce a paper record that the voter verifies. The paper record would then be secured for any future audit. The bill requires that such verified voting be ready in time for the 2004 election and that districts that can't meet the deadline use paper ballots instead. And it also requires surprise audits in each state.

I can't see any possible objection to this bill. Ignore the inevitable charges of "conspiracy theory." (Although some conspiracies are real: as =

yesterday's Boston Globe reports, "Republican staff members of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee infiltrated opposition computer files for a year, monitoring secret strategy memos and periodically passing on copies to the media.") To support verified voting, you don't personally have to believe that voting machine manufacturers have tampered or will tamper with elections. How can anyone object to measures that will place the vote above suspicion?

What about the expense? Let's put it this way: we're spending at least \$150 billion to promote democracy in Iraq. That's about \$1,500 for each vote cast in the 2000 election. How can we balk at spending a small fraction of that sum to secure the credibility of democracy at home?

(end of NY Times article by Paul Krugman)

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 with this text:
signoff aapornet

=====

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 14:03:04 -0800
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@FSCGROUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Happy?
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Does anyone else think that the use of this measure for happiness might =
be problematic in terms of validity? Think about depression: the =
measure for depression is a series of questions. If you answer yes to =
too many of them, you're depressed. They don't use "Generally speaking, =
how depressed would you say you are -- very depressed, fairly depressed, =
or not too depressed?"

Leora=20

Leora Lawton, Ph.D.
Director of Consumer & Demographic Research
Population Research Systems, LLC
A Member of the FSC Group
100 Spear, Suite 1700
San Francisco, CA 94105
v: 415 777-0707, ex. 117; f: 415 777-2420;
m: 510 928-7572
www.populationresearchsystems.com

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

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

=====
Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 19:08:02 -0500
Reply-To: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
Subject: Happiness and the Golden Fleece
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Indeed, the seminal book on this is Reports on Happiness by Norman Bradburn.

Some of its findings:

Rich people are happier than poor people.

Married people are happier than single people, especially divorced or widowed.

Healthy people are happier than sick people.

etc.

Senator Proxmire gave Norman Bradburn the golden fleece award for this research.

The book came out in 1965.

Andy Beveridge

P.S. People generally say they are happy, so Hume's question is typical of "Fair and Balanced" questioning.

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

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

Sent: Friday, January 23, 2004 11:55 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Happy?

Nick,

This seems like a pretty subjective matter.

Is personal happiness relevant to the political issues of concern the candidates are raising?

Should one focus on the 95% of Americans who are at least "fairly" happy, or the 45% who are less than "very" happy?

According to the field of positive psychology as I understand it, most people are indeed "happy" (although with different "set points" that they return to after dealing with positive and negative experiences). Might not many third world residents say they are happy? It seems naive to suggest that because people are "happy" that there aren't real societal problems that need to be addressed.

So to answer you, I would say Hume's use of the question may be overly simplistic, but I would not call it a "misuse."

An interesting topic for discussion however...

Lydia

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

From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com]
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2004 11:26 AM
To: Lydia_Saad@gallup.com; aapornet@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Happy?

Hume concluded - "Are you concerned at all, sir, that this bleak portrait that those running for president, including yourself, paint of the country may not resemble the country people, by the millions, are experiencing?" - misuse of a question asking about personal happiness.

Thanks.

Lydia_Saad@gallup.com wrote:

>Nick,
>
>That was a recent Gallup Poll, conducted Dec. 11-14, 2003
>
>We asked "Generally speaking, how happy would you say you are -- very happy,
>fairly happy, or not too happy?"
>
>The results were
>
>55% Very happy
>40% Fairly happy
>4% Not too happy
>1% No opinion
>
>Gallup first asked this in 1956, and has updated it sporadically.
>
>Lydia
>
>LYDIA SAAD
>Senior Editor, The Gallup Poll
>502 Carnegie Center, Suite 300
>Princeton, NJ 08540
>(609) 924-9600
>lydia_saad@gallup.com
>
>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: Nick Panagakis [mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM]
>Sent: Friday, January 23, 2004 10:46 AM
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>Subject: Happy?
>
>
>Toward the end of last night's debate, Hume asked this question. Does
>anyone know which recent poll he is citing?
>

>BRIT HUME: Well, let me ask a question to Senator Kerry. Senator, there
>was a recent survey, recent poll, found that 95 percent of Americans
>said they were either very or rather happy.

>
>Nick

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

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

>
>
>

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

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

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

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

Date: Fri, 23 Jan 2004 20:49:57 -0600
Reply-To: "Norval D. Glenn" <ndglenn@MAIL.LA.UTEXAS.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Norval D. Glenn" <ndglenn@MAIL.LA.UTEXAS.EDU>
Subject: Re: Happy?
Comments: To: Leora Lawton <leoralawton@fscgroup.com>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <4E6F22AE2717564287952C727F796F93296564@fscmail.fsc.local>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I think that happiness and depression are rather different. Everyone has a good sense of the difference between being happy and being unhappy, but everyone doesn't know the difference between being depressed and not being depressed. Depression is a clinical concept whereas happiness is not. Can you imagine what a multi-item happiness scale would look like? How many different ways can you ask about a person's happiness? When you move away from the simplest and most straightforward questions, you tend to lose face validity, which is not the case in dealing with the various symptoms of depression.

The fact that the simple happiness questions used by Gallup and NORC, among other survey organizations, produce results that are consistent with common sense is evidence that the results are likely to be roughly valid. That was the point of Proxmire's Golden Fleece award to Norman Bradburn; why do research to demonstrate what everyone already knows? However, common sense is not always correct, and it doesn't always tell us what to expect. So the simple happiness questions can be useful if the responses to them are interpreted with caution.

There are of course times when one should be skeptical of what the happiness data show, and I don't have much confidence in the validity of international comparisons; a stoic cultural tradition may well bias the responses upward, and there are translation problems.

Norval Glenn

On Fri, 23 Jan 2004, Leora Lawton wrote:

> Does anyone else think that the use of this measure for happiness might be problematic in terms of validity? Think about depression: the measure for depression is a series of questions. If you answer yes to too many of them, you're depressed. They don't use "Generally speaking, how depressed would you say you are -- very depressed, fairly depressed, or not too depressed?"

>
> Leora
>
>
> Leora Lawton, Ph.D.
> Director of Consumer & Demographic Research
> Population Research Systems, LLC
> A Member of the FSC Group
> 100 Spear, Suite 1700
> San Francisco, CA 94105
> v: 415 777-0707, ex. 117; f: 415 777-2420;
> m: 510 928-7572
> www.populationresearchsystems.com

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

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

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

Date: Sat, 24 Jan 2004 14:10:33 -0600
Reply-To: David_Moore@GALLUP.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: David Moore <David_Moore@GALLUP.COM>
Comments: To: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0

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

Had Mr. Hume wanted to use other Gallup data, perhaps more relevant to the debate than the question about personal happiness, he might have considered a Jan. 9-11 poll that asked "Would you say George W. Bush has done anything that made you angry since he became president, or not?" 51% said yes, 48% said no.

Or another Gallup poll (Jan. 12-15) that asked "In general, are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way things are going in the United States at this time?" 53% said dissatisfied, 46% satisfied.

Perhaps he was unaware of these results.

David

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

From: Andrew A Beveridge [mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU]
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2004 7:08 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Happiness and the Golden Fleece

Andy Beveridge

P.S. People generally say they are happy, so Hume's question is typical of "Fair and Balanced" questioning.

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

=====
Date: Sat, 24 Jan 2004 17:08:38 -0500
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@RIDER.EDU>
Organization: Rider University
Subject: Re: Use of survey results in journalism
Comments: To: David_Moore@GALLUP.COM
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Members of the AAPORnet have spoken about this issue before, but perhaps with an election year looming we should find a way to state officially that there should be some guidelines regarding the manner in which journalists use survey data. Of course they could not be formalized, but it disturbs me when Brit Hume asks a question of a presidential candidate that my freshman students in public opinion

or methods would know is an invalid interpretation of the survey results. I realize that we often have these conversations on the AAPORnet, but is there some way to communicate to the general public, or at least to the media, that there should be some quality control on their use of survey results. Is there a need for an official statement by AAPOR?

David Moore wrote:

> Had Mr. Hume wanted to use other Gallup data, perhaps more relevant to the
> debate than the question about personal happiness, he might have considered
> a Jan. 9-11 poll that asked "Would you say George W. Bush has done anything
> that made you angry since he became president, or not?" 51% said yes, 48%
> said no.
>
> Or another Gallup poll (Jan. 12-15) that asked "In general, are you
> satisfied or dissatisfied with the way things are going in the United States
> at this time?" 53% said dissatisfied, 46% satisfied.
>
> Perhaps he was unaware of these results.
>
> David
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Andrew A Beveridge [mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU]
> Sent: Friday, January 23, 2004 7:08 PM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Happiness and the Golden Fleece
>
> Andy Beveridge
>
> P.S. People generally say they are happy, so Hume's question is typical of
> "Fair and Balanced" questioning.
>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

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

Date: Sun, 25 Jan 2004 11:28:29 -0500
Reply-To: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
Subject: FW: Happiness and the Golden Fleece
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

The reference is:
Bradburn, Norman M.

Reports on happiness; a pilot study of behavior related to mental health, by Norman M. Bradburn and David Caplovitz.

Chicago, Aldine Pub. Co. [1965]

xvi, 195 p. 23 cm.

Also see

Bradburn, Norman M.

The structure of psychological well-being, by Norman M. Bradburn, with the assistance of C. Edward Noll.

Chicago, Aldine Pub. Co. [1969]

xvi, 318 p. forms. 23 cm.

"And you can look it up," Casey Stengle.

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

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

signoff aapornet

=====
Date: Sun, 25 Jan 2004 18:52:54 +0000

Reply-To: worc@MORI.COM

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Robert Worcester <worc@MORI.COM>

Subject: Re: Happy?

Comments: To: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset="UTF-8"

Content-transfer-encoding: base64

V2UgZGllIGV4dGVuc2l2ZSBzcGxpdcBiYWxsb3QgZXhwZXJpbWVudHMgaW4gQnJpdGFpbiBhYm91
dCAyNSB5ZWVycyBhZ28gdGhhdCBzaG93ZWQgdXNpbmcmGdmFyaW91cyBMaWNrZXJ0IHNjYWxldmVv
YmFsIHRhZ3MgdGhhdCB0aGUgQnJpdGlzaCBwdWJsaWMgd2VyZSBtb3JlIGxpa2VseSB0byBhbnN3
ZlIgcG9zaXRpdmVseSB0byBwb3NpdG12ZWx5IHdvcmlZCBzdGF0ZW1lbnRzIHRoYW4gbmVnYXRp
dmVseSB0byBuZWdhdG12ZWx5IHdvcmlZCBzdGF0ZW1lbnRzIGJ5IGZyb20gNSUgdG8gMTAIICh3
aXRoIHNvbWUgb3V0bGllcnMplLgogCkVjYgogCIBTLCBpZiBhbnkgb2YgdGhvc2UgaW50ZXJlc2Vk
IHdhbnQgbXkgYm9vayBjaGFwdGVyIChpbiB0aGUgRGVtb3MgdGhpbmstdGFuayBib29rbGV0ICJU
aGUgR29vZCBMaWZlIiBvbiB0aGlzIGRpe2N1c3NpbmcmGdGhliIHJlc3VsdHMgb2YgdGhliIDE5OTUt
NyBXb3JsZCBWYWx1ZXMGU3VydmV5ICdoYXBwaW5lc3MnIGZpbmRpbmcmgbGV0IG1lIGtub3cgYW5k
IEkgY2FuIGVtYWlsIGl0IHRvIHlvdSBpbiB3b3JkIGZvcmlhdDsgZm9yIHRoZSBYb2ZWFsbHkgaW50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gICAg
biBiZWwhbGYgb2YgTHlkaWEgU2FhZAoJICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAg
IEFNCgkgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAg
dWJqZWNo0iBSZTogSGFwcHk/CgkgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAg
ICAg
LgoJICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAg
IHBvbG10aWNhbCBpc3N1ZXMGb2YgY29uY2VybiB0aGUKCSAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAgICAg

Best wishes,

Frank Faulbaum

--=20

Prof. Dr. Frank Faulbaum
University of Duisburg-Essen
Campus Duisburg
Department of Methodology in the Social Sciences/
Empirical Social Research
Social Survey Research Center
Lotharstra=DFe 65
D-47048 Duisburg
Germany

Phone: +49 (0) 203 379 2532
-2804 (Secretary)

Fax: +49 (0) 203 379 2532

e-mail: faulbaum@uni-duisburg.de

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

Date: Mon, 26 Jan 2004 15:17:28 -0500
Reply-To: elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Betsy Martin <elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV>
Subject: LAST CALL: Please send your nominations for the AAPOR Book
Award

by February 15th!

Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

AAPOR members are invited to submit nominations for the newly-created AAPOR Book Award by February 15, 2004. The AAPOR Book Award seeks to recognize influential books that have stimulated theoretical and scientific research in public opinion, and/or influenced our understanding or application of survey research methodology.

Monographs or edited volumes by AAPOR and non-AAPOR members are eligible for the award. Books published since 1992 that are at least three years old are eligible.

Nominations should identify the book, and discuss how it meets the criteria for the award:

1. The excellence of exposition, ideas, and methods.
2. The monograph=s impact with respect to:
 - a. stimulating theoretical or empirical research;

- b. influencing the way public opinion researchers think about or conduct research on public opinion;
 - c. significantly influencing broader understanding of the theory or methods of public opinion; or
 - d. advancing the state of the art or practice of survey methodology.
3. Its lasting value, as indicated by (for example) the judgments of peers and citation in the literature.

Please forward all nominations by 15 February 2004 to:

Howard Schuman
255 Popham Road
Phippsburg ME 04562
Telephone: 207-389-9101
Email: hschuman@umich.edu

or to

Elizabeth Martin
U.S. Bureau of the Census
3715 FOB3
Washington, DC 20233
Telephone: 301-763-4905
Email: emartin@census.gov

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

Date: Mon, 26 Jan 2004 12:18:56 -0800
Reply-To: steve johnson <stevej@nsdssurvey.org>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: steve johnson <stevej@NSDSSURVEY.ORG>
Subject: Re: insiders and outsiders
Comments: To: braun@zuma-mannheim.de, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-15
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear AAPORNET readers,

This is a little outside what we usually discuss, but collective wisdom here is pretty high - so. A trial attorney who defends capital murder charges just asked me if I know of any research on the difference between seeing an event in person vs watching it at a distance (i.e. through a window or on video. Where this comes from is that Oregon is currently holding some trials in prison and does not allow the public to be in the court room, but instead to watch through a window or on video. The attorney is arguing that this is not actually the same as allowing the public to attend in person. Any ideas or citations of psychology on this would be useful.

Best

Steve Johnson, Ph.D.
President, Northwest Survey & Data Services

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

Date: Mon, 26 Jan 2004 16:45:35 -0500
Reply-To: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>
Subject: FW: The GOP In NYC
Comments: To: "Qcsoclis@Qc. Edu" <qcsoclis@qc.edu>, AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear All:

My current column for the Gotham Gazette (posted today) is about the demographics of the GOP in NYC.

Here is the link for those interested:

<http://www.gothamgazette.com/article/demographics/20040126/5/853>

Andy Beveridge

Andrew A. Beveridge
Professor of Sociology
Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY
Suite 233 Powdermaker Hall
65-30 Kissena Blvd
Flushing, NY 11367-1597
Phone: 718-997-2837
FAX: 718-997-2820
email: beveridg@optonline.net
web: www.socialexplorer.com
Home Office
50 Merriam Avenue
Bronxville, NY 10708-2743
Phone: 914-337-6237
FAX: 914-337-8210
email: beveridg@optonline.net

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

Date: Tue, 27 Jan 2004 10:37:10 -0800
Reply-To: Dretha Phillips <dretha@WSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Dretha Phillips <dretha@WSU.EDU>

Subject: mode effects for Russian & Vietnamese speakers ?
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Do any of you have data -- published or not -- on response rates by mode for people (especially low-income) whose primary language is Russian or Vietnamese?

If others are interested, then I'll be happy to share what you can tell me.

Thanks!

Dretha M. Phillips, Ph.D., Senior Research Associate
Social and Economic Sciences Research Center
Washington State University
Wilson Hall 133, P.O. Box 644014
Pullman, WA 99164-4014
phone: 509-335-1511 (direct line 335-1528)
FAX: 509-335-0116
e-mail: dretha@wsu.edu

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

=====

Date: Tue, 27 Jan 2004 15:58:59 -0500
Reply-To: Christopher Fleury <cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Christopher Fleury <cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG>
Organization: Center for the Study of Services
Subject: Interviewing Candidates for Survey Research Positions
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear Colleagues:

Having conducting countless interviews over the last four years as our survey research group has doubled in size, I am (belatedly, perhaps) seeking feedback from other people in the survey research business about successful techniques for interviewing and vetting job candidates for junior- to mid-level positions in survey research and project management. Specifically, I am interested in hearing feedback (on or off the list) from anyone on:

1. What questions do you find most useful for assessing candidates during interviews? What questions do you ask their references?

2. What exercises (e.g., writing brief reports, data analysis examples) have you used successfully for evaluating job candidates?
3. What experience have you had using any kind of standardized tests?
4. Can anyone recommend any good resources (e.g., articles, books, websites) on the topic of effective interviewing and hiring for positions in survey research organizations?

Thanks.

Chris

Christopher J. Fleury, Ph.D.
Survey Director, Healthcare Research Group
Center for the Study of Services
733 15th Street N.W., Suite 820
Washington, DC 20005

Voice: 202-454-3031

Fax: 202-347-4000

E-mail: cfleury@cssresearch.org

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

Date: Wed, 28 Jan 2004 13:06:08 -0500
Reply-To: Josh Klein <jklein@igc.org>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Josh Klein <jklein@IGC.ORG>
Subject: Online focus group advice
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The market research firm where I work (midtown NYC) is investigating conducting focus groups online. Can anyone recommend the best/most cost-effective online focus group software? Is this something that requires service (consulting/phone or computer arrangements etc)? If so, please recommend who our firm might hire to do this. Thanks!

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

Date: Wed, 28 Jan 2004 13:49:01 -0500
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Re: Online focus group advice
Comments: To: Josh Klein <jklein@IGC.ORG>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

An article by Judith Langer (Roper Starch) in a recent issue of Quirk's =
Marketing Research magazine contained a review of traditional and =
alternative focus group techniques.

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

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

From: Josh Klein <jklein@IGC.ORG>
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Date: Wednesday, January 28, 2004 1:20 PM
Subject: Online focus group advice

The market research firm where I work (midtown NYC) is investigating =
conducting focus groups online. Can anyone recommend the best/most =
cost-effective online focus group software? Is this something that =
requires service (consulting/phone or computer arrangements etc)? If =
so, please recommend who our firm might hire to do this. Thanks!

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

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

Date: Thu, 29 Jan 2004 11:16:38 -0800
Reply-To: Elena Caudle <yeah4me07@YAHOO.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Elena Caudle <yeah4me07@YAHOO.COM>
Subject: Polling on Superbowl Sunday
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Has anyone had any experience with conducting polling
on the night of the Superbowl? We have a client who
is interested in doing a national survey regarding
some pre-game commercials, but every field house we've
contacted says they close on Superbowl Sunday due to
very low response rates.

Please reply off list if you have any experience with this issue...or if you are aware of a field house that is planning to be open.

Thanks!

Elena Caudle

Research Analyst

the polling company/WomanTrend

ecaudle@pollingcompany.com

phone (202) 667-6557

fax (202) 467-6551

Do you Yahoo!?

Yahoo! SiteBuilder - Free web site building tool. Try it!

<http://webhosting.yahoo.com/ps/sb/>

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

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

signoff aapornet

Date: Thu, 29 Jan 2004 13:21:42 -0700

Reply-To: Karen Lisko <KLisko@PERSUASIONSTRATEGIES.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Karen Lisko <KLisko@PERSUASIONSTRATEGIES.COM>

Subject: Onsite Data Collection Solutions

Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

<<http://www.persuasionstrategies.com/email/pshigh.jpg>> =09

<<http://www.persuasionstrategies.com>> =

<<http://www.persuasionstrategies.com>> www.persuasionstrategies.com =09

<<http://www.persuasionstrategies.com>> =09

=20

For our field work with written questionnaires, we are considering =

moving to a new hardware/software package for onsite data collection, =

analysis, and display of quantitative information. Three quick =
questions:

=20

1. Do you have a software package that you really love for this =
purpose?

=20

2. Do you have any experience, positive or negative, with EListen =
software and Scanmark OMR scanning?

=20

3. Do you have any experience, positive or negative, with SNAP survey =
software?

=20

Thanks in advance for your responsiveness.

=20

_____ =20

Karen Lisko, Ph.D.
Senior Litigation Consultant
303.295.8393
Suite 3200
555 Seventeenth Street
Denver, Colorado 80202-1450
klisko@persuasionstrategies.com

Member of the American Society of Trial Consultants

<<http://www.persuasionstrategies.com>> =20

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message is confidential and may be =
privileged. If you believe that this email has been sent to you in =
error, please reply to the sender that you received the message in =
error; then please delete this e-mail. Thank you.=09

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

Date: Thu, 29 Jan 2004 15:19:38 -0600
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Employment Opportunity Announcement
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Please post the following announcement to your listserve. Thank you.=20

Irene Marchuk, PHR
HR Specialist
American Institutes for Research
1000 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW

Washington, DC 20007

Phone (202) 944-5442

Fax (202) 342-5053=20

*****=20

AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH=20

RESEARCH ANALYST - ESSI=20

The Education Statistics Services Institute of the American Institutes =
for Research, a well-established not-for-profit social science research =
and development organization, seeks a Research Analyst to support its =
client, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Positions =
are available for candidates with strong qualitative and quantitative =
skills. Knowledge and experience required with education issues =
including, though not limited to, early childhood, special education, =
adult literacy, vocational education, school reform, teacher education, =
math, reading, psychometrics or statistics. Successful candidates will =
have Ph.D. in education, sociology, public policy, or another discipline =
that includes a specialization in education, together with strong =
research and interpersonal skills. =20

AIR offers an excellent compensation package and benefits including =
tuition reimbursement and transportation subsidy. Convenient location in =
downtown DC. Please e-mail resume with cover letter, independently =
written and edited writing sample, and availability to resumes@air.org =
Re: ESSI Analyst or forward to:=20

American Institutes for Research
Human Resources -ESSI Analyst
Education Statistics Services Institute
1000 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20007-3835
Fax (202) 944-5454=20
www.air.org
EEO=20

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

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

Date: Thu, 29 Jan 2004 17:15:56 -0500

Reply-To: Stephen Dienstfrey <S.DIENSTFREY@SRBI.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Stephen Dienstfrey <S.DIENSTFREY@SRBI.COM>

Subject: Follow up to Washington Times article on using Census data

Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Content-disposition: inline

A week or so ago, a citation for a Washington Times article about the use of Census data to attempt to pinpoint potential terrorists was sent over the Listserv. Several people in the public data user community exchanged notes on what really happened. Attached is the URL of a follow up article that appeared recently in the Washington Times. It is a bit less conspiratorial.

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/national/20040122-104701-2120r.htm>

Stephen Dienstfrey
Schulman, Ronca, & Bucuvalas, Inc.
(301) 608-3883

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

=====
Date: Fri, 30 Jan 2004 07:03:49 -0700
Reply-To: Michael Dimock <dimockm@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Michael Dimock <dimockm@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG>
Subject: A Good Day for the Pollsters
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

A GOOD DAY FOR THE POLLSTERS
The Accuracy of Pre-Election Tracking Polls in New Hampshire

Despite the jokes about the glut of pre-election tracking polls in New Hampshire, these surveys were remarkably accurate in predicting the outcome of the race. And an analysis shows that when accumulated together, they provided a virtually perfect snapshot of the New Hampshire electorate's voting intentions. Added together, the surveys predicted the level of support for every candidate within a single percentage point.

For full analysis, see:
<http://people-press.org/commentary/display.php3?AnalysisID=3D84>

Michael Dimock
Research Director
Pew Research Center for the People and the Press
<http://people-press.org>
202-293-3126

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

=====
Date: Fri, 30 Jan 2004 09:44:51 -0500

Reply-To: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Leo G. Simonetta" <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Re: Follow up to Washington Times article on using Census data
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <s0193faf.016@srbi.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

That link takes me to today's Washington Times front page and searches for Census and NASA as well as Census and Terrorists produced nothing - does anyone have the text of the article saved?

--

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 Stephen Dienstfrey

> Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2004 5:16 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Follow up to Washington Times article on using Census data

>

> A week or so ago, a citation for a Washington Times article about the use
> of Census data to attempt to pinpoint potential terrorists was sent over
> the Listserv. Several people in the public data user community exchanged
> notes on what really happened. Attached is the URL of a follow up article
> that appeared recently in the Washington Times. It is a bit less
> conspiratorial.

>

> <http://www.washingtontimes.com/national/20040122-104701-2120r.htm=20>

>

>

>

> Stephen Dienstfrey
> Schulman, Ronca, & Bucuvalas, Inc.
> (301) 608-3883

>

> -----

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

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

> signoff aapornet

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

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

Date: Fri, 30 Jan 2004 12:32:52 -0500

Reply-To: elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Betsy Martin <elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV>
Subject: Re: FW: Follow up to Washington Times article on using Census data
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

<http://www.washtimes.com/national/20040122-104701-2120r.htm>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Subject: Re: Follow up to Washington Times article on using Census data

That link takes me to today's Washington Times front page and searches for Census and NASA as well as Census and Terrorists produced nothing - does anyone have the text of the article saved?

--

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 Stephen Dienstfrey

> Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2004 5:16 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Follow up to Washington Times article on using Census data

>

> A week or so ago, a citation for a Washington Times article about the use
> of Census data to attempt to pinpoint potential terrorists was sent over
> the Listserv. Several people in the public data user community exchanged
> notes on what really happened. Attached is the URL of a follow up
article

> that appeared recently in the Washington Times. It is a bit less
> conspiratorial.

>

> <http://www.washingtontimes.com/national/20040122-104701-2120r.htm>=20

>

>

>

> Stephen Dienstfrey

> Schulman, Ronca, & Bucuvalas, Inc.

> (301) 608-3883

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

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

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

Date: Fri, 30 Jan 2004 13:25:04 -0500
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Colleen Porter <cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU>
Subject: Re: Interviewing Candidates for Survey Research Positions
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu, cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Content-disposition: inline

Wow, what a great question.

I hope you post a summary, because I think this may be of great interest to many. After all, this field demands so many different skills: Communicating well with clients, and teasing out what they really want. Knowing the capabilities and limitations of your survey software. Being able to speak Greek with the statisticians.

One of the more interesting questions I was asked at my last interview was to describe my worst survey experience ever, and then my best survey experience ever, and finally to highlight what made the difference. That really helped those interviewing me to get a sense of the full range of my experience, as well as what I think is important to ensure good data collection.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter
Senior Project Coordinator
cporter@phhp.ufl.edu
phone: 352\273-6068, fax: 352\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

>>> Christopher Fleury <cfleury@CSSRESEARCH.ORG> 1/27/2004 3:58:59 PM

>>>

Dear Colleagues:

Having conducting countless interviews over the last four years as our survey research group has doubled in size, I am (belatedly, perhaps) seeking feedback from other people in the survey research business about

successful techniques for interviewing and vetting job candidates for junior- to mid-level positions in survey research and project management. Specifically, I am interested in hearing feedback (on or off the list) from anyone on:

1. What questions do you find most useful for assessing candidates during interviews? What questions do you ask their references?
2. What exercises (e.g., writing brief reports, data analysis examples) have you used successfully for evaluating job candidates?
3. What experience have you had using any kind of standardized tests?
4. Can anyone recommend any good resources (e.g., articles, books, websites) on the topic of effective interviewing and hiring for positions in survey research organizations?

Thanks.

Chris

Christopher J. Fleury, Ph.D.
Survey Director, Healthcare Research Group
Center for the Study of Services
733 15th Street N.W., Suite 820
Washington, DC 20005

Voice: 202-454-3031

Fax: 202-347-4000

E-mail: cfleury@cssresearch.org

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

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

aapornet-request@asu.edu

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

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

Date: Fri, 30 Jan 2004 16:57:35 -0500

Reply-To: Nancy Berson <NBerson@CMS.HHS.GOV>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Nancy Berson <NBerson@CMS.HHS.GOV>
Subject: Request for Comments on a Japanese Pension Statistics Study
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
Comments: cc: imsl@cdc.gov, kjd0@cdc.gov
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
Content-disposition: inline

Please see the following request for assistance on improving the utility of a report on pension data statistics. If you can help, please reply directly to Ms. Shimizu. Thank you very much.

>>> "Shimizu, Iris M." <imsl@cdc.gov> 01/22/04 02:12PM >>>

I am a statistician at the National Center for Health Statistics. I recently received a hardcopy report from an acquaintance who now works at Nikko Financial Intelligence, Inc. (Japan) and a request for comments that would be helpful for their next work. The report title is "Pension Data in Japan, 2003 Winter." An electronic copy of the report appears (in both English and Japanese) at the website <http://www.nikko-fi.co.jp/pension/index.html>. Having never worked with financial or pension statistics, I do not feel equipped to make meaningful comments on the subject matter. Hence, the question is would you be able to provide either comments on the report or know of someone who would be interested in the report.

Iris Shimizu

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

Date: Fri, 30 Jan 2004 15:35:37 -0800
Reply-To: steve johnson <stevej@nsdssurvey.org>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: steve johnson <stevej@NSDSSURVEY.ORG>
Subject: Re: marketing assistance
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I was wondering if any of you survey directors and administrators have had a good experience using a marketing firm to help increase your customer base? If so, any recommendations or things to watch out for.

Thanks in advance
Steve Johnson, Ph.D.
President, Northwest Survey & Data Services
Eugene, Oregon

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

Date: Sat, 31 Jan 2004 13:34:29 -0500
Reply-To: Ron Rapoport <rbrapo@WM.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ron Rapoport <rbrapo@WM.EDU>
Subject: Web authoring programs for classes
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

I teach an undergrad course in political polling and survey analysis. Although I currently have them do projects in which they do face-to-face interviewing, exit polling and telephone interviewing as part of projects they design, I was think of adding or replacing one of these with websurveys. In order to do this I need a web-authoring program which is highly accessible to students and which they could easily use to create their own (rather short) surveys. I also need something which is not too costly.

I have about 60 students in the class, but they work in groups of four so, they could all use the program off of the same computer if necessary (although having a copy available on our network would be even better).

Any suggestions would be appreciated and I would be glad to report back on the suggestions to anyone interested.

Thanks.

Ron

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