

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 LOG0410"

---

Date: Fri, 1 Oct 2004 08:14:08 -0400  
Reply-To: "Andrew E. Smith" <andrew.smith@UNH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Andrew E. Smith" <andrew.smith@UNH.EDU>  
Subject: Re: New Controversy!!!!  
Comments: To: aaPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <000c01c4a744\$d12d7b10\$f3ada682@Mobel>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

I guess my questions were not satirical enough. I was not questioning the IBD/TIPP poll, what I'm sick and tired of is people criticizing the intentions of pollsters when they don't like the results of a poll!

The Moveon.org ad in the Times questioning Gallup's credibility was an incredibly cheap shot. But it's one thing for a political organization do make these charges, it's more troubling when people on AAPORNET, who should know better, echo them.

Andy Smith

At 04:25 PM 9/30/2004 -0700, you wrote:

>So, what does account for the difference? Sampling errors across the polls  
>play a role, yes. Anything else? Does IDB/TIPP have demographically  
>different samples, temporally different calling, or otherwise politically  
>different results? Were the questions asked the same way, with the same or  
>similar leading questions - and, if not, what differences were there in  
>terms of other questions asked before the Bush/Kerry one?

>  
>And is the difference unique to this set of averages? (Andrew Smith's  
>questions imply that perhaps IDB/TIPP consistently paints Kerry as doing  
>better than others.)

>  
>Ellis Godard

>  
>  
>

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

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

>>> Raghavan K. Mayur

>>> Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2004 1:46 PM

>>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>>> Subject: Re: New Controversy!!!!

>>>

>>>

>>> I direct the IBD/TIPP Poll. To briefly answer your question,  
>>> our methodology is given in the story that IBD ran today (see

>>> below). We have been using the same method for the past 6  
>>> months and simply report the #s -- we have no hidden agendas  
>>> or ulterior motives to make the #s swing one way or the  
>>> other. They are what they are -- and we simply report the  
>>> findings. And do our best to interpret them in light of  
>>> current events.

>>>  
>>> FYI: To answer your question "Are they cooking their  
>>> figures?" -- Absolutely not, "Does IBD have secret pro-Kerry  
>>> sympathies?" -- Again no.

>>>  
>>> You may go back to RealClearPolitics.com and look over this  
>>> year's election polling since the beginning and make your own  
>>> conclusions.

>>>  
>>>

>>> Raghavan Mayur  
>>> President, TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence

>>  
>

>-----

>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>set aapornet nomail  
>On your return send: set aapornet mail

Andrew E. Smith  
Director, The Survey Center  
Thompson Hall  
University of New Hampshire  
Durham, NH 03824  
603.862.2226

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Fri, 1 Oct 2004 09:34:46 -0500  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: Re: A blast from the  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <000901c4a74e\$69e41720\$1a01a8c0@CERC2.cerc.local>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I agree with John. Four years ago - and a week and half later than the  
CNN story below - here is what those same polls reported.  
<http://www.ncpp.org/1936-2000.htm>

Nick

John Nienstedt wrote:

>Right. But instead of viewing this as an indictment of the polls, I  
>think this just highlights how fluid things can get in a high stakes  
>presidential race. Even the best polls (and at the national level all  
>the polling firms produce quality research using sound methods) are just  
>snap shots in time. If you're a Kerry fan you shouldn't look at the  
>polls and shoot the messengers or hang your head. Things can turn and,  
>hey, that's what a campaign is for anyway -- to change minds. And, if  
>you're a Bush fan, you can't get complacent for similar reasons.

>

>John E. Nienstedt, Sr.

>john@cerc.net

>Get the edge at [www.cerc.net](http://www.cerc.net)

>

>

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Andrew A Beveridge

>Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2004 4:19 PM

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: A blast from the

>

>Four years ago, on October 27, 2000, a \*mere week and a half before\* the

>election, CNN said that polls from six major news sources -- CNN, USA

>Today,

>Gallup, ABC News and the Washington Post -- all found that George W.

>Bush

>was ahead in the popular vote. Some polls said Bush was substantially

>ahead.

>

>

>"WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Republican presidential nominee George W. Bush

>holds a

>49-to-43 percent edge over Democratic rival Al Gore in the latest

>CNN/Time

>poll, conducted Wednesday and Thursday.

>

>The poll of 2,060 adult Americans, including 1,076 likely voters, has a

>margin of error of plus or minus three percentage points and is thus in

>essential agreement with a CNN/USA Today/Gallup tracking poll also

>released

>Friday. That poll gives Bush a 52 percent [to] 39 percent edge over

>Gore.

>More important, both polls show the same snapshot of the current state

>of

>the presidential campaign: a solid advantage for Bush.

>

>ABC News and The Washington Post both have daily tracking polls today

>putting the race at 48 percent for Bush and 45 percent for Gore."

>[at:

><http://www.cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/10/27/cnntime.poll/index.htm>

>1  
>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>set aapornet nomail  
>On your return send: set aapornet mail  
>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>set aapornet nomail  
>On your return send: set aapornet mail  
>  
>  
>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Sat, 2 Oct 2004 13:58:15 -0700  
Reply-To: Shapard Wolf <[shap.wolf@ASU.EDU](mailto:shap.wolf@ASU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Shapard Wolf <[shap.wolf@ASU.EDU](mailto:shap.wolf@ASU.EDU)>  
Subject: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Dear Fellow AAPORNET members:

At the most recent AAPOR Executive Council meeting, the following language describing our position on the privacy of messages posted on AAPORNET was adopted:

-----  
AAPORNET is a community. It exists only electronically, but nonetheless it's a community with norms of behavior.

One of these norms is how we use each other's contributions outside the community. Not everyone may know the details, but AAPORNET is a closed, subscription-only list. Only AAPOR members may post messages and view the archives.

Therefore it's AAPOR Council's view that list members should ask the original poster(s) for permission when wanting to use another's posting for some purpose outside of AAPORNET (e.g., quoting to a reporter, lecturing in class, posting on a web page, etc.).

Some have argued that in this electronic world, a group with over 1,000

members has no expectation of privacy. That may be, but we believe AAPOR, and AAPORNET, is a more close-knit community than the blind anonymous internet at large.

---

You might also think about noting in your posts (or modifying your signature) to say whether or not it is OK to quote you and in what circumstances. I'll also be modifying the message footer and the archives page to remind everyone of this policy.

On behalf of Council,  
Shap Wolf  
Associate Chair, Publications & Information  
AAPORNET Volunteer Coordinator

---

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

---

---

Date: Sun, 3 Oct 2004 11:03:17 -0400  
Reply-To: martin plissner <[plissner@VERIZON.NET](mailto:plissner@VERIZON.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: martin plissner <[plissner@VERIZON.NET](mailto:plissner@VERIZON.NET)>  
Subject: FW: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
Comments: cc: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

On whose behalf has the executive council posted this curious fatwah? =  
Who  
is it designed to protect -- and from what? Do Nick Panagakis, say, or  
Nathaniel Ehrlich or Leon Simonetta, who regularly share their wisdom =  
and  
insights with a select company on this website, really pick up the Wall  
Street Journal or the New York Times each morning in dread of finding =  
their  
ideas emblazoned on the front page -- let alone find out that they've =  
been  
leaked by one of their colleagues to a seminar at Yale? I myself can't  
recall reading anything on AAPORNET whose author would have anything to =  
fear  
from (or, more to the point, much hope of) finding it cited on Meet the  
Press.

Does the council have sanctions in mind for those who fail to live by =  
its  
ill-advised rules. If Rich Morin, say, finds some interesting =  
observations  
on a polling issue by a variety of AAPOR members on a polling issue, =  
does he  
really have to solicit releases from all of them to cite them in his =  
paper?

For whose benefit, including the public, does the council impose this requirement? What abuse is it designed to curb? =20

Suppose one of those members who, the council posting acknowledges, =  
think  
this is a really dumb idea goes ahead and breaches the embargo. What =  
price  
does this person pay? A stiff reprimand? A disabled password? =  
Perhaps,  
for s second offense, to be drummed out of the body? One needs to know. =  
=20

What exactly, moreover, does the council mean by describing AAPORNET as =  
a  
"closed-subscription only list." Surely it cannot be suggesting some =  
kind  
of copyright issue. I subscribe to Public Opinion Quarterly, but it =  
never  
occurred to me that I needed an author's permission to quote from it. =  
Is  
that coming next?

Marty Plissner=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Shapard Wolf  
Sent: Saturday, October 02, 2004 4:58 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution

Dear Fellow AAPORNET members:

At the most recent AAPOR Executive Council meeting, the following language describing our position on the privacy of messages posted on AAPORNET was adopted:

-----  
AAPORNET is a community. It exists only electronically, but nonetheless it's a community with norms of behavior.

One of these norms is how we use each other's contributions outside the community. Not everyone may know the details, but AAPORNET is a closed, subscription-only list. Only AAPOR members may post messages and view the archives.

Therefore it's AAPOR Council's view that list members should ask the original poster(s) for permission when wanting to use another's posting for some purpose outside of AAPORNET (e.g., quoting to a reporter, lecturing in class, posting on a web page, etc.).

Some have argued that in this electronic world, a group with over 1,000 members has no expectation of privacy. That may be, but we believe AAPOR, and AAPORNET, is a more close-knit community than the blind anonymous internet at large.

---

You might also think about noting in your posts (or modifying your signature) to say whether or not it is OK to quote you and in what circumstances. I'll also be modifying the message footer and the archives page to remind everyone of this policy.

On behalf of Council,  
Shap Wolf  
Associate Chair, Publications & Information  
AAPORNET Volunteer Coordinator

---

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

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Sun, 3 Oct 2004 21:40:48 +0200  
Reply-To: Edith de Leeuw <[edithl@XS4ALL.NL](mailto:edithl@XS4ALL.NL)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Edith de Leeuw <[edithl@XS4ALL.NL](mailto:edithl@XS4ALL.NL)>  
Subject: Re: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution  
Comments: To: Shapard Wolf <[shap.wolf@asu.edu](mailto:shap.wolf@asu.edu)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[A7AF1AE70A8C124593A1AC831EFE46FE0594DDA8@ex3.asurite.ad.asu.edu](mailto:A7AF1AE70A8C124593A1AC831EFE46FE0594DDA8@ex3.asurite.ad.asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

It is good policy to acknowledge or cite someone, e.g. Shapard Wolf, Aaporlist, October 2, 2004.

Personally, I think writing to someone, and asking permission is a step to far.

I do not write to an author of an interesting article in POQ and ask permission to quote: I just quote and use a standard way (e.g. APA) to cite. The same for web pages, discussion list and the www in general. Author, source, and preferably date of posting.

Warm regards from

Edith de Leeuw, The Netherlands

p.s. By the way,

As long as you acknowledge the source, I gave everyone full permission to quote my posting, replies, and comment on aapornet, srms, OR ANY OTHER DISCUSSION LIST

HUGs, no bugs (as Janet always says) your EEE...

At 01:58 PM 10/2/2004 -0700, you wrote:

>Dear Fellow AAPORNET members:

>

>At the most recent AAPOR Executive Council meeting, the following  
>language describing our position on the privacy of messages posted on  
>AAPORNET was adopted:

>

>-----

>AAPORNET is a community. It exists only electronically, but nonetheless  
>it's a community with norms of behavior.

>

>One of these norms is how we use each other's contributions outside the  
>community. Not everyone may know the details, but AAPORNET is a closed,  
>subscription-only list. Only AAPOR members may post messages and view  
>the archives.

>

>Therefore it's AAPOR Council's view that list members should ask the  
>original poster(s) for permission when wanting to use another's posting  
>for some purpose outside of AAPORNET (e.g., quoting to a reporter,  
>lecturing in class, posting on a web page, etc.).

>

>Some have argued that in this electronic world, a group with over 1,000  
>members has no expectation of privacy. That may be, but we believe  
>AAPOR, and AAPORNET, is a more close-knit community than the blind  
>anonymous internet at large.

>-----

>

>You might also think about noting in your posts (or modifying your  
>signature) to say whether or not it is OK to quote you and in what  
>circumstances. I'll also be modifying the message footer and the  
>archives page to remind everyone of this policy.

>

>On behalf of Council,  
>Shap Wolf  
>Associate Chair, Publications & Information  
>AAPORNET Volunteer Coordinator

>

>-----

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

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

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



-----  
De noordzee, de noordzee....The sea, the sea....  
Sign the Green Peace petition at <http://www.steundenoordzee.nl/index.php>  
Let future generation enjoy our seas too

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Sun, 3 Oct 2004 15:07:46 -0500  
Reply-To: [Mary.Losch@uni.edu](mailto:Mary.Losch@uni.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mary Losch <[mary.losch@UNI.EDU](mailto:mary.losch@UNI.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[5.1.0.14.2.20041003213224.01ea2c00@pop.xs4all.nl](mailto:5.1.0.14.2.20041003213224.01ea2c00@pop.xs4all.nl)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

AAPORnet Colleagues,  
We had a fairly rigorous discussion of this when the issue first arose after an AAPORnet post was quoted publicly with no permission or even notification of the source of the quote. As noted then, the issue is one of expectations and professional standards. Citing a scientific journal is, I believe, quite different from citing a post on a closed list serve. That is the issue. For many of us, AAPORnet is a conversation among colleagues. It is not a public document. I would never use a quote from a conversation with a friend or colleague without asking first. If I'm not mistaken, that's all the Exec Council is suggesting. I have no objection to making a simple professional and personal courtesy an AAPOR policy. Best, Mary Losch

On 3 Oct 2004 at 21:40, Edith de Leeuw wrote:

> It is good policy to acknowledge or cite someone, e.g. Shapard Wolf,  
> Aaporlist, October 2, 2004.  
> Personally, I think writing to someone, and asking permission is a step to far.  
>  
> I do not write to an author of an interesting article in POQ and ask  
> permission to quote: I just quote and use a standard way (e.g. APA) to cite.  
> The same for web pages, discussion list and the www in general. Author,  
> source, and preferably date of posting.  
>  
> Warm regards from  
>  
> Edith de Leeuw, The Netherlands  
>  
> p.s. By the way,  
>

> As long as you acknowledge the source, I gave everyone full permission to  
> quote my posting, replies, and comment on aapornet, srms, OR ANY OTHER  
> DISCUSSION LIST

>  
> HUgs, no bugs (as Janet always says) your EEE...

>  
>  
>  
>  
> At 01:58 PM 10/2/2004 -0700, you wrote:

>>Dear Fellow AAPORNET members:

>>  
>>At the most recent AAPOR Executive Council meeting, the following  
>>language describing our position on the privacy of messages posted on  
>>AAPORNET was adopted:

>>  
>>-----  
>>AAPORNET is a community. It exists only electronically, but nonetheless  
>>it's a community with norms of behavior.

>>  
>>One of these norms is how we use each other's contributions outside the  
>>community. Not everyone may know the details, but AAPORNET is a closed,  
>>subscription-only list. Only AAPOR members may post messages and view  
>>the archives.

>>  
>>Therefore it's AAPOR Council's view that list members should ask the  
>>original poster(s) for permission when wanting to use another's posting  
>>for some purpose outside of AAPORNET (e.g., quoting to a reporter,  
>>lecturing in class, posting on a web page, etc.).

>>  
>>Some have argued that in this electronic world, a group with over 1,000  
>>members has no expectation of privacy. That may be, but we believe  
>>AAPOR, and AAPORNET, is a more close-knit community than the blind  
>>anonymous internet at large.

>>-----  
>>  
>>You might also think about noting in your posts (or modifying your  
>>signature) to say whether or not it is OK to quote you and in what  
>>circumstances. I'll also be modifying the message footer and the  
>>archives page to remind everyone of this policy.

>>  
>>On behalf of Council,  
>>Shap Wolf  
>>Associate Chair, Publications & Information  
>>AAPORNET Volunteer Coordinator

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

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

> -----

> De noordzee, de noordzee....The sea, the sea....  
> Sign the Green Peace petition at <http://www.steundenoordzee.nl/index.php>  
> Let future generation enjoy our seas too  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> set aapornet nomail  
> On your return send: set aapornet mail

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Sun, 3 Oct 2004 17:23:08 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Subject: more Gallup  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

This probably won't make me any friends here...

Forthcoming in LBO #109, preview just posted to the LBO website

A Republican bias at Gallup? A reason behind the funny numbers?  
<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Gallup.html>>

--

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>

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Sun, 3 Oct 2004 17:01:00 -0700  
Reply-To: Mike O'Neil <[mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU](mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike O'Neil <[mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU](mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[416015C2.31976.9E778B0@localhost](mailto:416015C2.31976.9E778B0@localhost)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I would like to add my concurrence.

I think we all benefit from the greater candor we may get when colleagues feel they are unlikely to be quoted (though, as anyone who has ever dealt with the press for any length of time knows, there is really no such thing as truly "off the record"; if it is juicy enough it may see print).

The appropriate analogy for AAPORNET is a conversation in the hallway, not a publication.

Mike O'Neil  
[www.oneilresearch.com](http://www.oneilresearch.com)

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>]On Behalf Of Mary Losch  
Sent: Sunday, October 03, 2004 1:08 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)  
Subject: Re: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution

AAPORnet Colleagues,  
We had a fairly rigorous discussion of this when the issue first arose after an AAPORnet post was quoted publicly with no permission or even notification of the source of the quote. As noted then, the issue is one of expectations and professional standards. Citing a scientific journal is, I believe, quite different from citing a post on a closed list serve. That is the issue. For many of us, AAPORnet is a conversation among colleagues. It is not a public document. I would never use a quote from a conversation with a friend or colleague without asking first. If I'm not mistaken, that's all the Exec Council is suggesting. I have no objection to making a simple professional and personal courtesy an AAPOR policy. Best, Mary Losch

On 3 Oct 2004 at 21:40, Edith de Leeuw wrote:

> It is good policy to acknowledge or cite someone, e.g. Shapard Wolf,  
> Aaporlist, October 2, 2004.  
> Personally, I think writing to someone, and asking permission is a step to  
far.  
>  
> I do not write to an author of an interesting article in POQ and ask  
> permission to quote: I just quote and use a standard way (e.g. APA) to  
cite.  
> The same for web pages, discussion list and the www in general. Author,  
> source, and preferably date of posting.  
>  
> Warm regards from  
>  
> Edith de Leeuw, The Netherlands  
>  
> p.s. By the way,  
>  
> As long as you acknowledge the source, I gave everyone full permission to  
> quote my posting, replies, and comment on aapornet, srms, OR ANY OTHER  
> DISCUSSION LIST  
>  
> HUGs, no bugs (as Janet always says) your EEE...  
>  
>  
>  
> At 01:58 PM 10/2/2004 -0700, you wrote:  
>>Dear Fellow AAPORNET members:  
>>  
>>At the most recent AAPOR Executive Council meeting, the following  
>>language describing our position on the privacy of messages posted on  
>>AAPORNET was adopted:  
>>  
>>-----  
>>AAPORNET is a community. It exists only electronically, but nonetheless  
>>it's a community with norms of behavior.  
>>  
>>One of these norms is how we use each other's contributions outside the  
>>community. Not everyone may know the details, but AAPORNET is a closed,  
>>subscription-only list. Only AAPOR members may post messages and view  
>>the archives.  
>>  
>>Therefore it's AAPOR Council's view that list members should ask the  
>>original poster(s) for permission when wanting to use another's posting  
>>for some purpose outside of AAPORNET (e.g., quoting to a reporter,  
>>lecturing in class, posting on a web page, etc.).  
>>  
>>Some have argued that in this electronic world, a group with over 1,000  
>>members has no expectation of privacy. That may be, but we believe  
>>AAPOR, and AAPORNET, is a more close-knit community than the blind  
>>anonymous internet at large.  
>>-----  
>>  
>>You might also think about noting in your posts (or modifying your  
>>signature) to say whether or not it is OK to quote you and in what

> > circumstances. I'll also be modifying the message footer and the  
> > archives page to remind everyone of this policy.  
> >  
> > On behalf of Council,  
> > Shap Wolf  
> > Associate Chair, Publications & Information  
> > AAPORNET Volunteer Coordinator  
> >  
> > -----  
> > Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> > Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>  
> Dr. Edith D. de Leeuw, MethodikA  
> Plantage Doklaan 40, NL-1018 CN Amsterdam  
> tel + 31 20 622 34 38 fax + 31 20 330 25 97  
> e-mail [edithl@xs4all.nl](mailto:edithl@xs4all.nl)  
> -----  
> De noordzee, de noordzee....The sea, the sea....  
> Sign the Green Peace petition at  
<http://www.steundenoordzee.nl/index.php>  
> Let future generation enjoy our seas too  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> set aapornet nomail  
> On your return send: set aapornet mail

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Sun, 3 Oct 2004 20:12:05 -0500  
Reply-To: "Moore, David" <[David\\_Moore@GALLUP.COM](mailto:David_Moore@GALLUP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Moore, David" <[David\\_Moore@GALLUP.COM](mailto:David_Moore@GALLUP.COM)>

Subject: Re: more Gallup  
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Doug,

Shame on you! Have you no decency?=20

You're right -- your column is sleaze. The notion that anyone here is subtly picking polling techniques that favor the Republican Party -- or the Democratic Party -- or any political position -- is just plain wrong. Sampling procedures are in place and have been for months and years, with adjustments made for the U.S. Census figures but not for any goal, subtle or otherwise, of getting more or fewer Republicans or Democrats. Our reasons for using likely voters were very carefully considered, but we also make it a point to mention the results of both likely and registered voters -- so take your pick.

It's one thing when our colleagues question our techniques, it's quite another when they question our motives, subtle or otherwise. Gallup has no incentive, nor desire, political or otherwise, to fit our sampling techniques with some partisan orientation. We want to be right, both in describing the dynamics of the election and in our final poll which we use to predict the outcome. Period. You should be ashamed of yourself for suggesting otherwise, with absolutely no reason or evidence to support your outrageous charges.

David=20

David W. Moore  
Senior Editor, The Gallup Poll  
david\_moore@gallup.com

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

From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM]=20  
Sent: Sunday, October 03, 2004 5:23 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: more Gallup

This probably won't make me any friends here...

Forthcoming in LBO #109, preview just posted to the LBO website

A Republican bias at Gallup? A reason behind the funny numbers?  
<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Gallup.html>>

--

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>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Sun, 3 Oct 2004 21:50:12 -0400  
Reply-To: Scott Keeter <[keeters@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG](mailto:keeters@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Scott Keeter <[keeters@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG](mailto:keeters@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: more Gallup  
Comments: To: "Moore, David" <[David\\_Moore@GALLUP.COM](mailto:David_Moore@GALLUP.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To:  
<[06C64DE644F85843A90884803225A8070466BAEA@exchng12.noam.gallup.com](mailto:06C64DE644F85843A90884803225A8070466BAEA@exchng12.noam.gallup.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Doug -- I have enjoyed many of your postings and the skepticism your organization has put forward. But this attack on Gallup is really crazy.

David is too polite to point out that their latest poll shows the race tied. (Please don't tell me it's a make up call.) They, like all of the major polling organizations with which I am familiar, conduct their polls according to their standard methods and then report the results -- whatever they may be.

You can criticize them for going to LVs too soon, or for using too tight a filter, but there is absolutely no rationale for them to fudge the data. Do they jerk us around during September and early October and then get serious, when it matters to their reputation? I doubt it.

David Moore... a Democrat?... I don't know... he plays golf pretty regularly at AAPOR conferences, which raises suspicions that he might be GOP (but no lime green pants). But I haven't seen Frank Newport on the links, so he may be a Democrat in disguise.

The party ID issue is vexatious (to use a term John Kerry might use).



Here's the Pew Research Center's take on it.

<http://people-press.org/commentary/display.php3?AnalysisID=97>

Honestly, I don't really know why the polls have bounced around, but please don't impugn the motives of people who are trying to make sense of what's going on.

Scott

Scott Keeter

Pew Research Center for the People and the Press

1150 18th St. N.W., Suite 975

Washington, DC 20036

Voice 202 293 3126 x16

Personal fax 206 600 5448

E-mail [keeters@people-press.org](mailto:keeters@people-press.org)

Web site <http://pollcats.net>

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Moore, David

Sent: Sunday, October 03, 2004 9:12 PM

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

Subject: Re: more Gallup

Doug,

Shame on you! Have you no decency?

You're right -- your column is sleaze. The notion that anyone here is subtly picking polling techniques that favor the Republican Party -- or the Democratic Party -- or any political position -- is just plain wrong. Sampling procedures are in place and have been for months and years, with adjustments made for the U.S. Census figures but not for any goal, subtle or otherwise, of getting more or fewer Republicans or Democrats. Our reasons for using likely voters were very carefully considered, but we also make it a point to mention the results of both likely and registered voters -- so take your pick.

It's one thing when our colleagues question our techniques, it's quite another when they question our motives, subtle or otherwise. Gallup has no incentive, nor desire, political or otherwise, to fit our sampling techniques with some partisan orientation. We want to be right, both in describing the dynamics of the election and in our final poll which we use to predict the outcome. Period. You should be ashamed of yourself for suggesting otherwise, with absolutely no reason or evidence to support your outrageous charges.

David

David W. Moore

Senior Editor, The Gallup Poll

[david\\_moore@gallup.com](mailto:david_moore@gallup.com)

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

From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM]  
Sent: Sunday, October 03, 2004 5:23 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: more Gallup

This probably won't make me any friends here...

Forthcoming in LBO #109, preview just posted to the LBO website

A Republican bias at Gallup? A reason behind the funny numbers?  
<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Gallup.html>>

--

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>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Sun, 3 Oct 2004 22:35:13 -0400  
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <[cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU](mailto:cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Colleen Porter <[cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU](mailto:cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Content-disposition: inline

>>>> martin plissner <plissner@VERIZON.NET> 10/03/04 11:03 AM >>>>  
> On whose behalf has the executive council posted this curious fatwah?  
> Who  
> is it designed to protect -- and from what?

I think it's from having our words ripped out of context. I think Mike O'Neill is right on, that AAPORNET postings are much like a water-cooler discussion--or a hallway conversation at th AAPOR conference. There is a different tone, level of fact-checking (vs. off-the-cuff opinions), and formality that is lacking in these informal conversations.

I think that the more ethical amongst us already do support and practice what council is suggesting. I've been asked on a few occasions for permission to use my postings. They have been for use in a textbook, a blog, and actually quite a few people asked to share some of my thoughts on IRB issues with their own boards.

I have to say that the when someone wanted to use an anecdote for a textbook, I insisted that he read the actual press report about which my posting had complained. I thought that was only fair, for a textbook. But in the informality of the AAPORNET exchange of which it was a part, it didn't seem necessary to include that full text as well.

Different forms of communication have different rules and consequences. I don't know about y'all, but in dealing with my children and employees, I try never to do a correction or criticism in writing. The written word can be re-read time and again, ripped out of context, perhaps with the person getting more and more upset, so it has a greater impact. I try to do that kind of thing face to face, or at worst by telephone, so that the words disappear into thin air and can be more easily forgotten. Compliments, however, can be written, and hopefully they will be re-read later.

Now, I might have been saying the exact same words in person as in a note--but they are perceived differently, being in a different medium. And I think that is part of the dilemma here: We are writing for one (informal) medium and yet those words might show up in another (formal) medium.

I don't consider an AAPORNET posting to be publication. I do write professionally, and I understand that once something is out there, it is fair game. An instructor at our local University used one of my newspaper columns in an English class--and that's fair use; they didn't need to ask my permission.

But I expect (and I admit, it may be unrealistic) for AAPORNET to be a comfortable place, where I can share honestly with people who understand the kind of work I do. If we always had to self-censor for fear that some journalist was listening in, it might not be near so much fun.

For those of you in big cities or research centers, this need for a comfortable place can be satisfied by in-person contact with colleagues.

I note that DC-AAPOR is having a happy hour-mixer this Thursday (I looked this up because I'm coming later in the month, but I never seem to time my trips to NY or DC for when there is an event.) But for those of us who are not exactly in hotbeds of public opinion research, AAPORNET plays a crucial role in our social support network. I confess that on a few occasions when I've been in over my head, I've picked up the AAPOR directory and just called someone out of the blue for advice, when I'd never met them in person but just knew them from AAPORNET.

> What exactly, moreover, does the council mean by describing AAPORNET as  
> a  
> "closed-subscription only list."

That's just what it is. It is not a public forum. It's not like a Usenet Group or a listserv to which anyone can sign up. It is designed to be only for AAPOR members, as a benefit of membership. Just how public it is, and what the expectations are...well, I think that is exactly what council is trying to address.

Colleen Kay Porter  
University of Florida

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 06:31:50 -0500  
Reply-To: Brian Vargus <[igem100@IUPUI.EDU](mailto:igem100@IUPUI.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Brian Vargus <[igem100@IUPUI.EDU](mailto:igem100@IUPUI.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: more Gallup  
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Along with other concerns, I would like to note that the assertion that polls impact voting intentions for the leader is disproved by both the 1980 race---Carter conceded when Pacific and Mountain states (and Alaska and Hawaii) were still voting and people still voted--subject of Congressional hearing no less. Also, there are many tests of Noelle-Neuman's Spiral of Silence that suggest it may be culture bound. One of the best that relates to this issue and shows Henwood's assertion at best questionable is Lavrakas, et al, "Public Reactions to Polling News...." in Lavrakas, et al, Polling and Presidential Election Coverage. Sage, 1991, pp151ff. At least get a polling fact correct if you are going to criticize someone--in what seems inappropriate fashion.

Brian Vargus  
Professor, Political Science  
Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis.  
Brian Vargus

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

From: "Doug Henwood" <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>

To: <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

Sent: Sunday, October 03, 2004 4:23 PM

Subject: more Gallup

> This probably won't make me any friends here...

>

> Forthcoming in LBO #109, preview just posted to the LBO website

>

> A Republican bias at Gallup? A reason behind the funny numbers?

> <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Gallup.html>>

> --

>

> 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>

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

> set aapornet nomail

> On your return send: set aapornet mail

>

>

>

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 07:43:37 -0400

Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>

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

From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>

Subject: Re: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution

Comments: To: martin plissner <[plissner@VERIZON.NET](mailto:plissner@VERIZON.NET)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain

Since Martin Pilsner has mentioned the fact that I share my wisdom with members of this community, let me do so in regard to the regulation. I have always believed that anything I say via email to anyone is a public statement to the entire world. I have absolutely no expectation of privacy or confidentiality, no matter the addressee. Where email differs importantly

from speech is that citations can be verified and corrected for both content and time.

I do not consider the council's position a fatwah, but an advisory and I shall abide by it.

I hereby give my blanket, and even enthusiastic, permission to use the content of any email I send to AAPORNET in any way they see fit. Just please spell my name correctly.

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.

Research Specialist

Michigan State University

Institute for Public Policy and Social Research

Office for Social Research

321 Berkey Hall

East Lansing, MI 48824

517-355-6672

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

From: martin plissner [mailto:plissner@VERIZON.NET]

Sent: Sunday, October 03, 2004 10:03 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: FW: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution

On whose behalf has the executive council posted this curious fatwah? Who is it designed to protect -- and from what? Do Nick Panagakis, say, or Nathaniel Ehrlich or Leon Simonetta, who regularly share their wisdom and insights with a select company on this website, really pick up the Wall Street Journal or the New York Times each morning in dread of finding their ideas emblazoned on the front page -- let alone find out that they've been leaked by one of their colleagues to a seminar at Yale? I myself can't recall reading anything on AAPORNET whose author would have anything to fear from (or, more to the point, much hope of) finding it cited on Meet the Press.

Does the council have sanctions in mind for those who fail to live by its ill-advised rules. If Rich Morin, say, finds some interesting observations on a polling issue by a variety of AAPOR members on a polling issue, does he really have to solicit releases from all of them to cite them in his paper? For whose benefit, including the public, does the council impose this requirement? What abuse is it designed to curb?

Suppose one of those members who, the council posting acknowledges, think this is a really dumb idea goes ahead and breaches the embargo. What price does this person pay? A stiff reprimand? A disabled password? Perhaps, for a second offense, to be drummed out of the body? One needs to know.

What exactly, moreover, does the council mean by describing AAPORNET as a "closed-subscription only list." Surely it cannot be suggesting some kind of copyright issue. I subscribe to Public Opinion Quarterly, but it never occurred to me that I needed an author's permission to quote from it. Is that coming next?

Marty Plissner

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Shapard Wolf  
Sent: Saturday, October 02, 2004 4:58 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution

Dear Fellow AAPORNET members:

At the most recent AAPOR Executive Council meeting, the following language describing our position on the privacy of messages posted on AAPORNET was adopted:

-----  
AAPORNET is a community. It exists only electronically, but nonetheless it's a community with norms of behavior.

One of these norms is how we use each other's contributions outside the community. Not everyone may know the details, but AAPORNET is a closed, subscription-only list. Only AAPOR members may post messages and view the archives.

Therefore it's AAPOR Council's view that list members should ask the original poster(s) for permission when wanting to use another's posting for some purpose outside of AAPORNET (e.g., quoting to a reporter, lecturing in class, posting on a web page, etc.).

Some have argued that in this electronic world, a group with over 1,000 members has no expectation of privacy. That may be, but we believe AAPOR, and AAPORNET, is a more close-knit community than the blind anonymous internet at large.

-----  
You might also think about noting in your posts (or modifying your signature) to say whether or not it is OK to quote you and in what circumstances. I'll also be modifying the message footer and the archives page to remind everyone of this policy.

On behalf of Council,  
Shap Wolf  
Associate Chair, Publications & Information  
AAPORNET Volunteer Coordinator

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

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

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 08:02:04 -0400

Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>

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

From: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>

Subject: Mystery Poller's First Strike

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

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

From Today's Papers distributed by Slate and at [Slate.com](http://Slate.com):

Moreover, Mark "Mystery Pollster" Blumenthal cautions on his blog that polls conducted over the weekend (i.e., post-debate surveys by Gallup and Newsweek) are generally less representative because they are often skewed toward people who more closely follow current events.

Andy Beveridge

---

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 10:17:55 -0400

Reply-To: Michael Cohen <[mcohen@FABMAC.COM](mailto:mcohen@FABMAC.COM)>

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

From: Michael Cohen <[mcohen@FABMAC.COM](mailto:mcohen@FABMAC.COM)>

Organization: FMA

Subject: This Has Got To Stop

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

In-Reply-To: <005101c4a9b4\$7ce29cd0\$a8c0@scottstudy>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I think that Scott has effectively addressed Doug's points so let's take the broader issue of political bias head on. It makes me sick to my stomach to see AAPORNet become a forum for questioning the political motives of outstanding professionals.

I worked with many of these folks over the almost five years I worked as a senior research director for Gallup. They are strictly non-partisan and



completely focused on what the data says, rather than what one group or another would want it to say.

I left the firm to practice a more political brand of research. From personal experience, I have never, ever, heard ANY of the folks who work for the poll express angst over findings in a partisan context. It's all about the data, period.

Let me give you some insight into three of these people who have been attacked unfairly over the past couple of weeks. I have worked with each one of them. It is sad that some appear to need these references.

1. David Moore is outstanding and as much of a straight shooter as you will find. I worked with him on one particular project and he was very strong on task and extremely helpful even in a highly charged environment.
2. Frank Newport is extremely bright and the model of someone you would want in front of your organization. If you attack the poll, you indirectly attack Frank, who would rather talk about the methodology, the questions and the answers.
3. George Gallup, Jr. is a wonderfully generous man. His personal interest in religion is not tied to partisan politics. Rather, he views religion as a social issue for all of us to investigate. MoveOn.org picked the wrong target for their ad.
4. Without naming names, I think the Democrats who are unhappy with the Gallup Poll would be surprised to know how many Democrats and Independents work there. Believe me, they are not trying to re-elect Bush. And frankly, this question is irrelevant.

I had a discussion with my boss, who was Bob Dole's pollster in 1996, about this whole hub-bub and he found it amusing that he was complaining about the results during Dole for President and now the MoveOn.org folks have a beef. You can quibble about the methods, but you should not doubt the intentions.

In closing, anyone who has questions about the poll should simply ask a member of their team. Leave the conspiracy theories for another message board, please. Let's keep this one about research.

\*\*\*\*\*

Michael D. Cohen, Ph.D.  
Vice President  
Fabrizio, McLaughlin & Associates  
915 King Street, Second Floor  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
703.684.4510 Phone  
301.938.4281 Mobile  
703.739.0664 Fax

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Scott Keeter  
Sent: Sunday, October 03, 2004 9:50 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: more Gallup

Doug -- I have enjoyed many of your postings and the skepticism your organization has put forward. But this attack on Gallup is really crazy.

David is too polite to point out that their latest poll shows the race tied. (Please don't tell me it's a make up call.) They, like all of the major polling organizations with which I am familiar, conduct their polls according to their standard methods and then report the results -- whatever they may be.

You can criticize them for going to LVs too soon, or for using too tight a filter, but there is absolutely no rationale for them to fudge the data. Do they jerk us around during September and early October and then get serious, when it matters to their reputation? I doubt it.

David Moore... a Democrat?... I don't know... he plays golf pretty regularly at AAPOR conferences, which raises suspicions that he might be GOP (but no lime green pants). But I haven't seen Frank Newport on the links, so he may be a Democrat in disguise.

The party ID issue is vexatious (to use a term John Kerry might use). Here's the Pew Research Center's take on it.

<http://people-press.org/commentary/display.php3?AnalysisID=97>

Honestly, I don't really know why the polls have bounced around, but please don't impugn the motives of people who are trying to make sense of what's going on.

Scott

Scott Keeter

Pew Research Center for the People and the Press

1150 18th St. N.W., Suite 975

Washington, DC 20036

Voice 202 293 3126 x16

Personal fax 206 600 5448

E-mail [keeters@people-press.org](mailto:keeters@people-press.org)

Web site <http://pollcats.net>

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Moore, David

Sent: Sunday, October 03, 2004 9:12 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: more Gallup

Doug,

Shame on you! Have you no decency?

You're right -- your column is sleaze. The notion that anyone here is subtly picking polling techniques that favor the Republican Party -- or the Democratic Party -- or any political position -- is just plain

wrong. Sampling procedures are in place and have been for months and years, with adjustments made for the U.S. Census figures but not for any goal, subtle or otherwise, of getting more or fewer Republicans or Democrats. Our reasons for using likely voters were very carefully considered, but we also make it a point to mention the results of both likely and registered voters -- so take your pick.

It's one thing when our colleagues question our techniques, it's quite another when they question our motives, subtle or otherwise. Gallup has no incentive, nor desire, political or otherwise, to fit our sampling techniques with some partisan orientation. We want to be right, both in describing the dynamics of the election and in our final poll which we use to predict the outcome. Period. You should be ashamed of yourself for suggesting otherwise, with absolutely no reason or evidence to support your outrageous charges.

David

David W. Moore  
Senior Editor, The Gallup Poll  
david\_moore@gallup.com

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

From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM]  
Sent: Sunday, October 03, 2004 5:23 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: more Gallup

This probably won't make me any friends here...

Forthcoming in LBO #109, preview just posted to the LBO website

A Republican bias at Gallup? A reason behind the funny numbers?  
<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Gallup.html>>

--

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>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 10:51:55 -0400  
Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
Subject: Bias In Polls  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear All:

As with the charges and counter-charges of liberal or conservative bias in news organizations (excluding Fox News, of course), it seems to me that if there are biases in polls they are the result of subtle and not obvious points, including the attrition processes and the likely voter model, the response profile of the sample, etc.

These are very difficult to get at or understand, but the recent WSJ article reproduced here enumerated many of these.

If a polling organization bent its results to favor one or another party their credibility would be jeopardized. However, a lot of polling is an art, as it has been from the beginnings.

Andy Beveridge

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 11:38:12 -0400

Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>

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

From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>

Subject: Party ID Data

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

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain

The Michigan State of the State Survey has been collecting Party ID data from approximately 1,000 respondents/quarter [total of 30,366] on a 7-point scale, as represented below:

	Strong Rep	Rep	Lean Rep		
Independent	Lean Dem		Dem	Strong Dem	
MEAN	14%	15%	9%		
11%	13%		16%	20%	
ST DEV	2%	2%	2%		
2%	2%		2%	3%	
MIN	11%	12%	6%		
8%	10%		13%	16%	
MAX	19%	19%	13%		
16%	17%		22%	29%	

Summing across all categories, we arrive at the following hypotheticals:

Min Rep 29%

Max Rep 51%

Min Dem 39%

Max Dem 68%

And in 31 quarters of data, the value of the Democrat Percent minus the Republican Percent in a given quarter has varied from 0% to 28%, with a mean of 11% and a standard deviation of 7%.

Given these unweighted data, I believe the variations in party ID that we have seen reported in the past few weeks are unremarkable.

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.

Research Specialist

Michigan State University

Institute for Public Policy and Social Research

Office for Social Research

321 Berkey Hall

East Lansing, MI 48824

517-355-6672

---

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 11:45:24 -0400

Reply-To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>

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

From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>

Subject: Re: Bias In Polls

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

In-Reply-To: <[0I5200GGHEMM6I@mta9.srv.hcvlny.cv.net](mailto:0I5200GGHEMM6I@mta9.srv.hcvlny.cv.net)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Andrew A Beveridge wrote:

>As with the charges and counter-charges of liberal or conservative bias in  
>news organizations (excluding Fox News, of course), it seems to me that if  
>there are biases in polls they are the result of subtle and not obvious  
>points, including the attrition processes and the likely voter model, the  
>response profile of the sample, etc.

>  
>These are very difficult to get at or understand, but the recent WSJ article  
>reproduced here enumerated many of these.

>  
>If a polling organization bent its results to favor one or another party  
>their credibility would be jeopardized. However, a lot of polling is an  
>art, as it has been from the beginnings.

Which was precisely my point, a point that got lost in all the  
defensive high dudgeon. If I may quote the conclusion to my piece  
<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Gallup.html>> , which either  
didn't get read or noticed or appreciated by all those who adopted  
the denunciatory mode:

>This isn't to say that Gallup cooks the books; I don't believe that.  
>But in a field where you have to make a lot of choices about  
>technique, your unconscious can easily lead you to embrace the ones  
>that fit your preferences.

That's not boilerplate - I really mean that.

I suppose most professions are reluctant to examine their own  
techniques critically, and most researchers are unwilling to look at  
how their own biases affect their empirical work. But this attitude  
of "we're right, you're wrong" is part of why so much of the public  
resents pollsters. Normally I'm not one of those resenters - I've  
defended polling against many of my left-wing colleagues in print, in  
cyberspace, and on the radio. But you guys should recognize you've  
got an image problem.

Curiously the latest Gallup poll reports a party ID of 32% Dem and  
30% Rep, or a 2 point Dem advantage - a shift in party affiliation of

14 points in a week. While that does bring the party ID figures back into line with the rest of the known universe, what could explain that kind of shift? Was there any technical rethink behind the defensiveness?

--

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>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 09:01:32 -0700  
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>  
Subject: Re: This Has Got To Stop  
Comments: To: Michael Cohen <mcohen@FABMAC.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <200410041424.i94EOL309807@ironmine.radix.net>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Though I have nothing to say about the Gallup organization per se, this much must be said generically about the discussion. As Steven Jay Gould demonstrated in his historic and historical little work on bias in research (*The Mismeasure of Man*), bias is often unconscious and subtle. People do not have to be devious to unintentionally introduce bias (or their own values) into their work. This is just as true of bench research scientists where the measurements--their quantities and qualities--are precisely defined and measured. But social science is fraught with so many more soft issues and variables that it is even more inevitable. Those who think that having created some variables and moved them into a quantifiable realm, they can now feel confident that they operate in the world of objectivity are misguided. The idea that, so long as one works with those numbers with appropriate statistical methods, one can be actually free from the dread of bias is absurd, yet it underpins some of the comments written to this list. People who believe such nonsense will defend the indefensible as easily as the defensible behavior of themselves and their colleagues and in so doing will ultimately do more harm than good. As someone once said, statistics don't lie, but liars use statistics. As we all know, the main problem in this field is not the data, but the before and after in the methods and analysis. So who is a likely voter? Right now we don't

know because there is no historical precedent for such a polarized electorate.

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

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Michael Cohen  
Sent: Monday, October 04, 2004 6:18 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: This Has Got To Stop

I think that Scott has effectively addressed Doug's points so let's take the broader issue of political bias head on. It makes me sick to my stomach to see AAPORNet become a forum for questioning the political motives of outstanding professionals.

I worked with many of these folks over the almost five years I worked as a senior research director for Gallup. They are strictly non-partisan and completely focused on what the data says, rather than what one group or another would want it to say.

I left the firm to practice a more political brand of research. From personal experience, I have never, ever, heard ANY of the folks who work for the poll express angst over findings in a partisan context. It's all about the data, period.

Let me give you some insight into three of these people who have been attacked unfairly over the past couple of weeks. I have worked with each one of them. It is sad that some appear to need these references.

1. David Moore is outstanding and as much of a straight shooter as you will find. I worked with him on one particular project and he was very strong on task and extremely helpful even in a highly charged environment.
2. Frank Newport is extremely bright and the model of someone you would want in front of your organization. If you attack the poll, you indirectly attack Frank, who would rather talk about the methodology, the questions and the answers.



3. George Gallup, Jr. is a wonderfully generous man. His personal interest in religion is not tied to partisan politics. Rather, he views religion as a social issue for all of us to investigate. MoveOn.org picked the wrong target for their ad.

4. Without naming names, I think the Democrats who are unhappy with the Gallup Poll would be surprised to know how many Democrats and Independents work there. Believe me, they are not trying to re-elect Bush. And frankly, this question is irrelevant.

I had a discussion with my boss, who was Bob Dole's pollster in 1996, about this whole hub-bub and he found it amusing that he was complaining about the results during Dole for President and now the MoveOn.org folks have a beef. You can quibble about the methods, but you should not doubt the intentions.

In closing, anyone who has questions about the poll should simply ask a member of their team. Leave the conspiracy theories for another message board, please. Let's keep this one about research.

\*\*\*\*\*

Michael D. Cohen, Ph.D.  
Vice President  
Fabrizio, McLaughlin & Associates  
915 King Street, Second Floor  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
703.684.4510 Phone  
301.938.4281 Mobile  
703.739.0664 Fax

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Scott Keeter  
Sent: Sunday, October 03, 2004 9:50 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: more Gallup

Doug -- I have enjoyed many of your postings and the skepticism your organization has put forward. But this attack on Gallup is really crazy.

David is too polite to point out that their latest poll shows the race tied. (Please don't tell me it's a make up call.) They, like all of the major polling organizations with which I am familiar, conduct their polls according to their standard methods and then report the results -- whatever they may be.

You can criticize them for going to LVs too soon, or for using too tight a filter, but there is absolutely no rationale for them to fudge the data. Do they jerk us around during September and early October and then get serious, when it matters to their reputation? I doubt it.

David Moore... a Democrat?... I don't know... he plays golf pretty regularly at AAPOR conferences, which raises suspicions that he might be GOP (but no lime green pants). But I haven't seen Frank Newport on the links, so he may be a Democrat in disguise.

The party ID issue is vexatious (to use a term John Kerry might use). Here's the Pew Research Center's take on it.

<http://people-press.org/commentary/display.php3?AnalysisID=97>

Honestly, I don't really know why the polls have bounced around, but please don't impugn the motives of people who are trying to make sense of what's going on.

Scott

Scott Keeter

Pew Research Center for the People and the Press

1150 18th St. N.W., Suite 975

Washington, DC 20036

Voice 202 293 3126 x16

Personal fax 206 600 5448

E-mail [keeters@people-press.org](mailto:keeters@people-press.org)

Web site <http://pollcats.net>

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Moore, David

Sent: Sunday, October 03, 2004 9:12 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: more Gallup

Doug,

Shame on you! Have you no decency?

You're right -- your column is sleaze. The notion that anyone here is subtly picking polling techniques that favor the Republican Party -- or the Democratic Party -- or any political position -- is just plain wrong. Sampling procedures are in place and have been for months and years, with adjustments made for the U.S. Census figures but not for any goal, subtle or otherwise, of getting more or fewer Republicans or Democrats. Our reasons for using likely voters were very carefully considered, but we also make it a point to mention the results of both likely and registered voters -- so take your pick.

It's one thing when our colleagues question our techniques, it's quite another when they question our motives, subtle or otherwise. Gallup has no incentive, nor desire, political or otherwise, to fit our sampling techniques with some partisan orientation. We want to be right, both in

describing the dynamics of the election and in our final poll which we use to predict the outcome. Period. You should be ashamed of yourself for suggesting otherwise, with absolutely no reason or evidence to support your outrageous charges.

David

David W. Moore  
Senior Editor, The Gallup Poll  
david\_moore@gallup.com

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

From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM]  
Sent: Sunday, October 03, 2004 5:23 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: more Gallup

This probably won't make me any friends here...

Forthcoming in LBO #109, preview just posted to the LBO website

A Republican bias at Gallup? A reason behind the funny numbers?  
<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Gallup.html>>

--

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>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 11:21:54 -0500

Reply-To: Robert Godfrey <[rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU](mailto:rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU)>

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

From: Robert Godfrey <[rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU](mailto:rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU)>

Subject: Re: Party ID Data

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

In-Reply-To: <[C5E0665BB776D311868400805FF5603A0591B5DD@sscintex.ssc.msu.edu](mailto:C5E0665BB776D311868400805FF5603A0591B5DD@sscintex.ssc.msu.edu)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Regarding Party ID issues, this piece from 2000 <http://slate.msn.com/default.aspx?id=92147> highlights the problems of disparity between polls, polling organizations, and their funders, which could easily transfer to the current discussion of Gallup. A question I wonder about is whether Frank Newport's "differential intensity" between the parties (from the above article) really a question, according to both Pew and Mark Blumenthal, of "party ID [being] closer to a demographic than it is to an attitude, but ... obscured by poor measurements of Party ID" ? (from <http://www.mydd.com/story/2004/10/1/195339/421#readmore>).

Robert Godfrey

---

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 12:39:21 -0400

Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>

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

From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>

Subject: Re: Party ID Data

Comments: To: "Stuefen, Randy" <[rstuefen@usd.edu](mailto:rstuefen@usd.edu)>

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

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain

Thanks. I had imported the data from excel as text.  
Here it is again as html:

Strong Rep  
Rep  
Lean Rep  
Independent  
Lean Dem  
Dem  
Strong Dem

MEAN

14%  
15%  
9%  
11%  
13%  
16%  
20%

ST DEV

2%  
2%  
2%  
2%  
2%  
2%  
3%

MIN

11%  
12%  
6%  
8%  
10%  
13%  
16%

MAX

19%  
19%  
13%  
16%  
17%  
22%  
29%

Min Rep  
29%

Max Rep  
51%

Min Dem  
39%

Max Dem  
68%

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
Research Specialist  
Michigan State University  
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research  
Office for Social Research  
321 Berkey Hall  
East Lansing, MI 48824  
517-355-6672

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

From: Stuefen, Randy [mailto:rstuefen@usd.edu]  
Sent: Monday, October 04, 2004 11:15 AM  
To: Ehrlich, Nathaniel; Stuefen, Randy  
Subject: RE: Party ID Data

Nat,  
Did this come through not scrambled? The data was put into Excel, copied,  
pasted in the email as html. I don't know if this will work better or not  
but it is worth a try??

Strong Rep  
Rep  
Lean Rep  
Independent  
Lean Dem  
Dem  
Strong Dem

Mean  
14%  
15%  
9%  
11%  
13%  
16%  
20%

Std Dev

2%  
2%  
2%  
2%  
2%  
2%  
2%

Min

11%  
12%  
6%  
8%  
10%  
13%  
16%

Max

19%  
19%  
13%  
16%  
17%  
22%  
29%

Randall M. Stuefen  
Director of Research

\*\*\*\*\*

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



\*\*\*\*\*

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

From: Ehrlich, Nathaniel [mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU]  
Sent: October 04, 2004 10:38 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Party ID Data

The Michigan State of the State Survey has been collecting Party ID data from approximately 1,000 respondents/quarter [total of 30,366] on a 7-point scale, as represented below:

	Strong Rep	Rep	Lean Rep	
Independent	Lean Dem		Dem	Strong Dem
MEAN	14%	15%	9%	
11%	13%		16%	20%
ST DEV	2%	2%	2%	
2%	2%		2%	3%
MIN	11%	12%	6%	
8%	10%		13%	16%
MAX	19%	19%	13%	
16%	17%		22%	29%

Summing across all categories, we arrive at the following hypotheticals:

Min Rep            29%  
Max Rep            51%

Min Dem            39%

Max Dem            68%

And in 31 quarters of data, the value of the Democrat Percent minus the Republican Percent in a given quarter has varied from 0% to 28%, with a mean of 11% and a standard deviation of 7%.

Given these unweighted data, I believe the variations in party ID that we have seen reported in the past few weeks are unremarkable.

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
Research Specialist  
Michigan State University  
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research  
Office for Social Research  
321 Berkey Hall  
East Lansing, MI 48824  
517-355-6672

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail  
=====

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 12:45:39 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[C5E0665BB776D311868400805FF5603A0591B5DC@sscentex.ssc.msu.edu](mailto:C5E0665BB776D311868400805FF5603A0591B5DC@sscentex.ssc.msu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I was debating whether to do something similar to what Nat Ehrlich did since I was mentioned by name in the same posting and I do tend to post quite a bit (thought I suspect most of my postings of late have been reposting of links or articles). I, like Nat, have always considered my postings to AAPORnet to be rather public statements. I also figured it was HIGHLY unlikely that anyone would want to quote me in/to the media. If I was sufficiently well know outside of AAPOR that many people would recognize my name I might well think differently.

What would bother me would be the assumption that my statements would be associated with the organization by which I am currently employed. Not that in my case that association would carry any connotation of validity as is the case with many other frequent posters from universities or nationally and internationally known polling organizations.

On Usenet I (and many others) used to signatures that proclaimed their opinion's independence thusly:

Opinions expressed are solely those of the author.  
Standard Disclaimer of Organizational Representativeness  
My Opinions! Mine! All Mine!  
The above posting are the personal opinions of the author and not the position of Acme LLC.

All this being said I do think it is probably a good idea for AAPOR to at least encourage those who wish to quote a comment on AAPORnet more broadly to contact the writer.

And for those of you waiting with bated breath to quote me to FOX news or CNN it's Leo not Leon!

--  
Leo G. Simonetta  
Research Director  
Art & Science Group, LLC  
As always opinions expressed are solely those of the author.

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

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

> Ehrlich, Nathaniel

> Sent: Monday, October 04, 2004 7:44 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution

>

> Since Martin Pilsner has mentioned the fact that I share my  
> wisdom with members of this community, let me do so in regard  
> to the regulation. I have always believed that anything I say  
> via email to anyone is a public statement to the entire  
> world. I have absolutely no expectation of privacy or  
> confidentiality, no matter the addressee. Where email differs  
> importantly from speech is that citations can be verified and  
> corrected for both content and time.

> I do not consider the council's position a fatwah, but an  
> advisory and I shall abide by it.

> I hereby give my blanket, and even enthusiastic, permission  
> to use the content of any email I send to AAPORNET in any way  
> they see fit. Just please spell my name correctly.

> Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.

> Research Specialist

> Michigan State University

> Institute for Public Policy and Social Research Office for

> Social Research

> 321 Berkey Hall

> East Lansing, MI 48824

> 517-355-6672

>

>

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

> From: martin plissner [mailto:plissner@VERIZON.NET]

> Sent: Sunday, October 03, 2004 10:03 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: FW: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution

>

> On whose behalf has the executive council posted this curious  
> fatwah? Who is it designed to protect -- and from what? Do  
> Nick Panagakis, say, or Nathaniel Ehrlich or Leon Simonetta,  
> who regularly share their wisdom and insights with a select  
> company on this website, really pick up the Wall Street  
> Journal or the New York Times each morning in dread of  
> finding their ideas emblazoned on the front page -- let alone  
> find out that they've been leaked by one of their colleagues  
> to a seminar at Yale? I myself can't recall reading anything  
> on AAPORNET whose author would have anything to fear from  
> (or, more to the point, much hope of) finding it cited on  
> Meet the Press.

>

> Does the council have sanctions in mind for those who fail to  
> live by its ill-advised rules. If Rich Morin, say, finds  
> some interesting observations on a polling issue by a variety

> of AAPOR members on a polling issue, does he really have to  
> solicit releases from all of them to cite them in his paper?  
> For whose benefit, including the public, does the council  
> impose this requirement? What abuse is it designed to curb?  
>  
> Suppose one of those members who, the council posting  
> acknowledges, think this is a really dumb idea goes ahead and  
> breaches the embargo. What price does this person pay? A  
> stiff reprimand? A disabled password? Perhaps, for a second  
> offense, to be drummed out of the body? One needs to know.  
>  
> What exactly, moreover, does the council mean by describing  
> AAPORNET as a "closed-subscription only list." Surely it  
> cannot be suggesting some kind of copyright issue. I  
> subscribe to Public Opinion Quarterly, but it never occurred  
> to me that I needed an author's permission to quote from it.  
> Is that coming next?

>  
> Marty Plissner

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Shapard Wolf  
> Sent: Saturday, October 02, 2004 4:58 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution

>  
> Dear Fellow AAPORNET members:

>  
> At the most recent AAPOR Executive Council meeting, the  
> following language describing our position on the privacy of  
> messages posted on AAPORNET was adopted:

> -----  
> AAPORNET is a community. It exists only electronically, but  
> nonetheless it's a community with norms of behavior.

>  
> One of these norms is how we use each other's contributions  
> outside the community. Not everyone may know the details, but  
> AAPORNET is a closed, subscription-only list. Only AAPOR  
> members may post messages and view the archives.

>  
> Therefore it's AAPOR Council's view that list members should  
> ask the original poster(s) for permission when wanting to use  
> another's posting for some purpose outside of AAPORNET (e.g.,  
> quoting to a reporter, lecturing in class, posting on a web  
> page, etc.).

>  
> Some have argued that in this electronic world, a group with  
> over 1,000 members has no expectation of privacy. That may  
> be, but we believe AAPOR, and AAPORNET, is a more close-knit

> community than the blind anonymous internet at large.  
> -----  
> -----  
>  
> You might also think about noting in your posts (or modifying your  
> signature) to say whether or not it is OK to quote you and in  
> what circumstances. I'll also be modifying the message footer  
> and the archives page to remind everyone of this policy.

>  
> On behalf of Council,  
> Shap Wolf  
> Associate Chair, Publications & Information AAPORNET  
> Volunteer Coordinator

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

> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> set aapornet nomail  
> On your return send: set aapornet mail

> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
> set aapornet nomail  
> On your return send: set aapornet mail

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 13:31:05 -0400  
Reply-To: Paul Guerino <[PGuerino@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM](mailto:PGuerino@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Paul Guerino <[PGuerino@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM](mailto:PGuerino@MATHEMATICA-MPR.COM)>  
Subject: Justices Let Stand Do-Not-Call Ruling  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A5575-2004Oct4.html>

Justices Let Stand Do-Not-Call Ruling  
Compiled from Wire Service Dispatches  
Monday, October 4, 2004; 12:40 PM

The Supreme Court let stand a lower-court ruling that telemarketers' rights to free speech are not violated by the government's nationwide do-not-call list.

Without comment, the justices rejected an appeal by commercial telemarketers against the lower-court ruling, which upheld as constitutional the popular program in which consumers can put their names on a list if they do not want to be called by telemarketers.

<SNIP>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 13:41:00 -0400  
Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: This Has Got To Stop  
Comments: To: Marc Sapir <[marcsapir@COMCAST.NET](mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

Gould's work on the measurement of intelligence is an interesting analogy because like the definition of likely voter, there has been no true consensus on the definition of intelligence. And Gould himself had an opinion on intelligence that amounts to bias. But as I tried to point out last week, absent an indisputable metric, the use of words like bias and error is really not appropriate.

What we are doing is making estimates, guesses, hypotheses, conjectures as to the nature of an abstraction.

Back in 1975, the director of research for the Michigan Center for Forensic Psychiatry estimated that there would be 128 cases presented for adjudication for competency to stand trial in the following year. There were exactly 128 cases in 1976. As I mentioned to everyone who asked me about it, it was a total fluke that the curve-fitting I had done over the past three years had worked out to be the exact figure. Guesses sometimes -- very infrequently -- turn out to be accurate, but accuracy in predicting the future, or inaccuracy for that matter, has nothing to do with the legitimacy or validity of the methods used to make those predictions.

All anyone can do is report honestly the methodology they use. You can always criticize the methodology as being biased, or you can accept it as unbiased.

But the bottom line is this: when you accuse someone of 'unconscious bias' you are implying that they do not employ the methodology that you accept as unbiased, you're calling him a liar.

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
Research Specialist  
Michigan State University  
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research  
Office for Social Research  
321 Berkey Hall  
East Lansing, MI 48824  
517-355-6672

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

From: Marc Sapir [mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET]

Sent: Monday, October 04, 2004 11:02 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: This Has Got To Stop

Though I have nothing to say about the Gallup organization per se, this much must be said generically about the discussion. As Steven Jay Gould demonstrated in his historic and historical little work on bias in research (The Mismeasure of Man), bias is often unconscious and subtle. People do not have to be devious to unintentionally introduce bias (or their own values) into their work. This is just as true of bench research scientists where the measurements--their quantities and qualities--are precisely defined and measured. But social science is fraught with so many more soft issues and variables that it is even more inevitable. Those who think that having created some variables and moved them into a quantifiable realm, they can now feel confident that they operate in the world of objectivity are misguided. The idea that, so long as one works with those numbers with appropriate statistical methods, one can be actually free from the dread of bias is absurd, yet it underpins some of the comments written to this list. People who believe such nonsense will defend the indefensible as easily as the defensible behavior of themselves and their colleagues and in so doing will ultimately do more harm than good. As someone once said, statistics don't lie, but liars use statistics. As we all know, the main problem in this field is not the data, but the before and after in the methods and analysis. So who is a likely voter? Right now we don't know because there is no historical precedent for such a polarized electorate.

Marc Sapir MD, MPH

Executive Director

Retro Poll

[www.retropoll.org](http://www.retropoll.org)

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Michael Cohen

Sent: Monday, October 04, 2004 6:18 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: This Has Got To Stop

I think that Scott has effectively addressed Doug's points so let's take the broader issue of political bias head on. It makes me sick to my stomach to see AAPORNet become a forum for questioning the political motives of outstanding professionals.

I worked with many of these folks over the almost five years I worked as

a senior research director for Gallup. They are strictly non-partisan and completely focused on what the data says, rather than what one group or another would want it to say.

I left the firm to practice a more political brand of research. From personal experience, I have never, ever, heard ANY of the folks who work for the poll express angst over findings in a partisan context. It's all about the data, period.

Let me give you some insight into three of these people who have been attacked unfairly over the past couple of weeks. I have worked with each one of them. It is sad that some appear to need these references.

1. David Moore is outstanding and as much of a straight shooter as you will find. I worked with him on one particular project and he was very strong on task and extremely helpful even in a highly charged environment.
2. Frank Newport is extremely bright and the model of someone you would want in front of your organization. If you attack the poll, you indirectly attack Frank, who would rather talk about the methodology, the questions and the answers.
3. George Gallup, Jr. is a wonderfully generous man. His personal interest in religion is not tied to partisan politics. Rather, he views religion as a social issue for all of us to investigate. MoveOn.org picked the wrong target for their ad.
4. Without naming names, I think the Democrats who are unhappy with the Gallup Poll would be surprised to know how many Democrats and Independents work there. Believe me, they are not trying to re-elect Bush. And frankly, this question is irrelevant.

I had a discussion with my boss, who was Bob Dole's pollster in 1996, about this whole hub-bub and he found it amusing that he was complaining about the results during Dole for President and now the MoveOn.org folks have a beef. You can quibble about the methods, but you should not doubt the intentions.



In closing, anyone who has questions about the poll should simply ask a member of their team. Leave the conspiracy theories for another message board, please. Let's keep this one about research.

\*\*\*\*\*

Michael D. Cohen, Ph.D.  
Vice President  
Fabrizio, McLaughlin & Associates  
915 King Street, Second Floor  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
703.684.4510 Phone  
301.938.4281 Mobile  
703.739.0664 Fax

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Scott Keeter  
Sent: Sunday, October 03, 2004 9:50 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: more Gallup

Doug -- I have enjoyed many of your postings and the skepticism your organization has put forward. But this attack on Gallup is really crazy.

David is too polite to point out that their latest poll shows the race tied. (Please don't tell me it's a make up call.) They, like all of the major polling organizations with which I am familiar, conduct their polls according to their standard methods and then report the results -- whatever they may be.

You can criticize them for going to LVs too soon, or for using too tight a filter, but there is absolutely no rationale for them to fudge the data. Do they jerk us around during September and early October and then get serious, when it matters to their reputation? I doubt it.

David Moore... a Democrat?... I don't know... he plays golf pretty regularly at AAPOR conferences, which raises suspicions that he might be GOP (but no lime green pants). But I haven't seen Frank Newport on the links, so he may be a Democrat in disguise.

The party ID issue is vexatious (to use a term John Kerry might use). Here's the Pew Research Center's take on it.

<http://people-press.org/commentary/display.php3?AnalysisID=97>

Honestly, I don't really know why the polls have bounced around, but please don't impugn the motives of people who are trying to make sense of what's going on.

Scott

Scott Keeter  
Pew Research Center for the People and the Press  
1150 18th St. N.W., Suite 975

Washington, DC 20036  
Voice 202 293 3126 x16  
Personal fax 206 600 5448  
E-mail keeters@people-press.org  
Web site <http://pollcats.net>

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Moore, David  
Sent: Sunday, October 03, 2004 9:12 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: more Gallup

Doug,

Shame on you! Have you no decency?

You're right -- your column is sleaze. The notion that anyone here is subtly picking polling techniques that favor the Republican Party -- or the Democratic Party -- or any political position -- is just plain wrong. Sampling procedures are in place and have been for months and years, with adjustments made for the U.S. Census figures but not for any goal, subtle or otherwise, of getting more or fewer Republicans or Democrats. Our reasons for using likely voters were very carefully considered, but we also make it a point to mention the results of both likely and registered voters -- so take your pick.

It's one thing when our colleagues question our techniques, it's quite another when they question our motives, subtle or otherwise. Gallup has no incentive, nor desire, political or otherwise, to fit our sampling techniques with some partisan orientation. We want to be right, both in describing the dynamics of the election and in our final poll which we use to predict the outcome. Period. You should be ashamed of yourself for suggesting otherwise, with absolutely no reason or evidence to support your outrageous charges.

David

David W. Moore  
Senior Editor, The Gallup Poll  
[david\\_moore@gallup.com](mailto:david_moore@gallup.com)

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

From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM]  
Sent: Sunday, October 03, 2004 5:23 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: more Gallup

This probably won't make me any friends here...

Forthcoming in LBO #109, preview just posted to the LBO website

A Republican bias at Gallup? A reason behind the funny numbers?

<<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Gallup.html>>

--

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>

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 13:36:26 -0400

Reply-To: [ckkenned@UMICH.EDU](mailto:ckkenned@UMICH.EDU)

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

From: Courtney Kennedy <[ckkenned@UMICH.EDU](mailto:ckkenned@UMICH.EDU)>

Subject: Do Not Call List - Supreme Court Challenge

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Oct 4, 1:13 PM EDT

Supreme Court Won't Hear Do Not Call Case

WASHINGTON (AP) -- The Supreme Court turned away a challenge Monday to the federal do-not-call registry, ending telemarketers' bid to invoke free-speech arguments to get the popular ban on unwanted phone solicitations thrown out.

The court, without comment, let stand a 10th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals decision that upheld the registry of more than 57 million phone numbers as a reasonable government attempt to safeguard personal privacy and reduce telemarketing abuse.

Under the 2003 federal law, businesses face fines of up to \$11,000 if they call people who sign up for the registry - unless they have recently done business with them. Charities, pollsters and callers on behalf of politicians, however, are exempt.

Telemarketing groups had filed the appeal, arguing in filings that the registry violated First Amendment rights because it singled businesses out while exempting other groups. They also said 2 million of their 6.5 million workers will lose their jobs within two years if the do-not-call rules stand.

A federal judge in Denver agreed with the telemarketers, but the circuit court upheld the registry in February 2004 after concluding there was no evidence suggesting that charitable or political callers were as intrusive to consumers' privacy.

The case is American Teleservices Association v. FTC, 03-1552.

----

On the Net:

Interactive

The Court

Brown v. Board of Ed Decision

Supreme Court: <http://www.supremecourtus.gov/>

© 2004 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed.

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

Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail  
=====

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 13:50:58 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Frank Luntz & MSNBC  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

From  
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A4636-2004Oct3.html>

Pollster Frank Luntz is crying foul after MSNBC canceled his long-scheduled focus group two days before the debate. Luntz, who is under contract to MSNBC, had already spent \$30,000 on recruits for several focus groups and invited reporters in Florida to watch -- only to be told that the network didn't want to declare a winner in the debate.

"I think they buckled to political pressure," says Luntz, who has advised Republicans from Newt Gingrich to Rudy Giuliani but says he's done no GOP work since 2001. "They caved. . . . Why is it that Democrats are allowed to do this" after leaving politics, "but Republicans aren't?"

But MSNBC spokesman Jeremy Gaines says: "We made a decision not to use focus groups as part of our debate coverage. This decision had nothing to do with Frank's past work or politics. We think our viewers should be able to make up their own minds without 'scientific' help" -- despite the fact that the network has prominently featured Luntz and his on-air focus groups for four years.

Luntz has criticized President Bush on occasion, and his non-televised focus group, ironically, favored Kerry in the debate. Some NBC executives find him extremely fair but believe his longtime GOP links create a perception problem.

"For me, nothing is more important than getting it right," Luntz says. He says MSNBC bowed to pressure from conservative-turned-liberal activist David Brock in dumping him and that the network hasn't even agreed to use him as an analyst -- sans focus groups -- in this week's debates.

--

Leo G. Simonetta  
Research Director  
Art & Science Group, LLC  
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
Baltimore MD 21209

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 13:58:27 -0400  
Reply-To: Brian Dautch <[bdautch@CMOR.ORG](mailto:bdautch@CMOR.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Brian Dautch <[bdautch@CMOR.ORG](mailto:bdautch@CMOR.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: Do Not Call List - Supreme Court Challenge  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[1096911386.41618a1a3fb9c@web.mail.umich.edu](mailto:1096911386.41618a1a3fb9c@web.mail.umich.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

I have uploaded a story on this point to [www.cmor.org](http://www.cmor.org), if anyone wants to see (granted, it is strikingly similar to the messages posted here). If anyone has questions about legal or political ramifications, please feel free to contact me.

Thanks,  
Brian

Brian Dautch  
Director of Government Affairs

CMOR  
Promoting and Advocating Survey Research  
7475 Wisconsin Ave., Suite 300  
Bethesda, MD 20814  
ph: (301) 654-6601  
fax: (208) 693-0564  
[bdautch@cmor.org](mailto:bdautch@cmor.org) <<mailto:bdautch@cmor.org>>

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Courtney Kennedy  
Sent: Monday, October 04, 2004 1:36 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Do Not Call List - Supreme Court Challenge

Oct 4, 1:13 PM EDT

## Supreme Court Won't Hear Do Not Call Case

WASHINGTON (AP) -- The Supreme Court turned away a challenge Monday to the federal do-not-call registry, ending telemarketers' bid to invoke free-speech arguments to get the popular ban on unwanted phone solicitations thrown out.

The court, without comment, let stand a 10th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals decision that upheld the registry of more than 57 million phone numbers as a reasonable government attempt to safeguard personal privacy and reduce telemarketing abuse.

Under the 2003 federal law, businesses face fines of up to \$11,000 if they call people who sign up for the registry - unless they have recently done business with them. Charities, pollsters and callers on behalf of politicians, however, are exempt.

Telemarketing groups had filed the appeal, arguing in filings that the registry violated First Amendment rights because it singled businesses out while exempting other groups. They also said 2 million of their 6.5 million workers will lose their jobs within two years if the do-not-call rules stand.

A federal judge in Denver agreed with the telemarketers, but the circuit court upheld the registry in February 2004 after concluding there was no evidence suggesting that charitable or political callers were as intrusive to consumers' privacy.

The case is American Teleservices Association v. FTC, 03-1552.

----

On the Net:

Interactive  
The Court  
Brown v. Board of Ed Decision

Supreme Court: <http://www.supremecourtus.gov/>

© 2004 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 13:54:47 -0400  
Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>  
Subject: FW: Party ID Data  
Comments: To: "AAPORNET@asu.edu" <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

Last attempt: let's see if this works. If not, email me directly and I'll send you the excel spreadsheet.

Please scroll down.

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.

Research Specialist

Michigan State University

Institute for Public Policy and Social Research

Office for Social Research

321 Berkey Hall

East Lansing, MI 48824

517-355-6672

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

From: Ehrlich, Nathaniel

Sent: Monday, October 04, 2004 12:48 PM

To: Ehrlich, Nathaniel

Subject: RE: Party ID Data

The Michigan State of the State Survey has been collecting Party ID data from approximately 1,000 respondents/quarter [total of 30,366] on a 7-point scale, as represented below:

	MEAN	ST DEV	MIN	MAX
Strong Rep	14%	2%	11%	19%
Rep	15%	2%	12%	19%
Lean Rep	9%	2%	6%	13%
Independent	11%	2%	8%	16%
Lean Dem	13%	2%	10%	17%
Dem	16%	2%	13%	22%



Strong Dem 20% 3% 16% 29%

Summing across all categories, we arrive at the following hypotheticals:

Min Rep 29%  
Max Rep 51%

Min Dem 39%

Max Dem 68%

And in 31 quarters of data, the value of the Democrat Percent minus the Republican Percent in a given quarter has varied from 0% to 28%, with a mean of 11% and a standard deviation of 7%. Given these unweighted data, I believe the variations in party ID that we have seen reported in the past few weeks are unremarkable.

---

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 11:05:41 -0700

Reply-To: Joel Moskowitz <[jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU)>

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

From: Joel Moskowitz <[jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU)>

Subject: Supreme Court Won't Hear Do Not Call Case

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

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Supreme Court Won't Hear Do Not Call Case

Associated Press, Oct 4, 2004

WASHINGTON (AP) - The Supreme Court turned away a challenge Monday to the federal do-not-call registry, ending telemarketers' bid to invoke free-speech arguments to get the popular ban on unwanted phone solicitations thrown out.

The court, without comment, let stand a 10th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals decision that upheld the registry of more than 57 million phone numbers as a reasonable government attempt to safeguard personal privacy and reduce telemarketing abuse.

Under the 2003 federal law, businesses face fines of up to \$11,000 if they call people who sign up for the registry - unless they have recently done business with them. Charities, pollsters and callers on behalf of

politicians, however, are exempt.

Telemarketing groups had filed the appeal, arguing in filings that the registry violated First Amendment rights because it singled businesses out while exempting other groups. They also said 2 million of their 6.5 million workers will lose their jobs within two years if the do-not-call rules stand.

A federal judge in Denver agreed with the telemarketers, but the circuit court upheld the registry in February 2004 after concluding there was no evidence suggesting that charitable or political callers were as intrusive to consumers' privacy.

The case is American Teleservices Association v. FTC, 03-1552.

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

-----  
Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 14:51:15 -0400

Reply-To: Brian Dautch <[bdautch@CMOR.ORG](mailto:bdautch@CMOR.ORG)>

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

From: Brian Dautch <[bdautch@CMOR.ORG](mailto:bdautch@CMOR.ORG)>

Subject: FCC Extension on Established Business Relationship--faxes

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

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear AAPORNETters,

The FCC has decided to delay the implementation of a new rule that would require businesses to get written permission before sending \*commercial\* faxes. Initially scheduled to kick in on January 1, 2005, the new proposed date would be June 30, 2005.

CMOR has always maintained that survey research is not commercial speech. Still, I know that this requirement, and others like it, have caused a lot of headaches for many of our members who do their work via fax. At the very least, we have had to send letters to State Attorneys General on the issue, so they can discern the difference between survey research and commercial speech, and then finally dismiss any potential charges that may have been imposed against CMOR members.

That said, CMOR has lobbied havily for a Congressional bill, mentioned in the piece below, that would simply eliminate the FCC rule. The bill would state that as long as you have an established business relationship with a respondent, you would be able to fax them without worrying about constantly securing written permission to do so. (Many CMOR members worry about how the FCC rule would be implemented..."Would we need permission to send each fax? For each project?," etc. It would basically legalize formally the method in use at present. (Of course, we still tell our members to make sure that their faxes contain absolutely no hint of "commercialism".)

That bill has passed the house and is awaiting a vote in the Senate. More in the article below.

### FCC Grants Another Fax-Rule Extension

The Federal Communications Commission pushed back the effective date of its new fax rule that will require commercial faxers to get written permission from consumers to June 30, 2005, the FCC said Friday.

The delay represents the second time the FCC has rescheduled the rule's implementation. The FCC issued the rule, along with other changes to the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, on July 3, 2003, but in August 2003 it delayed implementation to Jan. 1, 2005, in response to industry concerns.

Commercial faxers currently need only an existing business relationship with a consumer to send a fax. Faxers complained that requiring written permission from consumers would be an administrative burden, hurting nonprofit organizations that use faxes to communicate with members as well as small businesses such as real estate and insurance agents.

In July, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 4600, the Junk Fax Prevention Act, which would overturn the written-permission rule. The Senate version, S. 2603, is out of committee but has not received a vote by the full Senate.

"In light of recent action by the U.S. House of Representatives to amend the TCPA and similar proposed legislation in the U.S. Senate, we believe the public interest would best be served by delaying the effective date of the written-consent requirement for six months to allow Congress to act," the FCC said in its written order for the delay. "Should Congress not act in this regard, a further extension will provide the commission requisite time to address the petitions for reconsideration filed on these issues."

The existing business relationship standard will remain in place until the issue is resolved or the June 30, 2005, deadline is reached, the FCC said. The FCC issued the delay in response to a petition by the Fax Ban Coalition, which represents industries that include financial, real estate, distributing, travel, medical and publishing.

Brian Dautch  
Director of Government Affairs

CMOR  
Promoting and Advocating Survey Research  
7475 Wisconsin Ave., Suite 300  
Bethesda, MD 20814  
ph: (301) 654-6601  
fax: (208) 693-0564  
bdautch@cmor.org

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 15:13:26 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Subject: Re: This Has Got To Stop  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <C5E0665BB776D311868400805FF5603A0591B5DF@sscintex.ssc.msu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Ehrlich, Nathaniel wrote:

>But the bottom line is this: when you accuse someone of 'unconscious bias'  
>you are implying that they do not employ the methodology that you accept as  
>unbiased, you're calling him a liar.

No you're not. That's completely wrong, a total misunderstanding of a critique of methodology. I'm not calling anyone a liar, nor do I think anyone involved in this dispute is a liar. Nor do I think there's any methodology that's unbiased. We're all biased in some way; some of us are more likely than others to admit it. After 2000, we can't even trust the voting machines to be unbiased.

In economics, statistical models are often run with several different specifications, to see how much the various specifications influence the results. I never see any of the popular polls testing their own work for "robustness" in that fashion. It would confuse the newspapers immensely if they did, but it sure would be interesting.

--

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>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

---

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 15:21:34 -0400  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Subject: Re: Party ID Data  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <C5E0665BB776D311868400805FF5603A0591B5DD@sscentex.ssc.msu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Thanks. It is a very interesting table. It gives a good insight into the variability of party ID in Michigan. One could make the argument that if there is such variability in party ID there definitely should be weighting by party ID. Of course it does not answer the question as to what party ID surveys should be weighted to or whether it is stable by election day so that party ID weighting makes sense. I believe the topic is still an open question

Anyone who says party ID does not vary has not been looking at the survey data available.  
warren mitofsky

At 11:38 AM 10/4/2004, Ehrlich, Nathaniel wrote:

>The Michigan State of the State Survey has been collecting Party ID data  
>from approximately 1,000 respondents/quarter [total of 30,366] on a 7-point  
>scale, as represented below:

	Strong Rep	Rep	Lean Rep	Dem	Strong Dem
>Independent	14%	15%	9%		
>MEAN	14%	15%	9%		
>11%	13%	16%	20%		
>ST DEV	2%	2%	2%	2%	
>2%	2%	2%	3%		
>MIN	11%	12%	6%		
>8%	10%	13%	16%		
>MAX	19%	19%	13%		
>16%	17%	22%	29%		

>>Summing across all categories, we arrive at the following hypotheticals:

>Min Rep	29%
>Max Rep	51%
>Min Dem	39%
>Max Dem	68%

>And in 31 quarters of data, the value of the Democrat Percent minus the  
>Republican Percent in a given quarter has varied from 0% to 28%, with a mean  
>of 11% and a standard deviation of 7%.

>Given these unweighted data, I believe the variations in party ID that we  
>have seen reported in the past few weeks are unremarkable.

>>Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
>Research Specialist  
>Michigan State University  
>Institute for Public Policy and Social Research

>Office for Social Research  
>321 Berkey Hall  
>East Lansing, MI 48824  
>517-355-6672

>  
>

>-----

>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>set aapornet nomail  
>On your return send: set aapornet mail

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

212 980-3031  
212 980-3107 Fax

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

-----

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 16:15:39 -0400  
Reply-To: [elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Betsy Martin <[elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV)>  
Subject: Re: Party ID Data  
Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

I wonder if anyone has looked at the influence of question wording on the stability of party ID.

The Gallup question, "In politics, as of TODAY, do you consider yourself a Republican, Democrat, or Independent?" emphasizes immediate, perhaps ephemeral, feelings about the parties, rather than a longer run sense of identification. One might suppose that Independents, or people with a weak party identification, might change as the wind blows one way or the other.

Has there been any evaluation of the effects of question wording on stability of party ID at either the individual or aggregate level?

Betsy Martin

Warren Mitofsky  
<mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
cc:  
Sent by: AAPORNET Subject: Re: Party ID Data  
<AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>

10/04/2004 03:21  
PM  
Please respond to  
Warren Mitofsky

Thanks. It is a very interesting table. It gives a good insight into the variability of party ID in Michigan. One could make the argument that if there is such variability in party ID there definitely should be weighting by party ID. Of course it does not answer the question as to what party ID surveys should be weighted to or whether it is stable by election day so that party ID weighting makes sense. I believe the topic is still an open question

Anyone who says party ID does not vary has not been looking at the survey data available.  
warren mitofsky

At 11:38 AM 10/4/2004, Ehrlich, Nathaniel wrote:

>The Michigan State of the State Survey has been collecting Party ID data  
>from approximately 1,000 respondents/quarter [total of 30,366] on a  
>7-point

>scale, as represented below:

	Strong Rep	Rep	Lean Rep	
>Independent	Lean Dem	Dem	Strong Dem	
>MEAN	14%	15%	9%	
>11%	13%		16%	20%
>ST DEV	2%	2%	2%	2%
>2%	2%		2%	3%
>MIN	11%	12%	6%	
>8%	10%		13%	16%
>MAX	19%	19%	13%	
>16%	17%		22%	29%

>  
>Summing across all categories, we arrive at the following hypotheticals:

>  
>Min Rep 29%  
>Max Rep 51%

>

>Min Dem 39%  
>  
>Max Dem 68%  
>And in 31 quarters of data, the value of the Democrat Percent minus the  
>Republican Percent in a given quarter has varied from 0% to 28%, with a  
mean  
>of 11% and a standard deviation of 7%.  
>Given these unweighted data, I believe the variations in party ID that we  
>have seen reported in the past few weeks are unremarkable.  
>  
>  
>Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
>Research Specialist  
>Michigan State University  
>Institute for Public Policy and Social Research  
>Office for Social Research  
>321 Berkey Hall  
>East Lansing, MI 48824  
>517-355-6672  
>  
>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>set aapornet nomail  
>On your return send: set aapornet mail

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

212 980-3031  
212 980-3107 Fax

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 16:34:47 -0400  
Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Mich party ID variability



Comments: To: Alan Abramowitz <polsaa@emory.edu>,  
Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>,  
AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>, Donald Green <donald.green@yale.edu>,  
Larry Bartels <bartels@Princeton.EDU>,  
rbrapo@wm.edu, "Cook, Charlie" <ccook@nationaljournal.com>,  
Thomas Mann <TMANN@brookings.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain

You are correct in that the hypotheticals are meaningless, except to illustrate that there is more variability within each category than one might suspect.

When I looked at the combined Republican and Democratic totals, and compared those totals with the means + or - the standard deviations for those totals, then there were 8 of 29 quarters where the 'all Republicans' were out of range (39%  $\pm$  3%); 4 were high, 4 were low. There were also 8 quarters where the 'all Democrats' were out of range (50%  $\pm$  4%), also 4 high and 4 low. This all serves to demonstrate that the variability closely approximates a normal distribution of a random variable.

The comment that I hoped everyone would notice was referred to the spread of 0-28 percentage points between all Republicans and all Democrats in a given quarter.

Here, in chronological order, are those differences [% Democrat minus % Republican]

0%  
14%  
9%  
8%  
9%  
6%  
16%  
13%  
7%  
17%  
19%  
12%  
15%  
22%  
6%  
14%  
9%  
11%  
24%  
5%  
11%  
6%  
7%  
4%  
5%  
1%  
28%  
11%  
7%

Note that this is nothing like a smooth progression; the high value of 28%

is preceded by 1% and followed by 11%. So it is still to these old eyes unremarkable that polls of 500-1000 respondents nationwide differ as much as they do.

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.

Research Specialist

Michigan State University

Institute for Public Policy and Social Research

Office for Social Research

321 Berkey Hall

East Lansing, MI 48824

517-355-6672

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

From: Alan Abramowitz [mailto:polsaa@emory.edu]

Sent: Monday, October 04, 2004 2:53 PM

To: Warren Mitofsky; Ehrlich, Nathaniel; AAPORNET; Donald Green; Larry Bartels; rbrapo@wm.edu; Cook, Charlie; Thomas Mann

Subject: Re: Mich party ID variability

Warren--Thanks for the data. But if you look closely at their analysis, I think that there is much less real change going on there than meets the eye.

1. The "hypotheticals" are meaningless. You can't just add together the maximum/minimum values of strong, weak and ind Dems or Reps as if they all occurred in the same survey. Obviously that would not happen. When strong D goes up, it is probably at the expense of weak D; when weak D goes up it is primarily at the expense of strong D or ind D. Same for Reps.
2. The standard deviations for each category are actually quite small. Two-thirds of the time, the results for individual polls fall within +/- 2 percentage points of the overall mean.
3. The real question is, how does the observed variation compare with what one would expect by chance alone if there was no real change in the underlying distribution of party id? This is the null hypothesis. My hunch is that it would compare pretty closely.

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

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

set aapornet nomail

On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 13:53:16 -0700

Reply-To: "Henry E. Brady" <[hbrady@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:hbrady@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU)>

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

From: "Henry E. Brady" <[hbrady@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:hbrady@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU)>

Subject: Re: Party ID Data

Comments: To: [elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:elizabeth.ann.martin@CENSUS.GOV), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

In-Reply-To: <[OFF09B2519.904A4CB7-ON85256F23.006DF76E-85256F23.006F4BA5@boc.ad.census.gov](mailto:OFF09B2519.904A4CB7-ON85256F23.006DF76E-85256F23.006F4BA5@boc.ad.census.gov)>

>

MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

There has been an ongoing discussion of the volatility of the Gallup measure in political science with arguments about whether or not the Gallup question is more susceptible to short-term forces given its question wording. My reading of that literature is that the Gallup question IS at least somewhat more volatile, especially in periods when things are changing a lot politically. I've listed a few of the references below.

Henry Brady  
University of California, Berkeley

#### REFERENCES

Macropartisanship: An Empirical Reassessment (in Research Notes), Paul R. Abramson; Charles W. Ostrom, Jr.  
The American Political Science Review, Vol. 85, No. 1. (Mar., 1991), pp. 181-192.

Question Wording and Macropartisanship (in Controversy), Michael B. MacKuen; Robert S. Erikson; James A. Stimson; Paul R. Abramson; Charles W. Ostrom, Jr., The American Political Science Review, Vol. 86, No. 2. (Jun., 1992), pp. 475-486.

Question Wording and Partisanship: Change and Continuity in Party Loyalties During the 1992 Election Campaign, Paul R. Abramson; Charles W. Ostrom, The Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 58, No. 1. (Spring, 1994), pp. 21-48.

Question Form and Context Effects in the Measurement of Partisanship: Experimental Tests of the Artifact Hypothesis (in Controversy), The American Political Science Review, Vol. 88, No. 4. (Dec., 1994), pp. 945-958.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 17:45:27 -0400  
Reply-To: "Andrew E. Smith" <[andrew.smith@UNH.EDU](mailto:andrew.smith@UNH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Andrew E. Smith" <[andrew.smith@UNH.EDU](mailto:andrew.smith@UNH.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Party ID Data  
Comments: To: [aapORNET@asu.edu](mailto:aapORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[200410042053.i94KrM4t019984@csm.Berkeley.EDU](mailto:200410042053.i94KrM4t019984@csm.Berkeley.EDU)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

I disagree with with Henry regarding the volatility of the Gallup measure of partisanship. We conducted a series of 15 experiments testing for differences between the Gallup question and the Michigan question.

>Question Form and Context Effects in the Measurement of Partisanship:  
>Experimental Tests of the Artifact Hypothesis (in Controversy), George  
>Bishop, Alfred Tuchfarber, Andrew E. Smith, The American Political  
>Science Review, Vol. 88, No. 4. (Dec., 1994), pp. 945-958.

The Michigan question supposedly is the more stable indicator as it asks  
"Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican ...  
while Gallup reads "In politics, as of today, do you consider yourself a  
Republican ..."

Out of 15 experiments, only 1 produced a significant difference between  
responses - about what you'd expect by chance. We also found a lack of  
consistent evidence between macropartisanship and a host of other political  
indicators. Our conclusion is there is little difference between the two  
most widely used indicators of partisanship.

This does not say that partisanship doesn't fluctuate. As others have  
shown on this list, it does, sometimes dramatically. Rather, the Gallup  
measure is no more sensitive to these fluctuations than is the Michigan  
indicator.

Andy Smith

At 01:53 PM 10/4/2004 -0700, you wrote:

>There has been an ongoing discussion of the volatility of the Gallup measure  
>in political science with arguments about whether or not the Gallup question  
>is more susceptible to short-term forces given its question wording. My  
>reading of that literature is that the Gallup question IS at least somewhat  
>more volatile, especially in periods when things are changing a lot  
>politically. I've listed a few of the references below.

>  
>Henry Brady  
>University of California, Berkeley

>  
>REFERENCES

>Macropartisanship: An Empirical Reassessment (in Research Notes), Paul R.  
>Abramson; Charles W. Ostrom, Jr.  
>The American Political Science Review, Vol. 85, No. 1. (Mar., 1991), pp.  
>181-192.

>  
>Question Wording and Macropartisanship (in Controversy), Michael B. MacKuen;  
>Robert S. Erikson; James A. Stimson; Paul R. Abramson; Charles W. Ostrom,  
>Jr., The American Political Science Review, Vol. 86, No. 2. (Jun., 1992),  
>pp. 475-486.

>  
>Question Wording and Partisanship: Change and Continuity in Party Loyalties  
>During the 1992 Election Campaign, Paul R. Abramson; Charles W. Ostrom, The  
>Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 58, No. 1. (Spring, 1994), pp. 21-48.

>  
>  
>Question Form and Context Effects in the Measurement of Partisanship:  
>Experimental Tests of the Artifact Hypothesis (in Controversy), The American  
>Political Science Review, Vol. 88, No. 4. (Dec., 1994), pp. 945-958.

>

>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>set aapornet nomail  
>On your return send: set aapornet mail

Andrew E. Smith  
Director, The Survey Center  
Thompson Hall  
University of New Hampshire  
Durham, NH 03824  
603.862.2226

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 17:50:07 -0500  
Reply-To: Robert Godfrey <[rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU](mailto:rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Robert Godfrey <[rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU](mailto:rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Party ID Data  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[5.1.0.14.0.20041004173322.01635e88@cisunix.unh.edu](mailto:5.1.0.14.0.20041004173322.01635e88@cisunix.unh.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

While touting today's new poll results of "Kerry Pulls Even With Bush at 49%-49%" Gallup's Frank Newport noted that voters' perceptions that Kerry did much better in the debate than Bush have only grown over the weekend:

<http://www.gallup.com/poll/content/?ci=13240>  
"There is little question that Thursday night's presidential debate has made a significant difference in the presidential race.

=====  
In the bigger scheme of things, Gallup, notes that Kerry is doing better with likely voters right now because the Democrats are more activated than they have been since the summer.

#### Likely Voter Samples

Poll of September 13-15  
Reflected Bush Winning by 55%-42%

GOP: 40%  
Dem: 33%  
Ind: 28%

Poll of September 24-26  
Reflected Bush Winning by 52%-44%

GOP: 43%  
Dem: 31%  
Ind: 25%

Poll of October 1-3  
Reflected Dead Heat 49%-49%  
772 Likely Voters

GOP: 35%  
Dem: 39%  
Ind: 26%

Here's where I'm struggling a bit with this, given that Gallup's likely voter methodology is accurate, one would have to accept that there was a 16% swing in party self-identification in one week, with 8% fewer likely voters self-identifying as Republicans and 8% more self-identifying as Democrats.

Is this measure of Party ID truly that volatile? And if so, how do other pollsters account for it in their polling methodology?

Robert Godfrey

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Mon, 4 Oct 2004 22:02:24 -0400  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Party ID Data  
Comments: To: "Andrew E. Smith" <[andrew.smith@UNH.EDU](mailto:andrew.smith@UNH.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[5.1.0.14.0.20041004173322.01635e88@cisunix.unh.edu](mailto:5.1.0.14.0.20041004173322.01635e88@cisunix.unh.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

For the 15 experiments were the sample sizes roughly constant? Were they comparable to the Gallup sample sizes?

At 05:45 PM 10/4/2004, Andrew E. Smith wrote:

>I disagree with with Henry regarding the volatility of the Gallup measure  
>of partisanship. We conducted a series of 15 experiments testing for  
>differences between the Gallup question and the Michigan question.

>  
>>Question Form and Context Effects in the Measurement of Partisanship:  
>>Experimental Tests of the Artifact Hypothesis (in Controversy), George  
>>Bishop, Alfred Tuchfarber, Andrew E. Smith, The American Political  
>>Science Review, Vol. 88, No. 4. (Dec., 1994), pp. 945-958.

>

>The Michigan question supposedly is the more stable indicator as it asks  
>"Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican ...  
>while Gallup reads "In politics, as of today, do you consider yourself a  
>Republican ..."

>  
>Out of 15 experiments, only 1 produced a significant difference between  
>responses - about what you'd expect by chance. We also found a lack of  
>consistent evidence between macropartisanship and a host of other political  
>indicators. Our conclusion is there is little difference between the two  
>most widely used indicators of partisanship.

>  
>This does not say that partisanship doesn't fluctuate. As others have  
>shown on this list, it does, sometimes dramatically. Rather, the Gallup  
>measure is no more sensitive to these fluctuations than is the Michigan  
>indicator.

>  
>Andy Smith

>  
>At 01:53 PM 10/4/2004 -0700, you wrote:  
>>There has been an ongoing discussion of the volatility of the Gallup measure  
>>in political science with arguments about whether or not the Gallup question  
>>is more susceptible to short-term forces given its question wording. My  
>>reading of that literature is that the Gallup question IS at least somewhat  
>>more volatile, especially in periods when things are changing a lot  
>>politically. I've listed a few of the references below.

>>  
>>Henry Brady  
>>University of California, Berkeley

>>  
>>REFERENCES  
>>Macropartisanship: An Empirical Reassessment (in Research Notes), Paul R.  
>>Abramson; Charles W. Ostrom, Jr.  
>>The American Political Science Review, Vol. 85, No. 1. (Mar., 1991), pp.  
>>181-192.

>>  
>>Question Wording and Macropartisanship (in Controversy), Michael B. MacKuen;  
>>Robert S. Erikson; James A. Stimson; Paul R. Abramson; Charles W. Ostrom,  
>>Jr., The American Political Science Review, Vol. 86, No. 2. (Jun., 1992),  
>>pp. 475-486.

>>  
>>Question Wording and Partisanship: Change and Continuity in Party Loyalties  
>>During the 1992 Election Campaign, Paul R. Abramson; Charles W. Ostrom, The  
>>Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 58, No. 1. (Spring, 1994), pp. 21-48.

>>  
>>  
>>Question Form and Context Effects in the Measurement of Partisanship:  
>>Experimental Tests of the Artifact Hypothesis (in Controversy), The American  
>>Political Science Review, Vol. 88, No. 4. (Dec., 1994), pp. 945-958.

>>  
>>-----  
>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>>Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>>set aapornet nomail  
>>On your return send: set aapornet mail

>  
>Andrew E. Smith  
>Director, The Survey Center  
>Thompson Hall  
>University of New Hampshire  
>Durham, NH 03824  
>603.862.2226

>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
>set aapornet nomail  
>On your return send: set aapornet mail

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

=====  
Date: Tue, 5 Oct 2004 08:53:11 -0400  
Reply-To: Paul Braun <[pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM](mailto:pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Paul Braun <[pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM](mailto:pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: FW: Supreme Court Rejects Review of DNC Case  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

AAPOR members,

I received this note from CMOR and I thought it should be passed around.

Regards to all,

Paul Braun

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

From: Brian Dautch [<mailto:info@cmor.org>]  
Sent: Monday, October 04, 2004 5:04 PM  
To: [pbraun@braunresearch.com](mailto:pbraun@braunresearch.com)  
Subject: Supreme Court Rejects Review of DNC Case

Earlier today, the Supreme Court declined to review the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals decision about the Do-Not-Call Registry. This rejection signified that the DNC is fully and completely constitutional, and that all legal remedies have been exhausted!

As a result, we now have verification from the highest court in the land that the implicit exemption enjoyed by survey research will not be overturned by any court, since all legal appeals end and perish when the



Supreme Court declines to review them.

For more, please see our article on the case at:  
[http://www.cmor.org/govt\\_affairs\\_DNC\\_Challenge.htm](http://www.cmor.org/govt_affairs_DNC_Challenge.htm)

Thank you,

Brian Dautch  
Director of Government Affairs  
CMOR  
Promoting and Advocating Survey Research  
7475 Wisconsin Ave., Suite 300  
Bethesda, MD 20814  
ph: (301) 654-6601  
fax: (208) 693-0564  
[bdautch@cmor.org](mailto:bdautch@cmor.org)

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

Date: Tue, 5 Oct 2004 09:11:36 -0400  
Reply-To: "Raghavan K. Mayur" <[mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM](mailto:mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Raghavan K. Mayur" <[mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM](mailto:mayur@TECHNOMETRICA.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Party ID Data  
Comments: To: Robert Godfrey <[rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU](mailto:rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[p06020400bd877eb377ab@\[24.196.95.44\]](mailto:p06020400bd877eb377ab@[24.196.95.44])>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The distribution for the October 1-3 Gallup poll is very close to  
Election 2000 exit poll.

Poll of October 1-3, Reflected Dead Heat 49%-49%, 772 Likely Voters,  
GOP: 35%, Dem: 39%, Ind: 26%

>Is this measure of Party ID truly that volatile? And if so, how do  
other pollsters account for it in their polling methodology?

Given below is the data from exit polls for presidential elections  
1988-2000 that may help to answer your question for longer time frames.

My observation -- there is volatility on the short-term (from one month  
to another -- poll to poll) -- however, if you look at slightly longer  
short-term periods (6 months) there is reasonable stability.

At IBD/Christian Science Monitor/TIPP Poll we look at the most recent  
5-months data for voting age pop (age 18+). We use this distribution as  
our benchmark. Then we weight at "All respondents" (universe level) for  
party and not at the likely voter level or registered voter level.

We then do a sanity check by examining the likely voter party distribution vs. Exit poll 2000. Generally they are pretty close -- and we don't worry about minor deviations.

Raghavan Mayur  
TechnoMetrica Market Intelligence

#### Exit Poll Results:

2000

GOP: 35%

Dem: 39%

Ind: 27%

1996

GOP: 35%

Dem: 39%

Ind: 26%

1992

GOP: 35%

Dem: 38%

Ind: 27%

1988

GOP: 35%

Dem: 38%

Ind: 26%

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Robert Godfrey

Sent: Monday, October 04, 2004 18:50

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Party ID Data

While touting today's new poll results of "Kerry Pulls Even With Bush at 49%-49%" Gallup's Frank Newport noted that voters' perceptions that Kerry did much better in the debate than Bush have only grown over the weekend:

<http://www.gallup.com/poll/content/?ci=13240>

"There is little question that Thursday night's presidential debate has made a significant difference in the presidential race.

=====

In the bigger scheme of things, Gallup, notes that Kerry is doing better with likely voters right now because the Democrats are more activated than they have been since the summer.

Likely Voter Samples

Poll of September 13-15  
Reflected Bush Winning by 55%-42%

GOP: 40%  
Dem: 33%  
Ind: 28%

Poll of September 24-26  
Reflected Bush Winning by 52%-44%

GOP: 43%  
Dem: 31%  
Ind: 25%

Poll of October 1-3  
Reflected Dead Heat 49%-49%  
772 Likely Voters

GOP: 35%  
Dem: 39%  
Ind: 26%

Here's where I'm struggling a bit with this, given that Gallup's likely voter methodology is accurate, one would have to accept that there was a 16% swing in party self-identification in one week, with 8% fewer likely voters self-identifying as Republicans and 8% more self-identifying as Democrats.

Is this measure of Party ID truly that volatile? And if so, how do other pollsters account for it in their polling methodology?

Robert Godfrey

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Vacation hold? Send email to [listserv@asu.edu](mailto:listserv@asu.edu) with this text:  
set aapornet nomail  
On your return send: set aapornet mail

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 5 Oct 2004 10:40:05 -0400  
Reply-To: Michael Wood <[mwood@HUNTER.CUNY.EDU](mailto:mwood@HUNTER.CUNY.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Michael Wood <[mwood@HUNTER.CUNY.EDU](mailto:mwood@HUNTER.CUNY.EDU)>  
Subject: request: list assisted datasets  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

I am interested in obtaining data from list-assisted studies, for the purpose of researching nonresponse. The topic of the study, or whether it is recent, is not important. But the study needs to contain, at minimum, a) one or more sex measures for respondents, and b) a zip or a telephone exchange or some geographic identifier(s) for the (list) nonrespondents. A panel or repeat design would be especially interesting. I have some funds available to cover costs. Thank you --MW

--  
Michael Wood  
Dept. of Sociology; MS in Applied Social Research Program  
Hunter College, CUNY  
New York, NY 10021  
212-772-5572

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

Date: Tue, 5 Oct 2004 14:33:12 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Subject: turnout  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Someone posted this summary of a Curtis Gans interview on C-SPAN to the listserv I run. If he's right, the likely voter models are in need of a retuning.

Doug

----  
Curtis Gans -- the 'dean' of experts on the American electorate -- was interviewed on C-SPAN on Sept.10.  
Among the things he mentioned:

1 He's estimating a turnout of between 58 and 60 % (between 118 and 121 million voters). This would be the highest turnout since '68, and would be significantly higher than in recent elections.

2 He said the election could be close, but if it wasn't this would be to Kerry's benefit (i.e. Kerry would win big).

3 Women will probably have a 4% greater share of the vote than men (this is because there are 2 % more women in the population to begin with, and because a greater percentage of women vote than do men).

4 Every poll of voter interest shows 10-15% higher than at this time four years ago. He attributed this to, "the Bush administration has served as a lightning rod. There is a polarized public around the president's policies."

5 "It is almost INCONCEIVABLE that people will not come out. It is

an emotional election. It is despite the campaigns, a big picture election." (an exact quote).

---

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

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

---

Date: Tue, 5 Oct 2004 12:03:14 -0700

Reply-To: Nancy Bates <[NANCY.A.BATES@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:NANCY.A.BATES@CENSUS.GOV)>

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

From: Nancy Bates <[NANCY.A.BATES@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:NANCY.A.BATES@CENSUS.GOV)>

Subject: FCSM Research Conference Abstract Deadline Nov. 1

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

## FCSM RESEARCH CONFERENCE

### CALL FOR PAPERS

November 14-16, 2005 Washington, DC Area

The Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology (FCSM), composed of the senior statisticians from several federal statistical agencies and organizations, and sponsored by the Office of Management and Budget, is planning a research conference to be held November 14-16, 2005. The conference will primarily feature contributed papers with formal discussion and software demonstrations on topics related to a variety of statistical research issues. Papers and demonstrations should address methodology, empirical studies, relevant issues, or topics for future statistical research. Papers must be original and not previously published or disseminated. Proceedings will be published from the conference.

Possible topics include but are not limited to:

#### Survey design and data collection

=B7 Geospatial data collection and analysis

=B7 Impact of culture and language diversity on questionnaire design

=B7 Improving coverage and response rates

=B7 Research on data collection instrument design, pretesting, and evaluation

=B7 Survey integration & cross-survey planning

=B7 Treatment of missing data

=B7 Imputation methods

=B7 Uses of innovative technologies for data collection, processing and dissemination

=B7 Advances in frame development for censuses and surveys

=B7 Model-based survey estimation

=B7 Innovative methods in sample design and estimation

=B7 Response & coverage issues associated with web data collection

#### Analysis

=B7 Bayesian statistical methods

=B7 Estimation methodologies to obtain early or preliminary data

=B7 Exposure analysis and modeling

=B7 Forecasting, time series analysis, and seasonal adjustment

- =B7 Innovative methods for designing and analyzing epidemiological studies
- =B7 Methods of statistical modeling
- =B7 Item response theory
- =B7 Meta-analysis
- =B7 Use of data for policy-making

Evaluation

- =B7 Census and survey evaluation methodologies
- =B7 Environmental effects and ecological assessments
- =B7 Innovative approaches to program evaluation
- =B7 Measuring data quality
- =B7 Nonsampling error: estimation and evaluation
- =B7 Usability testing

Cross-cutting topics

- =B7 Statistical issues in national security
- =B7 Confidentiality, privacy, and disclosure issues in data dissemination and linkage
- =B7 Data mining, warehousing and metadata
- =B7 Design and analysis of longitudinal studies
- =B7 Measurement issues and bridging changes in classification systems
- =B7 Statistical uses of administrative records
- =B7 Nonresponse
- =B7 Data safety monitoring boards
- =B7 Quality standards and guidelines

To submit a paper or demonstration for consideration, send an abstract via e-mail by November 1, 2004 to:

Bill Mockovak, Program Chair, and  
 Nancy Bates, Co-chair, by November 1, 2004  
 E-mail: [fesm@bls.gov](mailto:fesm@bls.gov)  
 Phone (Bill Mockovak): 202-691-7414  
 Phone (Nancy Bates): 301-763-5248

To obtain registration information or to be included on the mailing list, contact:

Carol McDaniel, Conference Coordination  
 E-mail: [fesm@census.gov](mailto:fesm@census.gov) <<mailto:fesm@census.gov>>  
 Phone: 301 457-2308  
 Fax: 301-457-3682

FCSM Website: [www.fesm.gov](http://www.fesm.gov) <<http://www.fesm.gov>> Abstracts should include a brief description of the paper; up to four key words; authors' names and e-mail addresses; plus the presenter's name, affiliation, mailing address, phone & fax numbers. Submit a Word or ASCII text file by e-mail. Early submissions are encouraged. See back of this announcement for more details.=

Tentative Schedule of Activities

Activity	Date
Abstracts due	November 1, 2004

Papers selected December 2004  
Authors notified December-January 2004  
Advance program ready April 2005  
Draft paper due June 10, 2005  
Final paper due (6 pages max) August 15, 2005  
Final program ready September 2005  
Conference registration open September 2005  
Conference dates November 14-16, 2005  
Final paper due (no page limit) January 6, 2006

1 Abstracts should be submitted as early as possible. No abstracts will be accepted after November 1, 2004.

2 Authors/presenters are responsible for their own travel expenses.

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

Date: Tue, 5 Oct 2004 14:08:09 -0500  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject: FCSM Research Conference  
Comments: To: [AAPORNet@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

## FCSM RESEARCH CONFERENCE

### CALL FOR PAPERS

November 14-16, 2005 Washington, DC Area

The Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology (FCSM), composed of the senior statisticians from several federal statistical agencies and organizations, and sponsored by the Office of Management and Budget, is planning a research conference to be held November 14-16, 2005. The conference will primarily feature contributed papers with formal discussion and software demonstrations on topics related to a variety of statistical research issues. Papers and demonstrations should address methodology, empirical studies, relevant issues, or topics for future statistical research. Papers must be original and not previously published or disseminated. Proceedings will be published from the conference.

Possible topics include but are not limited to:

Survey design and data collection

\* Geospatial data collection and analysis

- \* Impact of culture and language diversity on questionnaire design
- \* Improving coverage and response rates
- \* Research on data collection instrument design, pretesting, and evaluation
- \* Survey integration & cross-survey planning
- \* Treatment of missing data
- \* Imputation methods
- \* Uses of innovative technologies for data collection, processing and dissemination
- \* Advances in frame development for censuses and surveys
- \* Model-based survey estimation
- \* Innovative methods in sample design and estimation
- \* Response & coverage issues associated with web data collection

#### Analysis

- \* Bayesian statistical methods
- \* Estimation methodologies to obtain early or preliminary data
- \* Exposure analysis and modeling
- \* Forecasting, time series analysis, and seasonal adjustment
- \* Innovative methods for designing and analyzing epidemiological studies
- \* Methods of statistical modeling
- \* Item response theory
- \* Meta-analysis
- \* Use of data for policy-making

#### Evaluation

- \* Census and survey evaluation methodologies
- \* Environmental effects and ecological assessments



- \* Innovative approaches to program evaluation
- \* Measuring data quality
- \* Nonsampling error: estimation and evaluation
- \* Usability testing

Cross-cutting topics

- \* Statistical issues in national security
- \* Confidentiality, privacy, and disclosure issues in data dissemination and linkage
- \* Data mining, warehousing and metadata
- \* Design and analysis of longitudinal studies
- \* Measurement issues and bridging changes in classification systems
- \* Statistical uses of administrative records
- \* Nonresponse
- \* Data safety monitoring boards
- \* Quality standards and guidelines

To submit a paper or demonstration for consideration, send an abstract via e-mail by November 1, 2004 to:

Bill Mockovak, Program Chair, and

Nancy Bates, Co-chair, by November 1, 2004

E-mail: [fesm@bls.gov](mailto:fesm@bls.gov)

Phone (Bill Mockovak): 202-691-7414

Phone (Nancy Bates): 301-763-5248

=20

To obtain registration information or to be included on the mailing list,

contact:

Carol McDaniel, Conference Coordination

E-mail: [fesm@census.gov](mailto:fesm@census.gov) <<mailto:fesm@census.gov>>

<mailto:fcsm@.census.gov> >

Phone: 301 457-2308

Fax: 301-457-3682

FCSM Website: [www.fcsm.gov](http://www.fcsm.gov) <outbind://174/www.fcsm.gov>  
<<http://www.fcsm.gov> <<http://www.fcsm.gov/>> > Abstracts should include a brief description of the paper; up to four key words; authors' names and e-mail addresses; plus the presenter's name, affiliation, mailing address, phone & fax numbers. Submit a Word or ASCII text file by e-mail. Early submissions are encouraged. See back of this announcement for more details.

=20

=20

=20

Tentative Schedule of Activities

Activity Date

Abstracts due November 1, 2004

Papers selected December 2004

Authors notified December-January 2004

Advance program ready April 2005

Draft paper due June 10, 2005

Final paper due (6 pages max) August 15, 2005

Final program ready September 2005

Conference registration open September 2005

Conference dates November 14-16, 2005

Final paper due (no page limit) January 6, 2006

=20

1 Abstracts should be submitted as early as possible. No abstracts will be accepted after November 1, 2004.

2 Authors/presenters are responsible for their own travel expenses.

=20  
=20  
=20  
=20  
=20  
=20  
=20  
=20  
=20  
=20

---

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

---

Date: Tue, 5 Oct 2004 21:53:39 +0100  
Reply-To: [worc@MORI.COM](mailto:worc@MORI.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Robert Worcester <[worc@MORI.COM](mailto:worc@MORI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: turnout  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Is=20there=20an=20American,=20or=20other=20nationality=20although=20that's=  
=20unlikely,=20who  
is=20taking=20an=20academic=20interest=20in=20the=20votes=20of=20expats?=20=  
=20I'm=20doing=20some  
work=20on=20the=20voting=20power,=20and=20behaviour,=20of=20overseas=20Ame=  
ricans,=20and  
would=20be=20grateful=20to=20make=20contact=20with=20anyone=20else=20who=20=  
is=20working=20on  
this.=20=20

Up=20to=202000,=20the=20votes=20of=20O/S=20Yanks=20didn't=20matter=20much,=  
=20but=20we=20could=20have  
swung=20Florida,=20chads=20or=20no=20chads.

As=20a=20matter=20of=20interest,=20until=201976,=20Americans=20living=20ab=  
road=20had=20to=20pay  
taxes=20but=20were=20not=20allowed=20to=20vote.=20=20Some=20of=20us=20pres=  
sured=20Congress=20on  
the=20theme=20of=20'No=20taxation=20without=20representation'=20until=20Ti=  
p=20O'Neill=20took

an=20interest=20in=20us=20(when=20we=20said=20we'd=20throw=20tea=20in=20hi=  
s=20harbour)=20and  
President=20ford=20signed=20it=20into=20law=20in=20the=20first=20week=20of=  
=201977,=20just=20before  
leaving=20office.

Bob=20Worcester

-----  
Archives:=20<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Problems?-don't=20reply=20to=20this=20message,=20write=20to:  
[aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

This=20e-mail=20has=20been=20scanned=20for=20viruses=20for=20MORI=20by=20M=  
essageLabs.=20For  
further=20information=20visit=20<http://www.mci.com>

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

Disclaimer

This=20e-mail=20is=20confidential=20and=20intended=20solely=20for=20the=20=  
use=20of=20the  
individual=20to=20whom=20it=20is=20addressed.=20Any=20views=20or=20opinion=  
s=20presented=20are  
solely=20those=20of=20the=20author=20and=20do=20not=20necessarily=20repres=  
ent=20those=20of  
MORI=20Limited.=20  
If=20you=20are=20not=20the=20intended=20recipient,=20be=20advised=20that=20=  
you=20have  
received=20this=20e-mail=20in=20error=20and=20that=20any=20use,=20dissemin=  
ation,  
forwarding,=20printing,=20or=20copying=20of=20this=20e-mail=20is=20strictl=  
y=20  
prohibited.=20If=20you=20have=20received=20this=20e-mail=20in=20error=20pl=  
ease=20either=20  
notify=20the=20MORI=20Systems=20Helpdesk=20by=20telephone=20on=2044=20(0)=20=  
20=207347=203000=20  
or=20respond=20to=20this=20e-mail=20with=20WRONG=20RECIPIENT=20in=20the=20=  
title=20line.  
=3D=  
=3D=3D=3D=20

---

This=20e-mail=20has=20been=20scanned=20for=20viruses=20for=20MORI=20by=20M=  
essageLabs.=20For=20further=20information=20visit=20<http://www.mci.com>

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

Date: Tue, 5 Oct 2004 17:05:45 -0700  
Reply-To: phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Phillip J. Trounstine" <phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU>  
Subject: e-mail privacy  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

I understand the concerns raised by AAPOR's leadership about the re-transmission and quoting of individual communications on AAPORNET, but they're simply not realistic. As someone who has worked in the news media and in politics (and now in survey research), I have long accepted that you should always assume that anything you post over the internet is not a private communication. There is no "off the record" for a posting to a news group or a listserve -- it's in the public domain. AAPOR leaders could certainly kick individuals out of the message group for "abusing" their membership. But that, in my view, would be senseless. If you want to communicate privately with people, do it. You can even respond directly to individuals who post on AAPORNET. But don't expect your postings on the listserve to be private.

Phil Trounstine  
Survey and Policy Research Institute  
at San Jose State University  
408-924-6993  
phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 5 Oct 2004 22:57:24 -0400  
Reply-To: Teresa Mastin <mastinte@MSU.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Teresa Mastin <mastinte@MSU.EDU>  
Subject: Re: e-mail privacy  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I will be out of the office from Wednesday afternoon, October 6 until Monday, October 11. I will not be checking email regularly.

Teresa Mastin, Ph.D.  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Advertising  
Michigan State University  
317 Comm Arts Bldg.  
East Lansing, MI 48824-1212

517-432-8377

517-432-2589 (Fax)

e-mail: HYPERLINK "mailto:mastinte@msu.edu"mastinte@msu.edu

---

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Wed, 6 Oct 2004 00:43:54 -0500

Reply-To: Robert Godfrey <[rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU](mailto:rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU)>

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

From: Robert Godfrey <[rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU](mailto:rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU)>

Subject: Re: Party ID Data

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

In-Reply-To: <000001c4aadcd500cc0\$3f01010a@d0q2u4>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

<http://www.talkradionews.com/mediafiles/2164.mp3>

John Zogby, President and CEO of Zogby International, an independent polling firm, says that they believe there is a basic stability of republicans, democrats, and independents in the electorate at all times and it causes the polls not to have wild swings. (:46)

Tuesday, October 5, 2004

---

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Wed, 6 Oct 2004 07:50:14 -0400

Reply-To: Teresa Mastin <[mastinte@MSU.EDU](mailto:mastinte@MSU.EDU)>

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

From: Teresa Mastin <[mastinte@MSU.EDU](mailto:mastinte@MSU.EDU)>

Subject: Re: FCC Extension on Established Business Relationship--faxes

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

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I will be out of the office from Wednesday afternoon, October 6 until Monday, October 11. I will not be checking email regularly.

Teresa Mastin, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor

Department of Advertising

Michigan State University

317 Comm Arts Bldg.

East Lansing, MI 48824-1212

517-432-8377

517-432-2589 (Fax)

e-mail: HYPERLINK "mailto:mastinte@msu.edu"mastinte@msu.edu

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Wed, 6 Oct 2004 07:53:55 -0400

Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>

Subject: Re: Party ID Data

Comments: To: Robert Godfrey <rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain

I just listened to this clip. John Zogby states a 'fundamental disagreement' between his "belief" and that of his colleagues "Gallup for example" that party ID is stable "at any point in time" and says quite clearly that his polls don't have "wild swings" between the numbers of Republicans and Democrats, but others do.

Two days ago I posted data showing how fundamentally stable over time party ID in Michigan {roughly 39% Republican and 50% Democrat over an eleven-year period] can, within any given quarter, show a Democratic plurality of between 0% and 28% in 1,000 respondents. Typical response rate is 40%, cooperation rate is much higher.

Compare this to an overnight nationwide RDD poll. If 600 people respond, at a response rate of around 20%, it's not inconceivable that some states with low population will have fewer than 10 respondents. In an exhaustive survey I did at ISR in 2001, our of 1,416 respondents, 7 were from Wyoming, 6 from Vermont, 5 from Rhode Island, 49 from NY and 89 from California...These could very well contribute to 'wild fluctuation' in party ID.

Do we assume that anyone takes the trouble to establish party ID in each state and then weight the data for each state's party ID and population? I think not. If one is conducting a survey of attitudes [or use of assistive technology among persons with disabilities, as above] where state and party ID are irrelevant, no such weighting would be necessary, but Presidential elections are not determined by overall popular vote.

I won't comment on Mr. Zogby's comments further, since they are presented as a 46 clip from an interview, and the question, preamble and follow-up are inaudible.

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.

Research Specialist

Michigan State University

Institute for Public Policy and Social Research

Office for Social Research

321 Berkey Hall

East Lansing, MI 48824

517-355-6672

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

From: Robert Godfrey [mailto:rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU]

Sent: Wednesday, October 06, 2004 12:44 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Party ID Data

<http://www.talkradionews.com/mediafiles/2164.mp3>

John Zogby, President and CEO of Zogby International, an independent polling firm, says that they believe there is a basic stability of republicans, democrats, and independents in the electorate at all times and it causes the polls not to have wild swings. (:46)

Tuesday, October 5, 2004

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Wed, 6 Oct 2004 10:05:22 -0400

Reply-To: Sid Groeneman <[sid@GROENEMAN.COM](mailto:sid@GROENEMAN.COM)>

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

From: Sid Groeneman <[sid@GROENEMAN.COM](mailto:sid@GROENEMAN.COM)>

Subject: Religious Identification in the U.S.: A New Report

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

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Those of you who are interested the study of American religion or in measuring religious identification in surveys might want to check out a report that Gary Tobin and I recently completed. The main finding is that one in every six American adults are now failing to select a church or denomination when asked in surveys about their religious identity - that is, they answer none / no religion /secular / atheist /agnostic. This is up considerably from readings taken a decade earlier. The estimate is based a survey of 10,204 RDD interviews completed in 2002. The report is available on-line as a .pdf file at:

[www.jewishresearch.org/PDFs/Religion\\_Report2.pdf](http://www.jewishresearch.org/PDFs/Religion_Report2.pdf) . Comments welcome.

Sid Groeneman

Groeneman Research & Consulting, and

Senior Research Consultant -

Institute for Jewish & Community Research

301 469-0813

[sid@groeneman.com](mailto:sid@groeneman.com)

[www.groeneman.com](http://www.groeneman.com)

Dr. Gary A. Tobin - IJCR President:

415 386-2604



gatobin@jewishresearch.org

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Wed, 6 Oct 2004 13:47:56 -0400  
Reply-To: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>  
Subject: Regarding the AAPOR NET Privacy Policy  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear AAPOR Net Subscribers:

For those of you wondering about the origins of the AAPOR Net privacy advisory recently emailed to you, it for was developed after considerable discussion and complaints from members. It is obviously voluntary, and no sanctions are attached. I would advise participants to indicate routinely on their emails to this list whether they wish to be contacted before being quoted, or give blanket permission.

Nancy Belden  
President  
AAPOR

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Wed, 6 Oct 2004 15:07:32 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Surprise in store for political pollsters?  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Surprise in store for political pollsters?

By Dave Brooks  
Nashua Telegraph

<http://www.nashuatelegraph.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20041006/COLUMNIS/TS03/110060006/-1/columnists>

As a newspaper reporter, I'd love to write a story that produced a banner headline in a big-city daily. As long as it wasn't "Dewey Defeats Truman."

The quadrennial anniversary of the most famous flub in newspaper history is

coming up (Nov. 3, 1948, was the Chicago Tribune's moment of post-election trauma), leading to lots of backward-looking commentary about current presidential polls.

From what I can see on the Internet, such historical perspective demonstrates conclusively that (a) Kerry is doomed; (b) Bush is doomed; (c) Bush or Kerry is a shoo-in; and (d) the write-ins for Ross Perot will astonish everybody. (I think I'm going to drop that last Web site from my Bookmarks.)

SNIP

Which brings us back to 2004, when telephone polling is a well-established art. But telephones aren't what they used to be, and therein lies the rub. Consider:

- Cell phones now comprise about 43 percent of all U.S. phones, according to the International Telecommunication Union.
- Internet phoning is tiny but growing fast, leading to tech-analyst predictions like the acronym gem "VOIP threatens POTS" - which means "Voice over Internet Protocol threatens Plain Old Telephone System."
- Most importantly: Since 2000, the number of traditional "land-line" phones in the U.S. has dropped by more than 5 million, or nearly 3 percent, according to the Federal Communications Commission.

What this means is that polls based on calling people in a certain area are getting harder and harder to do, because most cell phone numbers and VOIP numbers aren't geographically based. You can't just pick randomly from 888-prefix numbers looking for Nashua voters anymore because you'll miss the people who have abandoned Verizon or aren't in the phone book.

SNIP

--

Leo G. Simonetta  
Research Director  
Art & Science Group, LLC  
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
Baltimore MD 21209

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Wed, 6 Oct 2004 12:46:25 -0400  
Reply-To: "Lavrakas, Paul" <Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>  
Subject: FW: Methodological Research Opening at Nielsen Media Research  
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu

Comments: cc: "Feeney, Kelly" <Kelly.Feeney@NielsenMedia.com>,  
"MILLIE (Bennett, Mildred)" <Mildred.Bennett@NielsenMedia.com>,  
"Holden, Rosemary" <Rosemary.Holden@NielsenMedia.com>

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain

This posting is for two (2) open positions at Nielsen Media Research in the Department of Methodological Research (which reports to me). Each position is at the research analyst level. One position will support our meter panel methodologies and the other will support our diary survey methodologies. Both positions are located in the Tampa area. The successful candidates will be expected to begin employment no later than January 2005.

Please pass along this posting to those who might be interested in applying.

Thanks, PJL

\*\*\*\*\*

Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.  
Vice President and  
Senior Research Methodologist  
Nielsen Media Research  
770 Broadway, 14th Floor  
New York, NY 10003-9595  
O: 646-654-8378  
F: 646-654-8492

\*\*\*\*\*

---

Senior Research Analyst Opening at Nielsen Media Research in the Tampa FL area

This fulltime Methodological Research position at Nielsen Media Research is located in Oldsmar FL. The position is responsible for helping to design and conduct moderately to highly complex research projects.

The main objectives of this position are:

- \* Contribute to the initiation of research ideas
- \* Assist in the design and planning of research projects
- \* Execute and monitor data collection and data analysis activities
- \* Provide cost detail on projects

## REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS:

1. B.S./B.A. in a quantitative Social Science discipline, Marketing Research, Statistics, or the equivalent. Four (4) years experience directly related to quantitative research.

2. Solid knowledge of:

- a. Mechanics of research methods for telephone, mail, in-person, and/or web surveys, including strategies to reduce nonresponse
- b. Questionnaire construction and flowcharting
- c. Basic Sampling methods for various data collection approaches
- d. Data analysis (SPSS and/or SAS) including coding and editing of raw data, tabulation (cross-tabulation, cumulative tabulation), summary statistical analyses for research data (mean, median, standard deviation, etc.)
- e. Equipment / software skills: PC, spreadsheet, word processing, statistical analyses software, presentation software.

## ADDITIONAL QUALIFICATIONS THAT ARE DESIRABLE:

3. Fluency in Spanish (written and spoken)
4. General media industry knowledge
5. Writing CATI programming syntax
6. Experience with conducting Focus Groups
7. Knowledge of project costing procedures
8. Multivariate data analysis experience

## 9. Co-authoring conference papers

NMR is an equal opportunity employer. For more information or to apply to the position, please contact Ms. Kelly Feeney at Kelly.Feeney@NielsenMedia.com <mailto:Kelly.Feeney@NielsenMedia.com> .

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
=====

Date: Thu, 7 Oct 2004 05:59:57 -0400  
Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Religious Identification in the U.S.: A New Report  
Comments: To: Sid Groeneman <sid@GROENEMAN.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <20041006140532.GQRD17054.out014.verizon.net@dell4300>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear Sid:

Personally, I am very glad that you highlighted that finding. It is also similar to a finding from the American Religious Identification Survey carried out by Barry Kosmin and the late Egon Mayer.

I actually wrote one of my columns for the Gotham Gazette on that finding.

The Passion for Religion Ebbs  
by Andrew Beveridge  
March 03, 2004

As the Passion of the Christ continues to break box office records, Christians observe lent, Jews prepare for Passover, the attorney general holds morning prayer services and politicians routinely voice their religious conviction from the stump, one might get the impression that Americans are becoming more and more religious, and that they are increasingly uneasy about such secular and scientific trends as abortion, equality for gay people, and stem cell research. Yet, data from the 2001 American Religious Identification Survey <http://www.gc.cuny.edu/studies/arid.pdf> shows that Americans, and New Yorkers, are actually becoming less religious. About 30 million adults were found to have no religious affiliation, which is almost double what it was a decade earlier (from 8.2 to 14.1 percent). In New York State, there are about 1.9 million such residents (or about 13.4 percent of the population), and in New York City, we can infer, some 14 percent of the population says it has no religious affiliation, which, again, is about double what it was a decade ago.

More here

<http://www.gothamgazette.com/article/Demographics/20040316/5/915>

Of course, there is also Tom Smith's recent work showing the decline of mainstream protestants.

<http://www-news.uchicago.edu/releases/04/040720.protestant.pdf>

Andy Beveridge

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Sid Groeneman

Sent: Wednesday, October 06, 2004 10:05 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Religious Identification in the U.S.: A New Report

Those of you who are interested the study of American religion or in measuring religious identification in surveys might want to check out a report that Gary Tobin and I recently completed. The main finding is that one in every six American adults are now failing to select a church or denomination when asked in surveys about their religious identity - that is, they answer none / no religion /secular / atheist /agnostic. This is up considerably from readings taken a decade earlier. The estimate is based a survey of 10,204 RDD interviews completed in 2002. The report is available on-line as a .pdf file at:

[www.jewishresearch.org/PDFs/Religion\\_Report2.pdf](http://www.jewishresearch.org/PDFs/Religion_Report2.pdf) . Comments welcome.

Sid Groeneman

Groeneman Research & Consulting, and  
Senior Research Consultant -  
Institute for Jewish & Community Research  
301 469-0813  
sid@groeneman.com  
www.groeneman.com

Dr. Gary A. Tobin - IJCR President:  
415 386-2604  
gatobin@jewishresearch.org

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 7 Oct 2004 10:15:45 -0400  
Reply-To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>

Subject: Re: Religious Identification in the U.S.: A New Report  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="UTF-8"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I thank you for this as well. After 15 years of using the same question to identify religion, this year, I've been toying with different approaches. Part of it stems from a high number in the "none" category, but also in the "other" category. I don't see the same phenomenon happening in these data, but perhaps the authors could comment. We changed from asking a question similar to that posed in this survey "Which of the following best describes your religious beliefs= Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Muslim, other, or none? We routinely got double-digit percentages saying "other" and when we followed up, the specific answers were "Baptist, Assembly of God," and assorted other protestant denominations. We've changed our wording to: "Which of the following best describes your religious beliefs= Christian, Jewish, Muslim, other, or none" and then follow with Christians to ask if they are Catholic, or some other kind of Christian. It's reduced the other a bit, but the "other" still seems high to me. Any one else seeing this? JAS

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

visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)

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

In a message dated 10/7/2004 5:05:49 AM Central Daylight Time, andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU writes:  
Dear Sid:

Personally, I am very glad that you highlighted that finding. It is also similar to a finding from the American Religious Identification Survey carried out by Barry Kosmin and the late Egon Mayer.

I actually wrote one of my columns for the Gotham Gazette on that finding.

The Passion for Religion Ebbs  
by Andrew Beveridge

March 03, 2004

As the Passion of the Christ continues to break box office records, Christians observe lent, Jews prepare for Passover, the attorney general holds morning prayer services and politicians routinely voice their religious conviction from the stump, one might get the impression that Americans are becoming more and more religious, and that they are increasingly uneasy about such secular and scientific trends as abortion, equality for gay people, and stem cell research. Yet, data from the 2001 American Religious Identification Survey <http://www.gc.cuny.edu/studies/aris.pdf> shows that Americans, and New Yorkers, are actually becoming less religious. About 30 million adults were found to have no religious affiliation, which is almost double what it was a decade earlier (from 8.2 to 14.1 percent). In New York State, there are about 1.9 million such residents (or about 13.4 percent of the population), and in New York City, we can infer, some 14 percent of the population says it has no religious affiliation, which, again, is about double what it was a decade ago.

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Thu, 7 Oct 2004 07:43:19 -0700  
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>  
Subject: Retro Poll findings--no horserace here.  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

October 7, 2004: For immediate release  
=20

Contact: Marc Sapir (510)-848-3826  
marcsapir@comcast.net  
www.retropoll.org

=20

=20

New Retro Poll Findings:

=20

How Poor Journalism Drives Nation to the Right  
(700 words)

=20

Berkeley--According to findings from several recent polls the public is split about 50:50 on whether the U.S. should immediately withdraw its military forces from Iraq. Now in a poll completed October 1, the Retro Poll organization takes an in depth look at what=92s behind that split.

Retro Poll=92s findings reveal that opposition to withdrawal, like = support

for the war in the first place, comes mostly (59%) from people who have been fooled into believing that Saddam Hussein and Iraq worked with the Al Qaeda terrorist network. This difference was highly significant



(likely to happen by chance less than 1 in 1,000 trials by chi-squared test).

=20  
=93The glass is both half full and half empty,=94 said Marc Sapir, Retro Poll=92s Executive Director. =93Twenty nine percent of our sample still believes, in the face of no evidence at all, that Al Qaeda worked with Saddam=92s Iraq and this group heavily supports continuing the = occupation.

But the group is getting to be a lonely place. At the beginning of the war the media did little to dispel the neo-con myth, so over half the public held that view. A year ago it was 41%; in May it was 39%; and now only 29% of our latest sample is holding on to this.=94

=20  
=93Moreover,=94 Sapir continued, =93it=92s just one of many examples = that expose

how corporate media=92s weak journalism and inadequate defense of the truth drive the U.S. public to the right and away from support of democratic values and their own best interests.=94

=20  
Similar dramatic findings in the poll pertain to the death penalty, often a major issue in political campaigns. Only 16% of the sample knew that more than 110 convicted murderers have been proven innocent and released from prison in recent years. About 80% (of that 16%) oppose the new rule allowing the Government to bug conversations between lawyers and prisoners while it=92s about 50:50 for removing that basic confidentiality among those who believe that 10 or less innocent people have been released from death row (a significant difference).=20

=20  
=93Media pay much attention to murder, mayhem, the rights of victims and the death penalty and yet seem to have failed in exposing the actual injustice in the application of the death penalty,=94 according to = Mickey

Huff another Retro Poll Director. =93This perpetuation of public = naivet=E9

is also born out by the data that just 15% were aware of systematic abuse of South Asians in several prisons within the U.S.; and only a small proportion was aware (as General Taguba=92s report proved) that = the

Abu Ghraib situation was not the result of =91a few bad apples.=92=94 Nevertheless, as in the May, 2004 poll, 56% still favor a suspension of the death penalty until systematic problems in its application have been addressed.

=20  
Turning to the struggle between Israel and the Palestinians, only 11% knew=97in the face of a consistently pro-Israeli media=97that there are = no

documents of any Israeli offer to Yasser Arafat and the Palestinians from the Camp David 2000 meetings sponsored by President Clinton. And 21% thought that Israel has been dismantling its settlements compared with 22% who knew that Israel has continued expanding its seizure of land and building of major population centers and army bases in the West Bank occupied territories. Nevertheless, 44% of respondents said Israel should remove all its settlements (28% no, 28% don=92t know). And a = hefty

70% said that Israel's treatment of the 3 million Palestinians it controls is not consistent with a democratic government (a direct slap at the U.S. media-government claim that Israel is the region's bastion of democracy).

As in a previous poll, knowledge on the Bill of Rights was high. Sixty to 90% correctly identified three important rights named. Over 70% identified two statements limiting rights as not part of the Constitution. People who thought that the Bill of Rights gave the government the power to hold people indefinitely without charges were significantly more likely to approve of taking away the privacy rights of prisoners again showing how ignorance skews opinions rightward (chance probability less than 3.5%). The poll reached 223 randomly selected people throughout the U.S. between September 17 and October 1st. The average margin of error statistic for individual questions was 5.5%. The complete poll and response rates can be found at [www.retopoll.org](http://www.retopoll.org) .

Marc Sapir MD MPH  
Executive Director, Retro Poll  
510-848-3826  
[marcsapir@comcast.net](mailto:marcsapir@comcast.net)

Mickey Huff  
Director, Retro Poll  
510-798-6251  
[mickeyhuff@mac.com](mailto:mickeyhuff@mac.com)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 7 Oct 2004 11:37:56 -0400  
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <[cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU](mailto:cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Colleen Porter <[cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU](mailto:cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Retro Poll findings--no horserace here.  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-disposition: inline

I am curious about the link between the belief that "Al Qaeda worked with Saddam's Iraq" and whether they listen to country music. Of course, the country music industry/community disowned the Dixie Chicks after their

anti-Bush comment at the start of the Iraq invasion, and my local country = station \*still\* won't play their tunes. =20

But what they do play is a lot of music that makes the link between 9/11 = and the war in Iraq.

One example is "Courtesy of the Red, White, & Blue," by Toby Keith (which = is subtitled, "The Angry American"). Part goes like this: =20

"Now this nation that I love has fallen under attack.  
A mighty sucker punch came flying in from somewhere in the back.  
Soon as we could see clearly through our big black eye,  
Man we lit up your world like the Fourth of July."

Since most folks think of the "shock and awe" that happened in Iraq as = "lighting up like the Fourth of July," it does make a connection between = the 9/11 attacks and Iraq. And I've seen footage of soldiers in Iraq = defacing government property by writing "Courtesy of the Red, White & = Blue" on a missile. One of Keith's other popular war songs, "American = Soldier," is on an album called "Shock'n Y'All."

Another song that uses the 9/11 attacks as a justification for the war is, = "Have You Forgotten?" by Darryl Worley. Part of it is this:

"I hear people saying we don't need this war.  
I say there's some things worth fighting for  
What about our freedom and this piece of ground?  
We didn't get to keep 'em by backing down.  
They say we don't realize the mess we're getting in.  
Before you start preaching,  
Let me ask you this my friend...

"Have you forgotten - how it felt that day?  
To see your homeland under fire  
And her people blown away.  
Have you forgotten when those towers fell?"

Now maybe they don't even have a country music station out there in = Berkeley, but drive across the heartland or take a turn to the South, and = it's all over the radio dial. And in that context, by and large, I don't = think it's a matter of "corporate media" perpetuating a myth, but rather = some well-meaning country boys (dare I call them rednecks?) who genuinely = believe they are patriotic, and can pluck an appealing tune, to which = people enjoy singing along. =20

As an Army veteran and graduate of the University of Texas at Austin (home = of "Austin City Limits") I don't underestimate the role of country music = in shaping public opinion among its listeners. =20

(But this is not my area, so I'll go back to my health surveys and let you = political scientists figure this one out.) =20

Colleen=20

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

>>> Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET> 10/7/2004 10:43:19 AM >>>

October 7, 2004: For immediate release

=20

Contact: Marc Sapir (510)-848-3826

marcsapir@comcast.net=20

www.retropoll.org=20

=20

=20

New Retro Poll Findings:

=20

How Poor Journalism Drives Nation to the Right

(700 words)

=20

Berkeley--According to findings from several recent polls the public is split about 50:50 on whether the U.S. should immediately withdraw its military forces from Iraq. Now in a poll completed October 1, the Retro Poll organization takes an in depth look at what's behind that split. Retro Poll's findings reveal that opposition to withdrawal, like support for the war in the first place, comes mostly (59%) from people who have been fooled into believing that Saddam Hussein and Iraq worked with the Al Qaeda terrorist network. This difference was highly significant (likely to happen by chance less than 1 in 1,000 trials by chi-squared test).

=20

"The glass is both half full and half empty," said Marc Sapir, Retro Poll's Executive Director. "Twenty nine percent of our sample still believes, in the face of no evidence at all, that Al Qaeda worked with Saddam's Iraq and this group heavily supports continuing the occupation. But the group is getting to be a lonely place. At the beginning of the war the media did little to dispel the neo-con myth, so over half the public held that view. A year ago it was 41%; in May it was 39%; and now only 29% of our latest sample is holding on to this."

=20

"Moreover," Sapir continued, "it's just one of many examples that expose how corporate media's weak journalism and inadequate defense of the truth drive the U.S. public to the right and away from support of democratic values and their own best interests."

=20

Similar dramatic findings in the poll pertain to the death penalty, often a major issue in political campaigns. Only 16% of the sample knew that more than 110 convicted murderers have been proven innocent and released from prison in recent years. About 80% (of that 16%) oppose the new rule allowing the Government to bug conversations between lawyers and prisoners while it's about 50:50 for removing that basic confidentiality among those who believe that 10 or less innocent people

have been released from death row (a significant difference).=20  
=20

"Media pay much attention to murder, mayhem, the rights of victims and the death penalty and yet seem to have failed in exposing the actual injustice in the application of the death penalty," according to Mickey Huff another Retro Poll Director. "This perpetuation of public naivet=E9 is also born out by the data that just 15% were aware of systematic abuse of South Asians in several prisons within the U.S.; and only a small proportion was aware (as General Taguba's report proved) that the Abu Ghraib situation was not the result of 'a few bad apples.'" Nevertheless, as in the May, 2004 poll, 56% still favor a suspension of the death penalty until systematic problems in its application have been addressed.

=20  
Turning to the struggle between Israel and the Palestinians, only 11% knew\*in the face of a consistently pro-Israeli media\*that there are no documents of any Israeli offer to Yasser Arafat and the Palestinians from the Camp David 2000 meetings sponsored by President Clinton. And 21% thought that Israel has been dismantling its settlements compared with 22% who knew that Israel has continued expanding its seizure of land and building of major population centers and army bases in the West Bank occupied territories. Nevertheless, 44% of respondents said Israel should remove all its settlements (28% no, 28% don't know). And a hefty 70% said that Israel's treatment of the 3 million Palestinians it controls is not consistent with a democratic government (a direct slap at the U.S. media-government claim that Israel is the region's bastion of democracy).

=20  
As in a previous poll, knowledge on the Bill of Rights was high. Sixty to 90% correctly identified three important rights named. Over 70% identified two statements limiting rights as not part of the Constitution. People who thought that the Bill of Rights gave the government the power to hold people indefinitely without charges were significantly more likely to approve of taking away the privacy rights of prisoners again showing how ignorance skews opinions rightward (chance probability less than 3.5%). The poll reached 223 randomly selected people throughout the U.S. between September 17 and October 1st. The average margin of error statistic for individual questions was 5.5%. The complete poll and response rates can be found at [www.retopoll.org](http://www.retopoll.org) <<http://www.retopoll.org/>> .

=20

=20

Contacts:=20

=20

Marc Sapir MD MPH  
Executive Director, Retro Poll  
510-848-3826  
marcsapir@comcast.net=20

=20

Mickey Huff  
Director, Retro Poll  
510-798-6251  
mickeyhuff@mac.com.

=20

=20  
=20  
=20  
=20

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 7 Oct 2004 12:27:32 -0400  
Reply-To: Sid Groeneman <sid@GROENEMAN.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Sid Groeneman <sid@GROENEMAN.COM>  
Subject: Measuring "religion"  
Comments: To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <1ea.2c155b65.2e96a991@aol.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Our measure of religious identity consisted of a series of questions rather than a single "religious preference" question that's more customary and simple to incorporate within the Demographics section of most standard opinion surveys. Following a series of detailed questions asking the religion the respondent was raised in (if any), we then asked a similar series about the respondent's current religion:

1. Do you now consider yourself Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, in some other religion, in more than one religion, or none?
- 2a. If the response was Protestant or Evangelical, we then asked: What is that church or denomination?
- 2b. If the response was Other religion, we asked: What religion would that be?
- 2c. If the response was More than one religion, we asked: Which would those be?

Interviewers had a list of precoded churches and denominations. If the response didn't match anything in the list exactly, they were instructed to record the answer verbatim for post-survey coding. This series and procedure no doubt helped reduce the number of "Other" responses. It's unfortunately time-consuming and expensive to replicate this in most conventional polls. Also, it's not so easy to back-code many of the answers into a smaller set of analytic categories for cross-tabulation. Religion in America is incredibly diverse and fragmented - and many denomination names sound similar to others. Maybe someone can formulate a satisfactory short-cut. But, in the end, there's probably no single best way to measure religion in surveys, as it will depend on how you want to use it.

Sid Groeneman

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of J. Ann Selzer

Sent: Thursday, October 07, 2004 10:16 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Religious Identification in the U.S.: A New Report

I thank you for this as well. After 15 years of using the same question to identify religion, this year, I've been toying with different approaches. Part of it stems from a high number in the "none" category, but also in the "other" category. I don't see the same phenomenon happening in these data, but perhaps the authors could comment. We changed from asking a question similar to that posed in this survey "Which of the following best describes your religious beliefs-Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Muslim, other, or none? We routinely got double-digit percentages saying "other" and when we followed up, the specific answers were "Baptist, Assembly of God," and assorted other protestant denominations. We've changed our wording to: "Which of the following best describes your religious beliefs-Christian, Jewish, Muslim, other, or none" and then follow with Christians to ask if they are Catholic, or some other kind of Christian. It's reduced the other a bit, but the "other" still seems high to me.

Any one else seeing this? JAS

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 7 Oct 2004 13:14:26 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Subject: Re: Retro Poll findings--no horserace here.  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <s1652ab2.042@fuji.hp.ufl.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Colleen Porter wrote:

>I don't think it's a matter of "corporate media" perpetuating a  
>myth, but rather some well-meaning country boys (dare I call them  
>rednecks?) who genuinely believe they are patriotic

From my interview with the Slovenian philosopher & cultural theorist  
Slavoj Zizek <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Zizek.html>>:

Q: A large portion of the American population believes that Saddam was behind September 11. Only about 17% of respondents to one poll could correctly say that there were no Iraqis among the hijackers on September 11. Where do you think these fantasy views come from? Also, there's a tendency of the American left that thinks that all you have to do is get the facts out there, and things will take care of themselves. How do fantasies figure in politics and how do you counter them?

A: Now that's a good, big question. Big in the sense that I don't have good answers to it. With all my admiration for Noam Chomsky, I partially disagree with him. It's an underlying premise of his work that you don't have to do any theory - just tell all the facts to the people. The way ideology works today is much more mysterious - not more complex, one can always say this, things are always more complex, it means nothing just to say this. People just do not want to know too much. There's an active refusal to know. If you ask average citizens with enough of their own worries, they'd say, "Don't even tell me this. We pay taxes so the government can do all the dirty things that I don't want to know about."

The question isn't of any real link between al-Qaeda and the Iraqi regime. I remember a debate on TV where some viewers' calls made their point clear, which is: we are not talking about empirical links. Both Saddam and al-Qaeda hate the U.S.. That's enough of a link. You cannot really help by making factual refutations. The key factor is not that people are duped - there's an active will not to know. Remember the Reagan presidency, when the media pointed out his factual mistakes. That only raised his popularity. This was the point of identification. With Bush, you have an almost ideal image for how things work: a naive, unknowing president, and a sinister figure of knowledge, like Dick Cheney, the operative, who really controls him. This is really quite a nice metaphor for how things work.

People like to identify themselves. "I can be stupid but I'm still at the top. The wiseguy is my vice [president], he is doing all the dirty jobs for me." There is something appealing in this, I think. Again, my basic position is drop the point that people want to know; people don't want to know. I'm not engaged in any conservative psychology of, you know, "People prefer ignorance, it's only for us, the evolutionary or spiritual elite to lead them." I'm not saying this is an eternal fact. I'm just describing how specifically today's ideology works, through a direct appeal to the will of ignorance.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 7 Oct 2004 12:09:29 -0700  
Reply-To: Doug Strand <dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Doug Strand <dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Religious Identification in the U.S.: A New Report



Comments: To: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <0I5700G0CL44MQ@mta4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

UC Berkeley Sociologists Mike Hout and Claude Fischer also documented this trend and analyzed possible explanations of it. See:

Hout and Fischer, "Americans with No Religious Preference," American Sociological Review 67 (April, 2002)

-Doug Strand  
-----

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

At 05:59 AM 10/7/2004 -0400, Andrew A Beveridge wrote:

>Dear Sid:

>

>Personally, I am very glad that you highlighted that finding. It is also  
>similar to a finding from the American Religious Identification Survey  
>carried out by Barry Kosmin and the late Egon Mayer.

>

>I actually wrote one of my columns for the Gotham Gazette on that finding.

>

>The Passion for Religion Ebbs

>by Andrew Beveridge

>March 03, 2004

>

>As the Passion of the Christ continues to break box office records,  
>Christians observe lent, Jews prepare for Passover, the attorney general  
>holds morning prayer services and politicians routinely voice their  
>religious conviction from the stump, one might get the impression that  
>Americans are becoming more and more religious, and that they are  
>increasingly uneasy about such secular and scientific trends as abortion,  
>equality for gay people, and stem cell research. Yet, data from the 2001  
>American Religious Identification Survey  
><http://www.gc.cuny.edu/studies/aris.pdf> shows that Americans, and New  
>Yorkers, are actually becoming less religious. About 30 million adults were  
>found to have no religious affiliation, which is almost double what it was a  
>decade earlier (from 8.2 to 14.1 percent). In New York State, there are  
>about 1.9 million such residents (or about 13.4 percent of the population),  
>and in New York City, we can infer, some 14 percent of the population says  
>it has no religious affiliation, which, again, is about double what it was a

>decade ago.

>

>More here

>

><http://www.gothamgazette.com/article/Demographics/20040316/5/915>

>

>

>Of course, there is also Tom Smith's recent work showing the decline of  
>mainstream protestants.

><http://www-news.uchicago.edu/releases/04/040720.protestant.pdf>

>

>Andy Beveridge

>

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Sid Groeneman

>Sent: Wednesday, October 06, 2004 10:05 AM

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

>Subject: Religious Identification in the U.S.: A New Report

>

>Those of you who are interested the study of American religion or in  
>measuring religious identification in surveys might want to check out a  
>report that Gary Tobin and I recently completed. The main finding is that  
>one in every six American adults are now failing to select a church or  
>denomination when asked in surveys about their religious identity - that is,  
>they answer none / no religion /secular / atheist /agnostic. This is up  
>considerably from readings taken a decade earlier. The estimate is based a  
>survey of 10,204 RDD interviews completed in 2002. The report is available  
>on-line as a .pdf file at:

>[www.jewishresearch.org/PDFs/Religion\\_Report2.pdf](http://www.jewishresearch.org/PDFs/Religion_Report2.pdf) . Comments welcome.

>

>Sid Groeneman

>

>Groeneman Research & Consulting, and

>Senior Research Consultant -

> Institute for Jewish & Community Research

>301 469-0813

>[sid@groeneman.com](mailto:sid@groeneman.com)

>[www.groeneman.com](http://www.groeneman.com)

>

>Dr. Gary A. Tobin - IJCR President:

>415 386-2604

>[gatobin@jewishresearch.org](mailto:gatobin@jewishresearch.org)

>

>

>-----

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>

>-----

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>

>-----

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Sat, 2 Oct 2004 17:23:05 -0400  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Subject: Re: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution  
Comments: To: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@asu.edu>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <A7AF1AE70A8C124593A1AC831EFE46FE0594DDA8@ex3.asurite.ad.asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Shap,  
The Council should have a different notice. To wit: DON'T POST ANYTHING YOU DON'T WANT REPEATED.  
warren mitofsky

At 04:58 PM 10/2/2004, you wrote:

>Dear Fellow AAPORNET members:

>

>At the most recent AAPOR Executive Council meeting, the following  
>language describing our position on the privacy of messages posted on  
>AAPORNET was adopted:

>

>-----

>AAPORNET is a community. It exists only electronically, but nonetheless  
>it's a community with norms of behavior.

>

>One of these norms is how we use each other's contributions outside the  
>community. Not everyone may know the details, but AAPORNET is a closed,  
>subscription-only list. Only AAPOR members may post messages and view  
>the archives.

>

>Therefore it's AAPOR Council's view that list members should ask the  
>original poster(s) for permission when wanting to use another's posting  
>for some purpose outside of AAPORNET (e.g., quoting to a reporter,  
>lecturing in class, posting on a web page, etc.).

>

>Some have argued that in this electronic world, a group with over 1,000  
>members has no expectation of privacy. That may be, but we believe  
>AAPOR, and AAPORNET, is a more close-knit community than the blind  
>anonymous internet at large.

>-----

>

>You might also think about noting in your posts (or modifying your  
>signature) to say whether or not it is OK to quote you and in what  
>circumstances. I'll also be modifying the message footer and the  
>archives page to remind everyone of this policy.

>

>On behalf of Council,  
>Shap Wolf  
>Associate Chair, Publications & Information  
>AAPORNET Volunteer Coordinator

>

>-----

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

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 7 Oct 2004 16:12:05 -0700

Reply-To: Marc Sapir <[marcsapir@COMCAST.NET](mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET)>

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

From: Marc Sapir <[marcsapir@COMCAST.NET](mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET)>

Subject: Re: Retro Poll findings--no horserace here.

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

In-Reply-To: <[p06110403bd8b2979f66c@\[192.168.0.17\]](mailto:p06110403bd8b2979f66c@[192.168.0.17])>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Well, I think Colleen's point (actually Zizek's) is well taken, but that the truth may be somewhere between. Ideology is definitely very powerful (we'd have to say that's so particularly for the born again Christians who have faith in Bush on that commonality alone and need little more than faith, and for other groups too for their ideological reasons to support certain ideas and notions of credibility and inevitability). However, if Colleen is right the presidential election should either lead to Bush's re-election or be very very close. I'm betting on the other horse's fortunes. I think at this point that there are a lot forces within the system working overtime to cut the lies about Iraq to shreds in the public arena. I think they (I don't mean just the Democrats but powerful forces throughout our institutions) are moving a lot of people onto it. And if the "facts win" principle is accurate that would create, barring the unforeseen, a rather hefty win for the Democrats. So I believe that the election outcome will probably provide some evidence one way or the other on this topic of what makes public opinion today. (There is one caveat: the entire mass media was so much an accomplice to the original lying and chicanery on Iraq that it's possible they will not be able to regain the confidence of millions of potential Bush voters in now exposing what they refused to expose before. Many common folks have been more prone to trust those consistent lies of Fox and some CNN pundits/commentators that are upfront ideologically driven, than the dissimulation of the other major media players. Still, my guess is that Kerry will win handily on the basis of the "facts".

Marc Sapir MD, MPH

Executive Director

Retro Poll

[www.retropoll.org](http://www.retropoll.org)

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Doug Henwood  
Sent: Thursday, October 07, 2004 9:14 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Retro Poll findings--no horserace here.

Colleen Porter wrote:

>I don't think it's a matter of "corporate media" perpetuating a  
>myth, but rather some well-meaning country boys (dare I call them  
>rednecks?) who genuinely believe they are patriotic

From my interview with the Slovenian philosopher & cultural theorist  
Slavoj Zizek <<http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Zizek.html>>:

Q: A large portion of the American population believes that Saddam was behind September 11. Only about 17% of respondents to one poll could correctly say that there were no Iraqis among the hijackers on September 11. Where do you think these fantasy views come from? Also, there's a tendency of the American left that thinks that all you have to do is get the facts out there, and things will take care of themselves. How do fantasies figure in politics and how do you counter them?

A: Now that's a good, big question. Big in the sense that I don't have good answers to it. With all my admiration for Noam Chomsky, I partially disagree with him. It's an underlying premise of his work that you don't have to do any theory - just tell all the facts to the people. The way ideology works today is much more mysterious - not more complex, one can always say this, things are always more complex, it means nothing just to say this. People just do not want to know too much. There's an active refusal to know. If you ask average citizens with enough of their own worries, they'd say, "Don't even tell me this. We pay taxes so the government can do all the dirty things that I don't want to know about."

The question isn't of any real link between al-Qaeda and the Iraqi regime. I remember a debate on TV where some viewers' calls made their point clear, which is: we are not talking about empirical links. Both Saddam and al-Qaeda hate the U.S.. That's enough of a link. You cannot really help by making factual refutations. The key factor is not that people are duped - there's an active will not to know. Remember the Reagan presidency, when the media pointed out his factual mistakes. That only raised his popularity. This was the point of identification. With Bush, you have an almost ideal image for how things work: a naive, unknowing president, and a sinister figure of knowledge, like Dick Cheney, the operative, who really controls him. This is really quite a nice metaphor for how things work.

People like to identify themselves. "I can be stupid but I'm still at the top. The wiseguy is my vice [president], he is doing all the dirty jobs for me." There is something appealing in this, I think. Again, my basic position is drop the point that people want to know; people don't want to know. I'm not engaged in any conservative

psychology of, you know, "People prefer ignorance, it's only for us, the evolutionary or spiritual elite to lead them." I'm not saying this is an eternal fact. I'm just describing how specifically today's ideology works, through a direct appeal to the will of ignorance.

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Thu, 7 Oct 2004 16:49:15 -0700  
Reply-To: phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Phillip J. Trounstine" <phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU>  
Subject: Re: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution  
Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Warren is exactly right.

Phil Trounstine  
Survey and Policy Research Institute  
at San Jose State University  
408-924-6993  
phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu

Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Sent by: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
10/02/2004 02:23 PM  
Please respond to Warren Mitofsky

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
cc:  
Subject: Re: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution

Shap,  
The Council should have a different notice. To wit: DON'T POST ANYTHING  
YOU  
DON'T WANT REPEATED.  
warren mitofsky

At 04:58 PM 10/2/2004, you wrote:  
>Dear Fellow AAPORNET members:

>  
>At the most recent AAPOR Executive Council meeting, the following  
>language describing our position on the privacy of messages posted on  
>AAPORNET was adopted:  
>  
>-----  
>AAPORNET is a community. It exists only electronically, but nonetheless  
>it's a community with norms of behavior.  
>  
>One of these norms is how we use each other's contributions outside the  
>community. Not everyone may know the details, but AAPORNET is a closed,  
>subscription-only list. Only AAPOR members may post messages and view  
>the archives.  
>  
>Therefore it's AAPOR Council's view that list members should ask the  
>original poster(s) for permission when wanting to use another's posting  
>for some purpose outside of AAPORNET (e.g., quoting to a reporter,  
>lecturing in class, posting on a web page, etc.).  
>  
>Some have argued that in this electronic world, a group with over 1,000  
>members has no expectation of privacy. That may be, but we believe  
>AAPOR, and AAPORNET, is a more close-knit community than the blind  
>anonymous internet at large.  
>-----  
>  
>You might also think about noting in your posts (or modifying your  
>signature) to say whether or not it is OK to quote you and in what  
>circumstances. I'll also be modifying the message footer and the  
>archives page to remind everyone of this policy.  
>  
>On behalf of Council,  
>Shap Wolf  
>Associate Chair, Publications & Information  
>AAPORNET Volunteer Coordinator  
>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 7 Oct 2004 20:48:44 -0400  
Reply-To: Ken Sherrill <[ken@KENSHERILL.COM](mailto:ken@KENSHERILL.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Ken Sherrill <[ken@KENSHERILL.COM](mailto:ken@KENSHERILL.COM)>

Subject: Re: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution  
Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <6.1.1.1.2.20041002172125.0347bfa8@pop.mindspring.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Warren is right. We should think before we write.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky  
Sent: Saturday, October 02, 2004 5:23 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution

Shap,  
The Council should have a different notice. To wit: DON'T POST ANYTHING  
YOU DON'T WANT REPEATED. warren mitofsky

At 04:58 PM 10/2/2004, you wrote:

>Dear Fellow AAPORNET members:

>

>At the most recent AAPOR Executive Council meeting, the following  
>language describing our position on the privacy of messages posted on  
>AAPORNET was adopted:

>

>-----

>AAPORNET is a community. It exists only electronically, but nonetheless

>it's a community with norms of behavior.

>

>One of these norms is how we use each other's contributions outside the

>community. Not everyone may know the details, but AAPORNET is a closed,

>subscription-only list. Only AAPOR members may post messages and view  
>the archives.

>

>Therefore it's AAPOR Council's view that list members should ask the  
>original poster(s) for permission when wanting to use another's posting

>for some purpose outside of AAPORNET (e.g., quoting to a reporter,  
>lecturing in class, posting on a web page, etc.).

>

>Some have argued that in this electronic world, a group with over 1,000

>members has no expectation of privacy. That may be, but we believe  
>AAPOR, and AAPORNET, is a more close-knit community than the blind  
>anonymous internet at large.

>-----

>

>

>You might also think about noting in your posts (or modifying your



>signature) to say whether or not it is OK to quote you and in what  
>circumstances. I'll also be modifying the message footer and the  
>archives page to remind everyone of this policy.

>  
>On behalf of Council,  
>Shap Wolf  
>Associate Chair, Publications & Information  
>AAPORNET Volunteer Coordinator

>  
>-----  
>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>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 2004 07:33:18 -0400  
Reply-To: Robert Ladner <rladner@behavioralscience.com>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Robert Ladner <rladner@BEHAVIORALSCIENCE.COM>  
Organization: BSR  
Subject: Re: Measuring "religion"  
Comments: To: Sid Groeneman <sid@GROENEMAN.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Weighing in on the issue of religion --

Disclaimer: I am a sociologist (PhD, Indiana University, 1972) who has been engaged in survey research and market development research for the last 30 years. I am also a minister in the United Methodist Church (a Protestant denomination) and have been since the early 90s.

As everybody on this listserv probably knows, the measuring concept of "Protestant, Catholic, Jew, Muslim" has been around in the research question literature for decades. Using the term "Protestant" was a lot easier when the common Christian alternatives to Roman Catholic identification were mainstream denominations back in the 50s and early 60s. We have found a lot of folks who are "non-Catholic Christians" who do not identify at all with Protestantism, particularly the so-called nondenominational Christians, many of whom are in the "born again" tradition and support the sitting president. We have found that using an additional Christian category of "other (or non-denominational) Christian" cuts through a lot of the write-in clutter.

Without skidding off the substantive road into a methodological thicket, it's the same problem we have in Miami when we speak of "Anglo, Hispanic,

Black" as a tripartite racial/ethnic division. As anyone in a multicultural city can attest, this distinction is convenient if you like using a chainsaw in your data analysis, but is totally inadequate for anything finer. So, for that matter, is "Protestant, Catholic, Jew, Muslim."

Bob Ladner  
President, Behavioral Science Research Corporation  
Coral Gables, FL  
Pastor, Palm Springs United Methodist Church  
Hialeah, FL

1-800-282-2771

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

From: "Sid Groeneman" <sid@GROENEMAN.COM>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Thursday, October 07, 2004 12:27 PM

Subject: Measuring "religion"

> Our measure of religious identity consisted of a series of questions rather  
> than a single "religious preference" question that's more customary and  
> simple to incorporate within the Demographics section of most standard  
> opinion surveys. Following a series of detailed questions asking the  
> religion the respondent was raised in (if any), we then asked a similar  
> series about the respondent's current religion:  
> 1. Do you now consider yourself Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, in  
> some other religion, in more than one religion, or none?  
> 2a. If the response was Protestant or Evangelical, we then asked: What is  
> that church or denomination?  
> 2b. If the response was Other religion, we asked: What religion would that  
> be?  
> 2c. If the response was More than one religion, we asked: Which would  
> those  
> be?  
> Interviewers had a list of precoded churches and denominations. If the  
> response didn't match anything in the list exactly, they were instructed  
> to  
> record the answer verbatim for post-survey coding. This series and  
> procedure  
> no doubt helped reduce the number of "Other" responses. It's unfortunately  
> time-consuming and expensive to replicate this in most conventional polls.  
> Also, it's not so easy to back-code many of the answers into a smaller set  
> of analytic categories for cross-tabulation. Religion in America is  
> incredibly diverse and fragmented - and many denomination names sound  
> similar to others. Maybe someone can formulate a satisfactory short-cut.  
> But, in the end, there's probably no single best way to measure religion  
> in  
> surveys, as it will depend on how you want to use it.  
>  
> Sid Groeneman  
>

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of J. Ann Selzer

> Sent: Thursday, October 07, 2004 10:16 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Religious Identification in the U.S.: A New Report

>

> I thank you for this as well. After 15 years of using the same question to

> identify religion, this year, I've been toying with different approaches.

> Part

> of it stems from a high number in the "none" category, but also in the

> "other" category. I don't see the same phenomenon happening in these data,

> but

> perhaps the authors could comment. We changed from asking a question

> similar to

> that posed in this survey "Which of the following best describes your

> religious

> beliefs-Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Muslim, other, or none? We

> routinely

> got double-digit percentages saying "other" and when we followed up, the

> specific answers were "Baptist, Assembly of God," and assorted other

> protestant

> denominations. We've changed our wording to: "Which of the following best

> describes your religious beliefs-Christian, Jewish, Muslim, other, or none"

> and then

> follow with Christians to ask if they are Catholic, or some other kind of

> Christian. It's reduced the other a bit, but the "other" still seems high

> to me.

> Any one else seeing this? JAS

>

> J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.

> Selzer & Company, Inc.

> Des Moines, Iowa 50312

> 515.271.5700

>

> -----

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

> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

> -----

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 2004 07:42:44 -0400

Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>

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

From: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>

Subject: FW: Measuring "religion"

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

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

In Great Britain, where the census used self-identification to classify religious affiliation, 390,000 people claimed their religious affiliation to be "Jedi Knight" in 2001 <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/nugget.asp?id=297>. Sparked in part by an internet campaign, this Star Wars religion was just behind Hinduism and just ahead of Sikhism according to census returns in Great Britain.

From my Gotham Gazette column The Vanishing Jews, July, 2003  
<http://www.gothamgazette.com/article/Demographics/20030708/5/447>

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Robert Ladner  
Sent: Friday, October 08, 2004 7:33 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Measuring "religion"

Weighing in on the issue of religion --

Disclaimer: I am a sociologist (PhD, Indiana University, 1972) who has been engaged in survey research and market development research for the last 30 years. I am also a minister in the United Methodist Church (a Protestant denomination) and have been since the early 90s.

As everybody on this listserv probably knows, the measuring concept of "Protestant, Catholic, Jew, Muslim" has been around in the research question literature for decades. Using the term "Protestant" was a lot easier when the common Christian alternatives to Roman Catholic identification were mainstream denominations back in the 50s and early 60s. We have found a lot of folks who are "non-Catholic Christians" who do not identify at all with Protestantism, particularly the so-called nondenominational Christians, many of whom are in the "born again" tradition and support the sitting president. We have found that using an additional Christian category of "other (or non-denomination) Christian" cuts through a lot of the write-in clutter.

Without skidding off the substantive road into a methodological thicket, it's the same problem we have in Miami when we speak of "Anglo, Hispanic, Black" as a tripartite racial/ethnic division. As anyone in a multicultural city can attest, this distinction is convenient if you like using a chainsaw in your data analysis, but is totally inadequate for anything finer. So, for that matter, is "Protestant, Catholic, Jew, Muslim."

Bob Ladner  
President, Behavioral Science Research Corporation Coral Gables, FL Pastor,  
Palm Springs United Methodist Church Hialeah, FL

1-800-282-2771

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

From: "Sid Groeneman" <sid@GROENEMAN.COM>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
Sent: Thursday, October 07, 2004 12:27 PM  
Subject: Measuring "religion"

> Our measure of religious identity consisted of a series of questions rather  
> than a single "religious preference" question that's more customary  
> and simple to incorporate within the Demographics section of most  
> standard opinion surveys. Following a series of detailed questions  
> asking the religion the respondent was raised in (if any), we then  
> asked a similar series about the respondent's current religion:  
> 1. Do you now consider yourself Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Muslim,  
> in some other religion, in more than one religion, or none?  
> 2a. If the response was Protestant or Evangelical, we then asked: What  
> is that church or denomination?  
> 2b. If the response was Other religion, we asked: What religion would  
> that be?  
> 2c. If the response was More than one religion, we asked: Which would  
> those  
> be?  
> Interviewers had a list of precoded churches and denominations. If the  
> response didn't match anything in the list exactly, they were  
> instructed  
> to  
> record the answer verbatim for post-survey coding. This series and  
> procedure  
> no doubt helped reduce the number of "Other" responses. It's  
> unfortunately time-consuming and expensive to replicate this in most  
> conventional polls.  
> Also, it's not so easy to back-code many of the answers into a smaller  
> set of analytic categories for cross-tabulation. Religion in America  
> is incredibly diverse and fragmented - and many denomination names  
> sound similar to others. Maybe someone can formulate a satisfactory  
> short-cut.  
> But, in the end, there's probably no single best way to measure  
> religion  
> in  
> surveys, as it will depend on how you want to use it.  
>  
> Sid Groeneman  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of J. Ann Selzer  
> Sent: Thursday, October 07, 2004 10:16 AM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: Religious Identification in the U.S.: A New Report  
>  
> I thank you for this as well. After 15 years of using the same  
> question  
> to  
> identify religion, this year, I've been toying with different approaches.  
> Part  
> of it stems from a high number in the "none" category, but also in the

> "other" category. I don't see the same phenomenon happening in these data,  
> but  
> perhaps the authors could comment. We changed from asking a question  
> similar to that posed in this survey "Which of the following best  
> describes your religious beliefs-Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Muslim,  
> other, or none? We  
routinely  
> got double-digit percentages saying "other" and when we followed up,  
> the specific answers were "Baptist, Assembly of God," and assorted  
> other protestant denominations. We've changed our wording to: "Which  
> of the following  
best  
> describes your religious beliefs-Christian, Jewish, Muslim, other, or  
none"  
> and then  
> follow with Christians to ask if they are Catholic, or some other kind  
> of Christian. It's reduced the other a bit, but the "other" still  
> seems high to me.  
> Any one else seeing this? JAS  
>  
> J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
> Selzer & Company, Inc.  
> Des Moines, Iowa 50312  
> 515.271.5700  
>

> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 8 Oct 2004 09:56:22 -0400  
Reply-To: Nancy Belden <[nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM](mailto:nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nancy Belden <[nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM](mailto:nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM)>  
Subject: undecideds  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Does anyone have handy the percent of undecideds at this point in Presidential elections in the past? Thanks -- Nancy

Nancy Belden  
Partner, Belden Russonello & Stewart  
President, American Association for Public Opinion Research

1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
202.822.6090

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

---

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 2004 09:26:29 -0500  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: Re: undecideds  
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[MAIN\\_SERVERt69X65jB00000003@MAIN\\_SERVER.pdc.brspoll.com](mailto:MAIN_SERVERt69X65jB00000003@MAIN_SERVER.pdc.brspoll.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Below is Polling Report national data for president in 2000. As you know, undecideds are whatever a pollster wants them to be so comparisons should be by polling organization, 2000 vs. 2004.

<http://www.pollingreport.com/wh2gen1.htm>

Nick

Nancy Belden wrote:

>Does anyone have handy the percent of undecideds at this point in  
>Presidential elections in the past? Thanks -- Nancy

>  
>Nancy Belden  
>Partner, Belden Russonello & Stewart  
>President, American Association for Public Opinion Research

>  
>1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700  
>Washington, DC 20036  
>202.822.6090

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu  
>  
>  
>

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

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 2004 10:40:18 -0400  
Reply-To: "Kulka, Richard A." <rak@RTI.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Kulka, Richard A." <rak@RTI.ORG>  
Subject: Re: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution  
Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I tend to agree with Warren on this. I suppose that it might constrain some of our members from posting comments, but I doubt that it would be many, and that might not be all bad.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky  
Sent: Saturday, October 02, 2004 5:23 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution

Shap,  
The Council should have a different notice. To wit: DON'T POST ANYTHING YOU DON'T WANT REPEATED.  
warren mitofsky

At 04:58 PM 10/2/2004, you wrote:

>Dear Fellow AAPORNET members:

>  
>At the most recent AAPOR Executive Council meeting, the following  
>language describing our position on the privacy of messages posted on  
>AAPORNET was adopted:

>  
>-----  
>AAPORNET is a community. It exists only electronically, but nonetheless  
>it's a community with norms of behavior.

>  
>One of these norms is how we use each other's contributions outside the  
>community. Not everyone may know the details, but AAPORNET is a closed,  
>subscription-only list. Only AAPOR members may post messages and view  
>the archives.

>  
>Therefore it's AAPOR Council's view that list members should ask the



>original poster(s) for permission when wanting to use another's posting  
>for some purpose outside of AAPORNET (e.g., quoting to a reporter,  
>lecturing in class, posting on a web page, etc.).  
>  
>Some have argued that in this electronic world, a group with over 1,000  
>members has no expectation of privacy. That may be, but we believe  
>AAPOR, and AAPORNET, is a more close-knit community than the blind  
>anonymous internet at large.

>-----

-  
>  
>You might also think about noting in your posts (or modifying your  
>signature) to say whether or not it is OK to quote you and in what  
>circumstances. I'll also be modifying the message footer and the  
>archives page to remind everyone of this policy.

>  
>On behalf of Council,  
>Shap Wolf  
>Associate Chair, Publications & Information  
>AAPORNET Volunteer Coordinator

>  
>-----  
>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>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

-----  
Date: Fri, 8 Oct 2004 09:53:21 -0500  
Reply-To: Scott Althaus <[salthaus@UIUC.EDU](mailto:salthaus@UIUC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Scott Althaus <[salthaus@UIUC.EDU](mailto:salthaus@UIUC.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Retro Poll Findings--no horserace here  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

The Retro Poll findings are very interesting, but I want to take issue with the interpretation of those findings that was presented in the press release: that the mistaken beliefs about the Saddam-9/11 link were a product of media coverage or of the Bush administration's information campaign in preparation for war against Iraq. This interpretation of these and related findings has also been made by other members of this list and is quite widely held among pundits. However, it does not square with the available evidence.

I and my co-author Devon Largio have just published a study in the October issue of PS: Political Science and Politics (available as an Adobe Acrobat file at <http://www.apsanet.org/PS/oct04/althaus.pdf>) that suggests this misperception was already in place immediately after the 9/11 attacks, and did not result from either media coverage of the Bush administration's efforts to convince the public of its case for going to war. To the contrary, popular levels of misperception on the Saddam-9/11 linkage have been declining steadily ever since 9/11. Moreover, and more importantly for this list, the apparent levels of public misperception were exaggerated by the wording of survey questions and by the universal switch away from open-ended to forced-choice response formats after September 2001.

Here is the concluding section of the paper, which sums up the main points of our argument:

The shift from Osama to Saddam occurred in media coverage during August of 2002, but began four months earlier in the public statements of President George Bush. As Osama bin Laden faded in news coverage and all but disappeared in President Bush's public statements, clear efforts were made by the Bush administration to replace Osama bin Laden as America's foremost enemy by linking Saddam Hussein to the War on Terror.

Yet the American public needed little convincing on the possibility that Hussein was involved in 9/11. In polls taken in the days immediately following the 9/11 attacks, open-ended questions showed that Americans were not spontaneously blaming Iraq for the attacks. But forced-choice questions showed that as many as 8 in 10 Americans thought that Hussein was probably behind them. When explicitly presented with the possibility in the immediate aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, Americans by wide margins were already prepared to believe that Saddam was to blame long before the administration began building popular support for the war.

The American public's apparently widespread belief that Saddam Hussein was responsible for the 9/11 terror attacks was no feat of misdirection by the Bush administration. Instead, the Bush administration inherited and played into a favorable climate of public opinion, which may have greatly facilitated its task of building public support for war against Iraq. The mistaken belief that Saddam Hussein was responsible for the 9/11 attacks was already widespread among Americans long before President Bush began publicly linking Saddam Hussein with the War on Terrorism. Indeed, nearly seven months before the 9/11 attacks, an Opinion Dynamics poll in late February of 2001 found that 73% of Americans said it was very or somewhat likely that "Saddam Hussein will organize terrorist attacks on United States [sic] targets to retaliate for the air strikes" that had recently been conducted in Iraq by American and British air forces.

Our analysis of surveys about the mistaken belief that Hussein was responsible for 9/11 also suggests that the degree of misperception was overstated in many polls. This was partly due to the universal switch to forced-choice survey questions after September, 2001, which exaggerated the degree to which Americans saw a connection between Hussein and the 9/11 attacks. The other reason was that most questions only permitted respondents to assess the likelihood that Hussein was involved in 9/11, rather than allowing them to choose from a range of alternative options featuring different degrees of involvement. The only survey to have done

this, conducted by the Program on International Policy Attitudes and Knowledge Networks, found that fewer than a quarter of Americans saw a direct tie between Hussein and the terror attacks in New York and Washington D.C.

News coverage and presidential rhetoric may have replaced Osama with Saddam over time, but Saddam was on the short list of most likely suspects from the beginning for most Americans. Rather than showing a gullible public blindly accepting the rationales offered by an administration bent on war, our analysis reveals a self-correcting public that has grown ever more doubtful of Hussein's culpability since the 9/11 attacks.

---

Scott L. Althaus  
Associate Professor, Dept. of Speech Communication  
Associate Professor, Dept. of Political Science  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Department of Speech Communication  
702 S. Wright St., Rm. 244  
Urbana, IL 61801 USA

Office 217.333.8968  
Fax 217.244.1598  
Email [salthaus@uiuc.edu](mailto:salthaus@uiuc.edu)  
Web [www.uiuc.edu/~salthaus](http://www.uiuc.edu/~salthaus)

---

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

---

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 2004 11:09:16 -0400  
Reply-To: Howard Schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Howard Schuman <[hschuman@UMICH.EDU](mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution  
Comments: To: aapor <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[28FD6CB1D229C04191C012BA5F4A31484A7C@rtpwexc04.RCC\\_NT.RTI.ORG](mailto:28FD6CB1D229C04191C012BA5F4A31484A7C@rtpwexc04.RCC_NT.RTI.ORG)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Here is another second to Warren's response to the new policy on aapornet. Perhaps Council might consider ...a survey, yes, a survey, of members regarding a policy that evidently many think unnecessary.

Kulka, Richard A. wrote:

>I tend to agree with Warren on this. I suppose that it might constrain  
>some of our members from posting comments, but I doubt that it would be

>many, and that might not be all bad.

>

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky

>Sent: Saturday, October 02, 2004 5:23 PM

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Re: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution

>

>Shap,

>The Council should have a different notice. To wit: DON'T POST ANYTHING

>YOU

>DON'T WANT REPEATED.

>warren mitofsky

>

>At 04:58 PM 10/2/2004, you wrote:

>

>

>>Dear Fellow AAPORNET members:

>>

>>At the most recent AAPOR Executive Council meeting, the following  
>>language describing our position on the privacy of messages posted on  
>>AAPORNET was adopted:

>>

>>-----

>>AAPORNET is a community. It exists only electronically, but nonetheless  
>>it's a community with norms of behavior.

>>

>>One of these norms is how we use each other's contributions outside the  
>>community. Not everyone may know the details, but AAPORNET is a closed,  
>>subscription-only list. Only AAPOR members may post messages and view  
>>the archives.

>>

>>Therefore it's AAPOR Council's view that list members should ask the  
>>original poster(s) for permission when wanting to use another's posting  
>>for some purpose outside of AAPORNET (e.g., quoting to a reporter,  
>>lecturing in class, posting on a web page, etc.).

>>

>>Some have argued that in this electronic world, a group with over 1,000  
>>members has no expectation of privacy. That may be, but we believe  
>>AAPOR, and AAPORNET, is a more close-knit community than the blind  
>>anonymous internet at large.

>>-----

>>

>>

>-

>

>

>>You might also think about noting in your posts (or modifying your  
>>signature) to say whether or not it is OK to quote you and in what  
>>circumstances. I'll also be modifying the message footer and the  
>>archives page to remind everyone of this policy.

>>

>>On behalf of Council,

>>Shap Wolf

>>Associate Chair, Publications & Information  
>>AAPORNET Volunteer Coordinator  
>>  
-----  
>>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>  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>  
-----

>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu  
>  
>  
>  
>

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

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 2004 11:20:07 -0400  
Reply-To: MMBlum@AOL.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark Blumenthal <MMBlum@AOL.COM>  
Subject: Past voting & likely voters  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Two quick questions:

Does anyone have handy a citation to a summary of the work on overreporting of past voting?

Also, I recall reading an article or chapter about a dozen years ago that summarized the mechanics of the likely voter models of the major public polls, but I can't seem to find it. Can anyone recall that article or provide a citation?

Mark Blumenthal  
\_www.mysterypollster.com\_ (<http://www.mysterypollster.com>)

-----  
Mark M. Blumenthal  
Bennett, Petts & Blumenthal

1010 Wisconsin NW, Suite 208  
Washington, DC 20007  
202-342-0700  
202-342-0330 (fax)  
mmlum@aol.com

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

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 2004 11:24:00 -0400  
Reply-To: Sid Groeneman <[sid@GROENEMAN.COM](mailto:sid@GROENEMAN.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Sid Groeneman <[sid@GROENEMAN.COM](mailto:sid@GROENEMAN.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Measuring "religion"  
Comments: To: Robert Ladner <[rladner@behavioralscience.com](mailto:rladner@behavioralscience.com)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[004501c4ad2a\\$9d5bfe60\\$0a02a8c0@bob](mailto:004501c4ad2a$9d5bfe60$0a02a8c0@bob)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Yes, we've found that ambiguity about the meaning of "Christian" in our surveys as well. Responses of "Christian" can conceivably mean anything that falls under the broad umbrella of Christianity, encompassing hundreds of different institutions from Roman Catholic (and Greek and other Orthodox?), to mainline Protestant churches, to the Evangelical churches, to non-denominational and inter-denominational Christians. And, we've found that many who call themselves "Christian" don't consider themselves Protestant, and refuse to be further categorized. This group is growing, as I believe the NORC surveys have also discovered. Exactly who this group is, in terms of doctrine and belief, I leave to the experts in this area. But for survey researchers, Bob's idea seems useful: Add an explicit "Other Christian" choice to the standard Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Muslim, other religion, or none categories (probably best inserted in 3rd position, after "Catholic" and "Protestant").

Sid Groeneman

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

From: Robert Ladner [<mailto:rladner@behavioralscience.com>]  
Sent: Friday, October 08, 2004 7:33 AM  
To: Sid Groeneman; [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Re: Measuring "religion"

Weighing in on the issue of religion --

Disclaimer: I am a sociologist (PhD, Indiana University, 1972) who has been engaged in survey research and market development research for the last 30 years. I am also a minister in the United Methodist Church (a Protestant denomination) and have been since the early 90s.

As everybody on this listserv probably knows, the measuring concept of

"Protestant, Catholic, Jew, Muslim" has been around in the research question literature for decades. Using the term "Protestant" was a lot easier when the common Christian alternatives to Roman Catholic identification were mainstream denominations back in the 50s and early 60s. We have found a lot of folks who are "non-Catholic Christians" who do not identify at all with Protestantism, particularly the so-called nondenominational Christians, many of whom are in the "born again" tradition and support the sitting president. We have found that using an additional Christian category of "other (or non-denominationl) Christian" cuts through a lot of the write-in clutter.

Without skidding off the substantive road into a methodological thicket, it's the same problem we have in Miami when we speak of "Anglo, Hispanic, Black" as a tripartite racial/ethnic division. As anyone in a multicultural city can attest, this distinction is convenient if you like using a chainsaw in your data analysis, but is totally inadequate for anything finer. So, for that matter, is "Protestant, Catholic, Jew, Muslim."

Bob Ladner  
President, Behavioral Science Research Corporation  
Coral Gables, FL  
Pastor, Palm Springs United Methodist Church  
Hialeah, FL

1-800-282-2771

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 8 Oct 2004 12:13:10 -0400  
Reply-To: "Lavrakas, Paul" <[Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM](mailto:Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <[Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM](mailto:Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Past voting & likely voters  
Comments: To: [MMBlum@AOL.COM](mailto:MMBlum@AOL.COM), [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

Chapter 9. "Who Will Vote? Ascertaining Likelihood to Vote and Modeling a Probable Electorate in Preelection Polls" Robert P. Daves (2000) ELECTION POLLS, THE NEWS MEDIA, AND DEMOCRACY (Lavrakas %& Traugott, eds.) CQ Press.

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Mark Blumenthal  
Sent: Friday, October 08, 2004 11:20 AM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Past voting & likely voters

Two quick questions:

Does anyone have handy a citation to a summary of the work on overreporting of past voting?

Also, I recall reading an article or chapter about a dozen years ago that summarized the mechanics of the likely voter models of the major public polls, but I can't seem to find it. Can anyone recall that article or provide a citation?

Mark Blumenthal

[\\_www.mysterypollster.com\\_](http://www.mysterypollster.com) (<http://www.mysterypollster.com>)

Mark M. Blumenthal Bennett, Petts & Blumenthal  
1010 Wisconsin NW, Suite 208 Washington, DC 20007 202-342-0700 202-342-0330  
(fax) [mdblum@aol.com](mailto:mdblum@aol.com)

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 8 Oct 2004 09:42:09 -0700

Reply-To: "Jon A. Krosnick" <[krosnick@STANFORD.EDU](mailto:krosnick@STANFORD.EDU)>

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

From: "Jon A. Krosnick" <[krosnick@STANFORD.EDU](mailto:krosnick@STANFORD.EDU)>

Subject: Identifying Likely Voters

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

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Visser, P. S., Krosnick, J. A., Marquette, J., & Curtin, M. (2000). Improving election forecasting: Allocation of undecided respondents, identification of likely voters, and response order effects. In P. Lavrakas & M. Traugott (Eds.), *Election polls, the news media, and democracy*. New York, NY: Chatham House.

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Mark Blumenthal

Sent: Friday, October 08, 2004 11:20 AM

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

Subject: Past voting & likely voters

Two quick questions:

Does anyone have handy a citation to a summary of the work on overreporting of past voting?

Also, I recall reading an article or chapter about a dozen years ago that summarized the mechanics of the likely voter models of the major public



polls, but I can't seem to find it. Can anyone recall that article or provide a citation?

Mark Blumenthal

[\\_www.mysterypollster.com\\_](http://www.mysterypollster.com) (<http://www.mysterypollster.com>)

Mark M. Blumenthal Bennett, Petts & Blumenthal  
1010 Wisconsin NW, Suite 208 Washington, DC 20007 202-342-0700 202-342-0330  
(fax) [mdblum@aol.com](mailto:mdblum@aol.com)

---

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

---

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

---

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

---

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 2004 13:40:23 -0400  
Reply-To: Ward Kay <[wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM](mailto:wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Ward Kay <[wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM](mailto:wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM)>  
Organization: Adirondack Communications  
Subject: Re: Measuring "religion"  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <20041008152406.NSHH6722.out002.verizon.net@dell4300>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I find this discussion fascinating, and I hope that some of you have been studying this will put together a session at the AAPOR meeting.

Ward Kay  
Adirondack Communications

---

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

---

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 2004 14:26:48 -0400  
Reply-To: [broh@MIT.EDU](mailto:broh@MIT.EDU)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "C. Anthony Broh" <[broh@MIT.EDU](mailto:broh@MIT.EDU)>  
Organization: Consortium on Financing Higher Education  
Subject: Childhood Family income

Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I recognize there are multiple problems in asking adults to recall information from their childhood, but I am engaged in a project doing exactly that.  
=A0 Could someone point me in the direction of some question wording that asks adults about their childhood family income.=A0 =

=A0  
Thank you.  
=A0  
Tony Broh

C. Anthony Broh  
Director of Research  
Consortium on Financing Higher Education  
Suite 402, COFHE  
238 Main Street  
Cambridge, MA=A0 02142  
=A0  
E-mail: broh@mit.edu  
Phone: (617) 253-5026  
Fax: (617) 258-8280=A0=A0 =

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

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 2004 19:37:12 +0100  
Reply-To: Bob Worcester <Bob.Worcester@MORI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Bob Worcester <Bob.Worcester@MORI.COM>  
Subject: Re: AAPORNET Privacy Policy--Council Resolution  
Comments: To: Howard Schuman <hschuman@UMICH.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Add=20mine=20to=20Warren's=20seconders=20please.

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

From:=20Howard=20Schuman=20[mailto:hschuman@UMICH.EDU]=20  
Sent:=2008=20October=202004=2016:09  
To:=20AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject:=20Re:=20AAPORNET=20Privacy=20Policy--Council=20Resolution

Here=20is=20another=20second=20to=20Warren's=20response=20to=20the=20new=20=  
policy=20on  
aapornet.=20Perhaps=20Council=20might=20consider=20...a=20survey,=20yes,=20=

a=20survey,=20of  
members=20regarding=20a=20policy=20that=20evidently=20many=20think=20unnec=  
essary.

Kulka,=20Richard=20A.=20wrote:

>I=20tend=20to=20agree=20with=20Warren=20on=20this.=20=20I=20suppose=20tha=  
t=20it=20might=20constrain

>some=20of=20our=20members=20from=20posting=20comments,=20but=20I=20doubt=20=  
that=20it=20would=20be

>many,=20and=20that=20might=20not=20be=20all=20bad.

>

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

>From:=20AAPORNET=20[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]=20On=20Behalf=20Of=20Warren=20=  
Mitofsky

>Sent:=20Saturday,=20October=202002,=202004=205:23=20PM

>To:=20AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject:=20Re:=20AAPORNET=20Privacy=20Policy--Council=20Resolution

>

>Shap,

>The=20Council=20should=20have=20a=20different=20notice.=20To=20wit:=20DON=  
'T=20POST=20ANYTHING

>YOU=20DON'T=20WANT=20REPEATED.

>warren=20mitofsky

>

>At=202004:58=20PM=202010/2/2004,=20you=20wrote:

>

>

>>Dear=20Fellow=20AAPORNET=20members:

>>

>>At=20the=20most=20recent=20AAPOR=20Executive=20Council=20meeting,=20the=20=  
following=20

>>language=20describing=20our=20position=20on=20the=20privacy=20of=20messa=  
ges=20posted=20on=20

>>AAPORNET=20was=20adopted:

>>

>>-----

>>AAPORNET=20is=20a=20community.=20It=20exists=20only=20electronically,=20=  
but=20

>>nonetheless=20it's=20a=20community=20with=20norms=20of=20behavior.

>>

>>One=20of=20these=20norms=20is=20how=20we=20use=20each=20other's=20contri=  
butions=20outside=20

>>the=20community.=20Not=20everyone=20may=20know=20the=20details,=20but=20=  
AAPORNET=20is=20a=20

>>closed,=20subscription-only=20list.=20Only=20AAPOR=20members=20may=20pos=  
t=20messages=20

>>and=20view=20the=20archives.

>>

>>Therefore=20it's=20AAPOR=20Council's=20view=20that=20list=20members=20sh=

ould=20ask=20the=20  
>>original=20poster(s)=20for=20permission=20when=20wanting=20to=20use=20an=20other's=20  
>>posting=20for=20some=20purpose=20outside=20of=20AAPORNET=20(e.g.,=20quot=20ing=20to=20a=20  
>>reporter,=20lecturing=20in=20class,=20posting=20on=20a=20web=20page,=20e=20tc.).  
>>  
>>Some=20have=20argued=20that=20in=20this=20electronic=20world,=20a=20grou=20p=20with=20over=20  
>>1,000=20members=20has=20no=20expectation=20of=20privacy.=20That=20may=20=20be,=20but=20we=20  
>>believe=20AAPOR,=20and=20AAPORNET,=20is=20a=20more=20close-knit=20commun=20ity=20than=20the=20  
>>blind=20anonymous=20internet=20at=20large.

>>-----

>>-

>>

>>

>-

>

>

>>You=20might=20also=20think=20about=20noting=20in=20your=20posts=20(or=20=20modifying=20your

>>signature)=20to=20say=20whether=20or=20not=20it=20is=20OK=20to=20quote=20=20you=20and=20in=20what=20

>>circumstances.=20I'll=20also=20be=20modifying=20the=20message=20footer=20=20and=20the=20

>>archives=20page=20to=20remind=20everyone=20of=20this=20policy.

>>

>>On=20behalf=20of=20Council,

>>Shap=20Wolf

>>Associate=20Chair,=20Publications=20&=20Information

>>AAPORNET=20Volunteer=20Coordinator

>>

>>-----

>>Archives:=20<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>>Problems?-don't=20reply=20to=20this=20message,=20write=20to:

>>

>>

>aapornet-request@asu.edu

>

>

>-----

>Archives:=20<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>Please=20ask=20authors=20before=20quoting=20outside=20AAPORNET.

>

>-----

>Archives:=20<http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

>Please=20ask=20authors=20before=20quoting=20outside=20AAPORNET.=20Problem=20

s?-don't=20

>reply=20to=20this=20message,=20write=20to:=20aapornet-request@asu.edu

>

>



Subject: Re: Religious Identification in the U.S.: A New Report  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

In a recent data collection I too found much more endorsement of none and other on religion when offered the usual categories. The write-ins were very instructive. The "others" were varieties of born-again and evangelical, and the "nones" who wrote in were Buddhist, secular humanists, or varieties of spiritual practice that do not consider themselves an organized "religion." It seems that "protestant" has narrowed from non-Catholic Christian to the old-line traditional protestant denominations and that we can no longer think of the "nones" as atheists, agnostics, or the disinterested. There appears to be a group that is very interested in the realm of the spiritual that does not identify with the concept of "religion" to describe their involvement.

It looks like it's time for qualitative research to come up with a new way of assessing what we used to mean by "religion."

>Date: Thu, 07 Oct 2004 10:15:45 -0400  
>From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>  
>Subject: Re: Religious Identification in the U.S.: A New Report  
>Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>Reply-to: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM  
>X-Mailer: 9.0 for Windows sub 5112  
>Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>Original-recipient: rfc822:majl@mail.nyu.edu

>  
>I thank you for this as well. After 15 years of using the same question to identify religion, this year, I've been toying with different approaches. Part of it stems from a high number in the "none" category, but also in the "other" category. I don't see the same phenomenon happening in these data, but perhaps the authors could comment. We changed from asking a question similar to that posed in this survey "Which of the following best describes your religious beliefs? Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Muslim, other, or none? We routinely

>got double-digit percentages saying "other" and when we followed up, the=20  
>specific answers were "Baptist, Assembly of God," and assorted other  
protestant=20  
>denominations. We've changed our wording to: "Which of the following best=  
=20  
>describes your religious beliefs=E2=80=94Christian, Jewish, Muslim, other, =  
or  
none" and then=20  
>follow with Christians to ask if they are Catholic, or some other kind of=  
=20  
>Christian. It's reduced the other a bit, but the "other" still seems high  
to me.=20  
> Any one else seeing this? JAS  
>  
>  
>  
>J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.  
>Selzer & Company, Inc.  
>Des Moines, Iowa 50312  
>515.271.5700  
>  
>visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)  
>  
>E-mail address for purposes of this list: [JAnnSelzer@aol.com](mailto:JAnnSelzer@aol.com); otherwise,=20  
>contact [JASelzer@SelzerCo.com](mailto:JASelzer@SelzerCo.com).  
>  
>In a message dated 10/7/2004 5:05:49 AM Central Daylight Time,=20  
>[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU) writes:  
>Dear Sid:  
>  
>Personally, I am very glad that you highlighted that finding. It is also  
>similar to a finding from the American Religious Identification Survey  
>carried out by Barry Kosmin and the late Egon Mayer.  
>  
>I actually wrote one of my columns for the Gotham Gazette on that finding.  
>  
>The Passion for Religion Ebbs  
>by Andrew Beveridge  
>March 03, 2004  
>  
>As the Passion of the Christ continues to break box office records,  
>Christians observe lent, Jews prepare for Passover, the attorney general  
>holds morning prayer services and politicians routinely voice their  
>religious conviction from the stump, one might get the impression that  
>Americans are becoming more and more religious, and that they are  
>increasingly uneasy about such secular and scientific trends as abortion,  
>equality for gay people, and stem cell research. Yet, data from the 2001  
>American Religious Identification Survey  
><http://www.gc.cuny.edu/studies/aris.pdf> shows that Americans, and New  
>Yorkers, are actually becoming less religious. About 30 million adults were  
>found to have no religious affiliation, which is almost double what it was=  
a  
>decade earlier (from 8.2 to 14.1 percent). In New York State, there are  
>about 1.9 million such residents (or about 13.4 percent of the population),

>and in New York City, we can infer, some 14 percent of the population says  
>it has no religious affiliation, which, again, is about double what it was=  
a  
>decade ago.

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

---

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 2004 15:04:05 -0400  
Reply-To: [MMBlum@AOL.COM](mailto:MMBlum@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mark Blumenthal <[MMBlum@AOL.COM](mailto:MMBlum@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Past voting & likely voters  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

In a message dated 10/8/2004 11:20:07 AM Eastern Daylight Time, MMBlum writes:

> Does anyone have handy a citation to a summary of the work on  
> overreporting  
> of past voting?

Answering my own question...

I discovered -- this afternoon -- my AAPOR member access to JSTOR. Didn't realize I had it. I typed "vote overreport" as a search string, and got...

ROBERT BERNSTEIN, ANITA CHADHA, and ROBERT MONTJOY  
Overreporting Voting: Why It Happens and Why It Matters  
Public Opin Q 2001 65: 22-44. [Abstract]

Carol A. Cassel  
Voting Records and Validated Voting Studies  
Public Opin Q 2004 68: 102-108. [Full Text]

ROBERT F. BELLI, MICHAEL W. TRAUGOTT, MARGARET YOUNG, and KATHERINE A.



MCGONAGLE

Reducing Vote Overreporting in Surveys: Social Desirability, Memory Failure,  
and Source Monitoring

Public Opin Q 1999 63: 90-108

Lesson learned & mission accomplished. Next time, I'll search first.

Back to regular programming. And thanks to Lavrakas, Daves and Krosnick for  
the likely  
voter citations.

Mark Blumenthal

[\\_www.mysterypollster.com\\_](http://www.mysterypollster.com) (<http://www.mysterypollster.com>)

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 8 Oct 2004 15:08:03 -0400

Reply-To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>

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

From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>

Subject: Re: Retro Poll Findings--no horserace here

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

In-Reply-To: <[5.1.1.5.2.20041008093927.01cc02f0@express.cites.uiuc.edu](mailto:5.1.1.5.2.20041008093927.01cc02f0@express.cites.uiuc.edu)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Scott Althaus wrote:

>I and my co-author Devon Largio have just published a study in the October  
>issue of PS: Political Science and Politics (available as an Adobe Acrobat  
>file at <http://www.apsanet.org/PS/oct04/althaus.pdf>) that suggests this  
>misperception was already in place immediately after the 9/11 attacks, and  
>did not result from either media coverage of the Bush administration's  
>efforts to convince the public of its case for going to war. To the  
>contrary, popular levels of misperception on the Saddam-9/11 linkage have  
>been declining steadily ever since 9/11. Moreover, and more importantly for  
>this list, the apparent levels of public misperception were exaggerated by  
>the wording of survey questions and by the universal switch away from  
>open-ended to forced-choice response formats after September 2001.

Interesting study, but the words "Fox News" don't appear anywhere in  
it. I thought the PIPA study showed Fox viewers were far more likely  
to believe the connection.

I also remember watching a roundtable with the Wall Street Journal  
editorial board (the opinion people, not the news people) on CNBC  
during the anthrax scare. Bob Bartley & most of his posse were  
convinced that Iraq was behind the poison mailings. When someone  
pointed out that the FBI didn't agree, Bartley dismissed the  
objection.

So there's more media to study than AP.

--

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>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 2004 15:32:39 -0500  
Reply-To: Robert Godfrey <[rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU](mailto:rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Robert Godfrey <[rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU](mailto:rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Measuring "religion"  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[001e01c4ad5d\\$e3901190\\$6501a8c0@Ward](mailto:001e01c4ad5d$e3901190$6501a8c0@Ward)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"

Speaking of measuring "religion," I'm wondering if there's a mistake with the "Pew Research Center for the People & the Press" findings report at <http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?ReportID=227>

when you click on the detailed demographic tables  
<http://people-press.org/reports/tables/227.pdf>  
and scroll to page two and the section on religious affiliation. You get the following:

Religious Affiliation  
Total White Protestant  
- Evangelical  
- Non-Evangelical  
White Catholic  
Secular

What do others who've polled religion issues make of this?

Robert Godfrey

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

---

Date: Fri, 8 Oct 2004 16:15:45 -0500  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: Re: Measuring "religion"  
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <aapornet@asu.edu>  
In-Reply-To: <p06020400bd8ca78602be@[66.191.114.82]>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

They separated the religion data by race because African-Americans are overwhelmingly Democrats.

Robert Godfrey wrote:

> Speaking of measuring "religion," I'm wondering if there's a mistake  
> with the "Pew Research Center for the People & the Press" findings  
> report at <http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?ReportID=227>  
>  
> when you click on the detailed demographic tables  
> <http://people-press.org/reports/tables/227.pdf>  
> and scroll to page two and the section on religious affiliation. You  
> get the following:  
> Religious Affiliation  
> Total White Protestant  
> - Evangelical  
> - Non-Evangelical  
> White Catholic  
> Secular  
>  
> What do others who've polled religion issues make of this?  
>  
> Robert Godfrey  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
>

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

Date: Sat, 9 Oct 2004 20:39:28 -0700  
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>  
Subject: Re: Party ID Data  
Comments: To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <C5E0665BB776D311868400805FF5603A0591B5FA@sscnetex.ssc.msu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0

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

Might as well put this reference in here...

A friend of mine sent me an article by Michael Schwartz (professor sociology, SUNY Stony Brook) about 'poll-watching addiction.

<http://www.commondreams.org/views04/1006-34.htm>

curious what the political polls folks here think about it.

Leora

Dr. Leora Lawton, Principal  
TechSociety Research  
2342 Shattuck Avenue PMB 362, Berkeley, CA 94704  
(510) 548-6174; fax (510) 548-6175; cell (510) 928-7572  
[www.techsociety.com](http://www.techsociety.com)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Sat, 9 Oct 2004 20:29:26 -0700  
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Measuring "religion"  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <20041008152406.NSHH6722.out002.verizon.net@dell4300>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

My two bits...

One technique you can use for getting more depth out of 'what is your current religious identification' is to also ask 'In which religion were you raised?' We did this for a paper on switching of religious identity(1) and it worked quite well at identifying Catholics who'd left the fold (Catholics were more likely than Protestants in this 1987 data to become 'nones', whereas Protestants switched to another Protestant denomination. This was National Survey of FAmilies and Households data, and they broke religion down to nearly every denomination under the sun, which we later aggregated.

On another paper(2), we looked used some additional questions to identify 'fundamentalist protestants'. Also NSFH data, the questions were: "The bible is Gd's word and everything happened or will happen exactly as it says." and "The bible is the answer to all important human problems" Those who agreed or strongly agreed with both these statements were classified as fundamentalist protestants. Using this distinction allowed us to show that fundamentalist protestants were more supportive of intergenerational coresidence (parents living with adult kids and vice versa) than were other religious classifications (other Protestants,

Catholics, and Jews).

Personally I think the trend to self-defining as something other than a defined religion was predicted by Bellah et al's "Habits of the Heart." Interesting to see how it's playing out.

-Leora

Dr. Leora Lawton, Principal  
TechSociety Research  
2342 Shattuck Avenue PMB 362, Berkeley, CA 94704  
(510) 548-6174; fax (510) 548-6175; cell (510) 928-7572  
www.techsociety.com

1. "Parental Divorce and the 'switching' of religious identity". (2001) Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 40: 99-111, LE Lawton, Leora & R Bures.
2. "Family experiences and the erosion of support for intergenerational coresidence" (1997) JMF 60: 623-632, FK Goldscheider & LE Lawton.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Date: Sun, 10 Oct 2004 13:27:44 -0700  
Reply-To: phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Phillip J. Trounstine" <phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU>  
Subject: SF Chronicle on cellphones  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

World of the wireless stymies political pollsters  
Those who use only cell phones difficult to track for surveys  
James Sterngold, Chronicle Staff Writer  
Sunday, October 10, 2004

The surging number of people who are "cutting the cord," abandoning wired telephone lines for cellular phones, is suddenly presenting political pollsters with a vexing problem -- the prospect that their surveys may be undercounting younger voters in this election who have decamped for a wireless lifestyle.

The American Association for Public Opinion Research, a trade group representing professional pollsters, is so concerned that it has run seminars on the subject this year. The federal government, one of the most voracious users of polling data, has conducted in-depth research to learn more about the growing number of cell phone-only people, who are excluded from traditional polls.

"It's a new wrinkle to us, and we don't know how it'll play out," said Cliff Zukin, a polling expert at Rutgers University and the president-elect of the public opinion research group. "It's worrisome." Polling has been refined over the years into a tightly disciplined science -- with plenty of touches of art -- of calling randomly selected, wired

phone lines and then tabulating and adjusting the responses using sophisticated computer models in an effort to construct the opinions of the broader population.

Capturing the preferences of younger voters has always been a problem, pollsters say, because they are frequently on the go, but the rapid increase in the numbers of people who rely solely on their cell phones has accentuated the concerns.

Because of federal restrictions and practical hurdles, such as the lack of large-scale directories, pollsters do not call cell phones.

"Cell phones are a problem," said independent pollster John Zogby. "It could become a crisis. If you have a greater proliferation of cell phones, you could find you're missing lots of people, and we will have to figure out how to get to them."

Some polls suggest that under-30 voters appear to prefer Kerry over Bush by a small margin, so missing cell-phone-only young voters might, polling experts say, slightly undercount Kerry's support.

In addition, there are strong indications that young voters are more engaged with this presidential race than other recent elections, and may turn out in larger numbers on Nov. 2, making an accurate analysis of their likely voting patterns even more important in a tight race.

"In a close election, in close states, two percentage points can be a big deal," said Zukin. "It's just not good to have a (polling) bias in there in a close election." A recent telephone survey conducted by CBS News on behalf of the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement at the University of Maryland, and MTV, found that 18- to 29-year-old voters were following the race closely and that 46 percent said they planned to vote for Kerry, with 40 percent preferring Bush. According to the federal Bureau of Labor Statistics, about 6 percent of Americans rely solely on their cell phones, a group that is heavily young and urban.

But a study earlier this year by In-Stat/MDR, a market research company, projected that the figure is likely to reach nearly 30 percent by the next presidential election, in 2008.

"If you get to that level, it is major," said Phil Trounstein, the director of the Survey and Policy Research Institute at San Jose State University. "The concern we have is that if you miss this group, you understate their point of view."

Pollsters have long known that some households have no wired phones -- about 5 percent of all households -- and have not worried about failing to reach them because research has shown their election turnout is relatively low. But cell-phone-only voters may be another matter.

The federal study found that the cell-only users were most likely to be between 15 and 24 years old, to be renters rather than homeowners, to live in apartment buildings rather than single-family dwellings, and to be unmarried. They are also concentrated in city centers.

"The cell-only households are different and growing," the study concluded.

Scott Keeter, the director of survey research at the Pew Center for People and the Press, cited the growing cell phone use among young people as one of several factors that he and other experts are worried about in the presidential race.

"It's not a fatal flaw in polling numbers, but there's a lot of discussion among pollsters in the back rooms about what we should do about it," said Keeter. "We can see the trend, and we're concerned. There is a potential

for bias, but we don't know yet what it is."

Typical of the kind of people pollsters are concerned about is Michael Russo.

Russo is a 19-year-old sophomore at the University of Southern California who has relied solely on his cell phone, he says, for about a year. The world that he and his peers live in has changed dramatically.

"The days of having a cell phone as a status symbol are gone for us," said Russo, who added that he hardly has any friends with wired lines. "This really is how we communicate all the time now."

Also, like many of his friends, Russo's area code has nothing to do with where he finds himself living; his area code, 812, is from Indiana, where his family lives. This drives pollsters crazy, because they use area codes as one way of ensuring they are reaching geographically diverse samplings.

One potential solution to the problem is using interactive polling, in which voters are contacted through the Internet and e-mail. A number of pollsters have developed methods for interactive surveys and say the results have been reliable.

Zogby said his company has been experimenting with interactive polling for six years and has found that the results do not differ from the results of traditional telephone polling, with one difference -- fewer undecided voters tend to respond to the interactive surveys.

And, he added, there is one other difference.

"Unlike the response with traditional phones, the response rates are much better among younger people with interactive surveys," said Zogby.

E-mail James Sterngold at [jsterngold@sfchronicle.com](mailto:jsterngold@sfchronicle.com).

Page A - 4

---

Phil Trounstine  
Survey and Policy Research Institute  
at San Jose State University  
408-924-6993  
[phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu](mailto:phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Sun, 10 Oct 2004 16:57:09 -0400  
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM)>  
Subject: Re: SF Chronicle on cellphones  
Comments: To: [phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU](mailto:phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[OF209E5DB5.8D15A8D0-ON88256F29.006FE35C-88256F29.007033FD@sjsu.edu](mailto:OF209E5DB5.8D15A8D0-ON88256F29.006FE35C-88256F29.007033FD@sjsu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

The discussion about cell phones misleading election polls is a red herring for the 2004 election. Arianna and others don't know what they are talking

about. Cell phones will be a big worry in the future, but this year their effect on the national election polls will be negligible. If cell phones-only users are 5% of total phones, and the turnout for their owners is the same as for other voters, a 20-point difference in their voting compared to the other 95%, will only change the overall margin by only 1-point.

Mitigating against even this effect are two things: 1) If these phones belong to young people their turnout will be less than other age groups; 2) weighting to age will reduce undercoverage of this group.  
warren mitofsky

At 04:27 PM 10/10/2004, Phillip J. Trounstein wrote:

>World of the wireless stymies political pollsters  
>Those who use only cell phones difficult to track for surveys  
>James Sterngold, Chronicle Staff Writer  
>Sunday, October 10, 2004  
>  
>The surging number of people who are "cutting the cord," abandoning wired  
>telephone lines for cellular phones, is suddenly presenting political  
>pollsters with a vexing problem -- the prospect that their surveys may be  
>undercounting younger voters in this election who have decamped for a  
>wireless lifestyle.  
>The American Association for Public Opinion Research, a trade group  
>representing professional pollsters, is so concerned that it has run  
>seminars on the subject this year. The federal government, one of the most  
>voracious users of polling data, has conducted in-depth research to learn  
>more about the growing number of cell phone-only people, who are excluded  
>from traditional polls.  
>"It's a new wrinkle to us, and we don't know how it'll play out," said  
>Cliff Zukin, a polling expert at Rutgers University and the  
>president-elect of the public opinion research group. "It's worrisome."  
>Polling has been refined over the years into a tightly disciplined science  
>-- with plenty of touches of art -- of calling randomly selected, wired  
>phone lines and then tabulating and adjusting the responses using  
>sophisticated computer models in an effort to construct the opinions of  
>the broader population.  
>Capturing the preferences of younger voters has always been a problem,  
>pollsters say, because they are frequently on the go, but the rapid  
>increase in the numbers of people who rely solely on their cell phones has  
>accentuated the concerns.  
>Because of federal restrictions and practical hurdles, such as the lack of  
>large-scale directories, pollsters do not call cell phones.  
>"Cell phones are a problem," said independent pollster John Zogby. "It  
>could become a crisis. If you have a greater proliferation of cell phones,  
>you could find you're missing lots of people, and we will have to figure  
>out how to get to them."  
>Some polls suggest that under-30 voters appear to prefer Kerry over Bush  
>by a small margin, so missing cell-phone-only young voters might, polling  
>experts say, slightly undercount Kerry's support.  
>In addition, there are strong indications that young voters are more  
>engaged with this presidential race than other recent elections, and may  
>turn out in larger numbers on Nov. 2, making an accurate analysis of their  
>likely voting patterns even more important in a tight race.



>"In a close election, in close states, two percentage points can be a big deal," said Zukin. "It's just not good to have a (polling) bias in there in a close election." A recent telephone survey conducted by CBS News on behalf of the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement at the University of Maryland, and MTV, found that 18- to 29-year-old voters were following the race closely and that 46 percent said they planned to vote for Kerry, with 40 percent preferring Bush. According to the federal Bureau of Labor Statistics, about 6 percent of Americans rely solely on their cell phones, a group that is heavily young and urban.

>But a study earlier this year by In-Stat/MDR, a market research company, projected that the figure is likely to reach nearly 30 percent by the next presidential election, in 2008.

>"If you get to that level, it is major," said Phil Trounstein, the director of the Survey and Policy Research Institute at San Jose State University. "The concern we have is that if you miss this group, you understate their point of view."

>Pollsters have long known that some households have no wired phones -- about 5 percent of all households -- and have not worried about failing to reach them because research has shown their election turnout is relatively low. But cell-phone-only voters may be another matter.

>The federal study found that the cell-only users were most likely to be between 15 and 24 years old, to be renters rather than homeowners, to live in apartment buildings rather than single-family dwellings, and to be unmarried. They are also concentrated in city centers.

>"The cell-only households are different and growing," the study concluded.

>

>Scott Keeter, the director of survey research at the Pew Center for People and the Press, cited the growing cell phone use among young people as one of several factors that he and other experts are worried about in the presidential race.

>"It's not a fatal flaw in polling numbers, but there's a lot of discussion among pollsters in the back rooms about what we should do about it," said Keeter. "We can see the trend, and we're concerned. There is a potential for bias, but we don't know yet what it is."

>Typical of the kind of people pollsters are concerned about is Michael Russo.

>Russo is a 19-year-old sophomore at the University of Southern California who has relied solely on his cell phone, he says, for about a year. The world that he and his peers live in has changed dramatically.

>"The days of having a cell phone as a status symbol are gone for us," said Russo, who added that he hardly has any friends with wired lines. "This really is how we communicate all the time now."

>Also, like many of his friends, Russo's area code has nothing to do with where he finds himself living; his area code, 812, is from Indiana, where his family lives. This drives pollsters crazy, because they use area codes as one way of ensuring they are reaching geographically diverse samplings.

>

>One potential solution to the problem is using interactive polling, in which voters are contacted through the Internet and e-mail. A number of pollsters have developed methods for interactive surveys and say the results have been reliable.

>Zogby said his company has been experimenting with interactive polling for six years and has found that the results do not differ from the results of

>traditional telephone polling, with one difference -- fewer undecided  
>voters tend to respond to the interactive surveys.  
>And, he added, there is one other difference.  
>"Unlike the response with traditional phones, the response rates are much  
>better among younger people with interactive surveys," said Zogby.  
>E-mail James Sterngold at [jsterngold@sfchronicle.com](mailto:jsterngold@sfchronicle.com).  
>Page A - 4

>  
>  
>  
>

---

>Phil Trounstine  
>Survey and Policy Research Institute  
>at San Jose State University  
>408-924-6993  
>[phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu](mailto:phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu)

>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Sun, 10 Oct 2004 14:31:08 -0700  
Reply-To: [phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU](mailto:phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Phillip J. Trounstine" <[phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU](mailto:phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: SF Chronicle on cellphones  
Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@mindspring.com](mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I agree that it is unlikely that cellphone-only people will cause a significant problem in 2004. And it's clear that some people with certain agendas are arguing the case for a political purpose. But at some point CPOs will be a huge problem and we can't take an ostrich attitude toward them. Weighting for younger people will work only if CPOs are demographically and politically similar to those who do have land lines -- a fact not in evidence. If there is a study out there that gives a demographic or political profile of the CPO population, I'd be grateful to someone to point me toward it. And if this group is not in a survey in the first place -- because they could not be polled -- then they cannot be weighted up to their proper proportion. Can we afford to take the stance that since we SUSPECT that the CPO population is like other younger people who have land lines, we can ASSUME that weighting will correct for their absence? Not, I think, for much longer.

Phil Trounstine  
Survey and Policy Research Institute

at San Jose State University  
408-924-6993  
phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu

Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>  
10/10/2004 01:57 PM

To: phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
cc:  
Subject: Re: SF Chronicle on cellphones

The discussion about cell phones misleading election polls is a red herring for the 2004 election. Arianna and others don't know what they are talking

about. Cell phones will be a big worry in the future, but this year their effect on the national election polls will be negligible. If cell phones-only users are 5% of total phones, and the turnout for their owners

is the same as for other voters, a 20-point difference in their voting compared to the other 95%, will only change the overall margin by only 1-point.

Mitigating against even this effect are two things: 1) If these phones belong to young people their turnout will be less than other age groups; 2) weighting to age will reduce undercoverage of this group.  
warren mitofsky

At 04:27 PM 10/10/2004, Phillip J. Trounstine wrote:

>World of the wireless stymies political pollsters  
>Those who use only cell phones difficult to track for surveys  
>James Sterngold, Chronicle Staff Writer  
>Sunday, October 10, 2004  
>  
>The surging number of people who are "cutting the cord," abandoning wired  
>telephone lines for cellular phones, is suddenly presenting political  
>pollsters with a vexing problem -- the prospect that their surveys may be  
>undercounting younger voters in this election who have decamped for a  
>wireless lifestyle.  
>The American Association for Public Opinion Research, a trade group  
>representing professional pollsters, is so concerned that it has run  
>seminars on the subject this year. The federal government, one of the  
>most  
>voracious users of polling data, has conducted in-depth research to learn  
>more about the growing number of cell phone-only people, who are excluded  
>from traditional polls.  
>"It's a new wrinkle to us, and we don't know how it'll play out," said

>Cliff Zukin, a polling expert at Rutgers University and the  
>president-elect of the public opinion research group. "It's worrisome."  
>Polling has been refined over the years into a tightly disciplined  
science  
>-- with plenty of touches of art -- of calling randomly selected, wired  
>phone lines and then tabulating and adjusting the responses using  
>sophisticated computer models in an effort to construct the opinions of  
>the broader population.  
>Capturing the preferences of younger voters has always been a problem,  
>pollsters say, because they are frequently on the go, but the rapid  
>increase in the numbers of people who rely solely on their cell phones  
has  
>accentuated the concerns.  
>Because of federal restrictions and practical hurdles, such as the lack  
of  
>large-scale directories, pollsters do not call cell phones.  
>"Cell phones are a problem," said independent pollster John Zogby. "It  
>could become a crisis. If you have a greater proliferation of cell  
phones,  
>you could find you're missing lots of people, and we will have to figure  
>out how to get to them."  
>Some polls suggest that under-30 voters appear to prefer Kerry over Bush  
>by a small margin, so missing cell-phone-only young voters might, polling  
>experts say, slightly undercount Kerry's support.  
>In addition, there are strong indications that young voters are more  
>engaged with this presidential race than other recent elections, and may  
>turn out in larger numbers on Nov. 2, making an accurate analysis of  
their  
>likely voting patterns even more important in a tight race.  
>"In a close election, in close states, two percentage points can be a big  
>deal," said Zukin. "It's just not good to have a (polling) bias in there  
>in a close election." A recent telephone survey conducted by CBS News on  
>behalf of the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and  
>Engagement at the University of Maryland, and MTV, found that 18- to  
>29-year-old voters were following the race closely and that 46 percent  
>said they planned to vote for Kerry, with 40 percent preferring Bush.  
>According to the federal Bureau of Labor Statistics, about 6 percent of  
>Americans rely solely on their cell phones, a group that is heavily young  
>and urban.  
>But a study earlier this year by In-Stat/MDR, a market research company,  
>projected that the figure is likely to reach nearly 30 percent by the  
next  
>presidential election, in 2008.  
>"If you get to that level, it is major," said Phil Trounstine, the  
>director of the Survey and Policy Research Institute at San Jose State  
>University. "The concern we have is that if you miss this group, you  
>understate their point of view."  
>Pollsters have long known that some households have no wired phones --  
>about 5 percent of all households -- and have not worried about failing  
to  
>reach them because research has shown their election turnout is  
relatively  
>low. But cell-phone-only voters may be another matter.  
>The federal study found that the cell-only users were most likely to be

>between 15 and 24 years old, to be renters rather than homeowners, to live  
>in apartment buildings rather than single-family dwellings, and to be  
>unmarried. They are also concentrated in city centers.  
>"The cell-only households are different and growing," the study concluded.  
>  
>Scott Keeter, the director of survey research at the Pew Center for People  
>and the Press, cited the growing cell phone use among young people as one  
>of several factors that he and other experts are worried about in the  
>presidential race.  
>"It's not a fatal flaw in polling numbers, but there's a lot of  
discussion  
>among pollsters in the back rooms about what we should do about it, "  
said  
>Keeter. "We can see the trend, and we're concerned. There is a potential  
>for bias, but we don't know yet what it is."  
>Typical of the kind of people pollsters are concerned about is Michael  
>Russo.  
>Russo is a 19-year-old sophomore at the University of Southern California  
>who has relied solely on his cell phone, he says, for about a year. The  
>world that he and his peers live in has changed dramatically.  
>"The days of having a cell phone as a status symbol are gone for us,"  
said  
>Russo, who added that he hardly has any friends with wired lines. "This  
>really is how we communicate all the time now."  
>Also, like many of his friends, Russo's area code has nothing to do with  
>where he finds himself living; his area code, 812, is from Indiana, where  
>his family lives. This drives pollsters crazy, because they use area  
codes  
>as one way of ensuring they are reaching geographically diverse  
samplings.  
>  
>One potential solution to the problem is using interactive polling, in  
>which voters are contacted through the Internet and e-mail. A number of  
>pollsters have developed methods for interactive surveys and say the  
>results have been reliable.  
>Zogby said his company has been experimenting with interactive polling  
for  
>six years and has found that the results do not differ from the results  
of  
>traditional telephone polling, with one difference -- fewer undecided  
>voters tend to respond to the interactive surveys.  
>And, he added, there is one other difference.  
>"Unlike the response with traditional phones, the response rates are much  
>better among younger people with interactive surveys," said Zogby.  
>E-mail James Sterngold at [jsterngold@sfnchronicle.com](mailto:jsterngold@sfnchronicle.com).

>Page A - 4

>

>

>

>

---

>Phil Trounstine

>Survey and Policy Research Institute  
>at San Jose State University  
>408-924-6993  
>phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu  
>

>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Mon, 11 Oct 2004 07:36:57 -0400  
Reply-To: RFunk787@AOL.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "G. Ray Funkhouser" <RFunk787@AOL.COM>  
Subject: voting fraud studies ?  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Is anyone aware of any QUANTITATIVE studies or estimates of voting fraud in American elections ? I've seen only anecdotal accounts of it. Given that Harry Truman and Lyndon Johnson both owed their Senate seats, and thus by extension their presidencies, to outright ballot-box stuffing, this is by no mean a trivial issue in American politics . . . even today. E.g., the NY Daily News reported 46,000 people registered to vote in both NY and FLA. And there's that Indian reservation in South Dakota that mysteriously enabled the Democrat senatorial candidate to eke out a win in 2002 (and may enable Daschle to save his seat in 2004). This seems to be an undiscussed (perhaps because undiscussable?) facet of American electoral politics. Vote fraud is, I think, a federal crime punishable by a fine of up to \$10,000. Yet everyone . . . at least, the mainstream media . . . seems to blow it off.

Ray Funkhouser

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

=====  
Date: Mon, 11 Oct 2004 07:56:12 -0400  
Reply-To: "Lavrakas, Paul" <Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>

Subject: Re: SF Chronicle on cellphones  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

There was a Cell Phone Sampling Summit held in NYC in 2003 which was reported at AAPOR 2003. It led to first ever population parameters being gathered by the Jan/Feb 2004 CPS showing cell phone only HHs making up about 6% of US HHs at that time (Tucker and Brick, AAPOR 2004 paper); renters were the demo group most likely to be cell phone only at 12%. There were three back-to-back paper sessions at AAPOR 2004 on cell phone and telephone surveying.

Cell Phone Sampling Summit II is being held in early 2005, and discussion at that meeting will be reported at AAPOR 2005. The primary focus of the 2005 meeting will be to deliberate on the challenge of a dual frame methodology for telephone surveying of the public, using an RDD HH frame and a cell phone person-level frame.

PJL

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Phillip J. Trounstine  
Sent: Sunday, October 10, 2004 5:31 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: SF Chronicle on cellphones

I agree that it is unlikely that cellphone-only people will cause a significant problem in 2004. And it's clear that some people with certain agendas are arguing the case for a political purpose. But at some point CPOs will be a huge problem and we can't take an ostrich attitude toward them. Weighting for younger people will work only if CPOs are demographically and politically similar to those who do have land lines -- a fact not in evidence. If there is a study out there that gives a demographic or political profile of the CPO population, I'd be grateful to someone to point me toward it. And if this group is not in a survey in the first place -- because they could not be polled -- then they cannot be weighted up to their proper proportion. Can we afford to take the stance that since we SUSPECT that the CPO population is like other younger people who have land lines, we can ASSUME that weighting will correct for their absence? Not, I think, for much longer.

Phil Trounstine  
Survey and Policy Research Institute  
at San Jose State University  
408-924-6993  
phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu

Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>  
10/10/2004 01:57 PM

To: phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
cc:  
Subject: Re: SF Chronicle on cellphones

The discussion about cell phones misleading election polls is a red herring for the 2004 election. Arianna and others don't know what they are talking

about. Cell phones will be a big worry in the future, but this year their effect on the national election polls will be negligible. If cell phones-only users are 5% of total phones, and the turnout for their owners

is the same as for other voters, a 20-point difference in their voting compared to the other 95%, will only change the overall margin by only 1-point.

Mitigating against even this effect are two things: 1) If these phones belong to young people their turnout will be less than other age groups; 2) weighting to age will reduce undercoverage of this group.  
warren mitofsky

At 04:27 PM 10/10/2004, Phillip J. Trounstine wrote:

>World of the wireless stymies political pollsters Those who use only  
>cell phones difficult to track for surveys James Sterngold, Chronicle  
>Staff Writer Sunday, October 10, 2004  
>  
>The surging number of people who are "cutting the cord," abandoning  
>wired telephone lines for cellular phones, is suddenly presenting  
>political pollsters with a vexing problem -- the prospect that their  
>surveys may be undercounting younger voters in this election who have  
>decamped for a wireless lifestyle.  
>The American Association for Public Opinion Research, a trade group  
>representing professional pollsters, is so concerned that it has run  
>seminars on the subject this year. The federal government, one of the  
most  
>voracious users of polling data, has conducted in-depth research to  
>learn more about the growing number of cell phone-only people, who are  
>excluded from traditional polls.  
>"It's a new wrinkle to us, and we don't know how it'll play out," said  
>Cliff Zukin, a polling expert at Rutgers University and the  
>president-elect of the public opinion research group. "It's worrisome."  
>Polling has been refined over the years into a tightly disciplined  
science  
>-- with plenty of touches of art -- of calling randomly selected, wired  
>phone lines and then tabulating and adjusting the responses using  
>sophisticated computer models in an effort to construct the opinions of  
>the broader population.  
>Capturing the preferences of younger voters has always been a problem,  
>pollsters say, because they are frequently on the go, but the rapid  
>increase in the numbers of people who rely solely on their cell phones  
has



>accentuated the concerns.

>Because of federal restrictions and practical hurdles, such as the lack of

>large-scale directories, pollsters do not call cell phones.

>"Cell phones are a problem," said independent pollster John Zogby. "It

>could become a crisis. If you have a greater proliferation of cell phones,

>you could find you're missing lots of people, and we will have to

>figure out how to get to them."

>Some polls suggest that under-30 voters appear to prefer Kerry over

>Bush by a small margin, so missing cell-phone-only young voters might,

>polling experts say, slightly undercount Kerry's support.

>In addition, there are strong indications that young voters are more

>engaged with this presidential race than other recent elections, and

>may turn out in larger numbers on Nov. 2, making an accurate analysis

>of

their

>likely voting patterns even more important in a tight race.

>"In a close election, in close states, two percentage points can be a

>big deal," said Zukin. "It's just not good to have a (polling) bias in

>there in a close election." A recent telephone survey conducted by CBS

>News on behalf of the Center for Information and Research on Civic

>Learning and Engagement at the University of Maryland, and MTV, found

>that 18- to 29-year-old voters were following the race closely and that

>46 percent said they planned to vote for Kerry, with 40 percent preferring

Bush.

>According to the federal Bureau of Labor Statistics, about 6 percent of

>Americans rely solely on their cell phones, a group that is heavily

>young and urban.

>But a study earlier this year by In-Stat/MDR, a market research

>company, projected that the figure is likely to reach nearly 30 percent

>by the

next

>presidential election, in 2008.

>"If you get to that level, it is major," said Phil Trounstein, the

>director of the Survey and Policy Research Institute at San Jose State

>University. "The concern we have is that if you miss this group, you

>understate their point of view."

>Pollsters have long known that some households have no wired phones --

>about 5 percent of all households -- and have not worried about failing

to

>reach them because research has shown their election turnout is

relatively

>low. But cell-phone-only voters may be another matter.

>The federal study found that the cell-only users were most likely to be

>between 15 and 24 years old, to be renters rather than homeowners, to

live

>in apartment buildings rather than single-family dwellings, and to be

>unmarried. They are also concentrated in city centers.

>"The cell-only households are different and growing," the study

concluded.

>

>Scott Keeter, the director of survey research at the Pew Center for

People

>and the Press, cited the growing cell phone use among young people as  
>one of several factors that he and other experts are worried about in  
>the presidential race.  
>"It's not a fatal flaw in polling numbers, but there's a lot of  
discussion  
>among pollsters in the back rooms about what we should do about it, "  
said  
>Keeter. "We can see the trend, and we're concerned. There is a  
>potential for bias, but we don't know yet what it is."  
>Typical of the kind of people pollsters are concerned about is Michael  
>Russo.  
>Russo is a 19-year-old sophomore at the University of Southern  
>California who has relied solely on his cell phone, he says, for about  
>a year. The world that he and his peers live in has changed dramatically.  
>"The days of having a cell phone as a status symbol are gone for us,"  
said  
>Russo, who added that he hardly has any friends with wired lines. "This  
>really is how we communicate all the time now."  
>Also, like many of his friends, Russo's area code has nothing to do  
>with where he finds himself living; his area code, 812, is from  
>Indiana, where his family lives. This drives pollsters crazy, because  
>they use area  
codes  
>as one way of ensuring they are reaching geographically diverse  
samplings.  
>  
>One potential solution to the problem is using interactive polling, in  
>which voters are contacted through the Internet and e-mail. A number of  
>pollsters have developed methods for interactive surveys and say the  
>results have been reliable.  
>Zogby said his company has been experimenting with interactive polling  
for  
>six years and has found that the results do not differ from the results  
of  
>traditional telephone polling, with one difference -- fewer undecided  
>voters tend to respond to the interactive surveys.  
>And, he added, there is one other difference.  
>"Unlike the response with traditional phones, the response rates are  
>much better among younger people with interactive surveys," said Zogby.  
>E-mail James Sterngold at [jsterngold@sfchronicle.com](mailto:jsterngold@sfchronicle.com).  
>Page A - 4  
>  
>  
>  
>  
-----  
>Phil Trounstine  
>Survey and Policy Research Institute  
>at San Jose State University  
>408-924-6993  
>[phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu](mailto:phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu)  
>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====

Date: Mon, 11 Oct 2004 07:56:34 -0500  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: Re: Cellphones  
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
In-Reply-To: <[LISTSERV%2004101105242751@LISTS.ASU.EDU](mailto:LISTSERV%2004101105242751@LISTS.ASU.EDU)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

This story in today's New York Times makes it sound like the cell phone market is saturated. This could mean that the growth of cell-phone only users has slowed.

"Mr. Scocca and millions of other senior citizens are an alluring lot for the mobile phone industry, which has virtually tapped out the rest of the adult market. While about 80 percent of people 19 to 65 own mobile phones and more than 45 percent of those 10 to 18 do, only 39 percent of people 65 and older use them, according to the Yankee Group, a research firm. Moreover, older people who do use phones spend less money for fewer minutes each month than Americans under 65, the firm says."

"There are only so many 18-year-olds to market to," said Jeff Nelson, a spokesman for Verizon  
<<http://www.nytimes.com/redirect/marketwatch/redirect.ctx?MW=http://custom.marketwatch.com/custom/nyt-com/html-companyprofile.asp&symp=VZ>>  
Wireless. "The senior population is a clear opportunity for growth."

Story Below  
<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/10/11/technology/11cell.html?th>

>  
> New York Times October 11, 2004  
> In Pitch to Older Customers, Static for Cellphone Industry  
> By MATT RICHTEL  
>  
> AN FRANCISCO, Oct. 10 - Having equipped most adults and half of all  
> teenagers with cellphones, the mobile phone industry is turning its

> attention to the last untapped demographic - people over 65.  
>  
> But its dreams of collecting monthly subscription fees from  
> grandparents talking to their grandchildren, retirees calling friends  
> from their recreational vehicles or patients checking in with their  
> doctors may exact a hefty and unexpected price. The mobile phone  
> industry has roused the interest of AARP, the powerful lobby and  
> advocacy group for older Americans.  
>  
> And AARP is not happy with what it has heard from its members:  
> complaints about incomprehensible service contracts, confusing bills  
> and dead zones that are not clearly marked on coverage maps. They are  
> the same concerns that have been expressed for years by other consumer  
> advocates, who now have a new champion in the 35-million-member AARP.  
>  
> SNIP  
>  
> In the middle of the debate are people like Silvio Scocca, 77, a  
> retired import-export broker in San Francisco.  
>  
> Mr. Scocca and millions of other senior citizens are an alluring lot  
> for the mobile phone industry, which has virtually tapped out the rest  
> of the adult market. While about 80 percent of people 19 to 65 own  
> mobile phones and more than 45 percent of those 10 to 18 do, only 39  
> percent of people 65 and older use them, according to the Yankee  
> Group, a research firm. Moreover, older people who do use phones spend  
> less money for fewer minutes each month than Americans under 65, the  
> firm says.  
>  
> "There are only so many 18-year-olds to market to," said Jeff Nelson,  
> a spokesman for Verizon Wireless. "The senior population is a clear  
> opportunity for growth."  
>  
> But first marketers must overcome the concerns of Mr. Scocca and his  
> peers, who say the phones are too small, too hard to hear and cost too  
> much. Mr. Scocca ought to know. Two years ago, he bought service from  
> AT&T Wireless. But he canceled it in May after the phone sat mostly  
> unused on his kitchen table, though he spent \$32 a month for service.  
>  
> "It shouldn't be so perplexing to use," Mr. Scocca said, as he waited  
> for lunch to be served at a Y.M.C.A. in San Francisco recently.  
>  
> The feeling is not universal. Some customers, like Charles R. Temple,  
> 77, said that they had adapted to the wireless era just fine. Mr.  
> Temple, a retired book publisher who still writes and publishes  
> newsletters in San Francisco, said he used his phone every day.  
> Besides, he said, "It's good to have in case you faint, or stumble or  
> get in trouble."  
>  
> To create more converts, analysts said, the big phone makers are  
> developing phones that will be easier to see and hear - and that will  
> reverse the trend toward miniaturization.  
>  
> If so, they would be mimicking efforts in Korea and Japan, where the

> higher penetration among older people has led to development of more  
> elderly-friendly gadgets, said Peggy Johnson, a division president for  
> Qualcomm, a company that makes software and computer chips used in  
> cellphones worldwide.

>

> In Korea, Ms. Johnson noted, the phone maker LG recently introduced a  
> phone that allows people to measure their glucose levels. In Japan and  
> Korea, she said, phone makers have added tracking features that let  
> loved ones know their whereabouts.

>

> Carriers in the United States are putting pressure on phone makers to  
> be sensitive to the needs of older users, said Alan D. Ferber, vice  
> president for marketing for U.S. Cellular, which has 4.5 million  
> subscribers.

>

> Last year, in the hope of attracting more older customers, the photos  
> in U.S. Cellular brochures started to include older people using  
> cellphones. So, too, did those at Sprint; one of its brochures, from  
> November 2003, had a picture of a white-haired woman playing with a  
> young girl.

>

> Mr. Ferber said the older demographic was not only growing, but  
> becoming more technology savvy as baby boomers aged. "The senior of  
> today is primarily a safety user," he said. "The senior of tomorrow  
> has been a wireless user for 15 or 20 years."

>

> It also is a group with a powerful lobbying arm in AARP, which, Ms.  
> Weinstock said, had begun letter and phone campaigns at the state  
> legislative level. Its first significant effort prompted legislators  
> to introduce a measure two months ago in New York State that would  
> permit people to cancel their wireless phone contracts within 15 days  
> after receiving the first bill.

>

> The idea, Ms. Weinstock said, is to permit older people to see the  
> full cost of their bill after taxes and surcharges have been added.  
> She would like to take the proposal next to Pennsylvania and Illinois.  
> The group is also lobbying Congress to require the cellphone companies  
> to ask consumers before including their names and phone numbers in a  
> wireless telephone directory. The industry has said it plans to use  
> such an "opt-in" process, but consumer groups want it to be required  
> by law, not done voluntarily by cellphone carriers.

>

> AARP believes that if the opt-in process is not made law, the  
> cellphone industry could ultimately decide unilaterally to put names  
> in a cellphone directory, thus, AARP says, jeopardizing consumer privacy.

>

> In addition, Ms. Weinstock said AARP wanted companies to publish more  
> precise maps of their coverage areas. That way, she said, people who  
> use a phone infrequently or for emergencies only will not be surprised  
> to find it does not work as expected.

>

> In each of the last five years, AARP has asked members what service or  
> product they would most like AARP to provide, and cellphone service  
> was the No. 1 answer. The organization is considering marketing its

> own branded plan, by reselling access to the network of a major phone  
> carrier.  
>  
> In the meantime, AARP plans to try to make the existing companies more  
> responsive to older customers' needs.  
>  
> "I don't see how the industry is not going to have to stand up and  
> take notice," Ms. Weinstock said.  
>  
> Gene Kimmelman, executive director of Consumers Union, publisher of  
> Consumer Reports magazine, said AARP had another motive - getting its  
> own membership to take notice.  
>  
> He said that the lobbying group angered a lot of its members last year  
> during a brutal fight over the future of Medicare. AARP is taking on  
> telecommunications issues in a way it hasn't in many years, he said.  
>  
> "AARP is trying to get more in tune with its members' day-to-day  
> needs," Mr. Kimmelman said. "This is an obvious issue where they can  
> tap into resentment and confusion over cellphones - and score a lot of  
> points with members."  
>  
> Ms. Weinstock disputed that the internal dynamics were driving the  
> matter. She did say that the emphasis on telecommunications was not  
> new on the state level, though the AARP was putting in new effort at  
> the federal level.  
>  
> "We took up the wireless issue because it's a big issue and consumers  
> are unhappy about it," she said.

> Copyright 2004 The New York Times Company | [Home](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) |  
> [Search](#) | [Corrections](#) | [RSS](#) | [Help](#) | [Back to Top](#)

> Phillip J. Trounstine wrote:

>>I agree that it is unlikely that cellphone-only people will cause a  
>>significant problem in 2004. And it's clear that some people with certain  
>>agendas are arguing the case for a political purpose. But at some point  
>>CPOs will be a huge problem and we can't take an ostrich attitude toward  
>>them. Weighting for younger people will work only if CPOs are  
>>demographically and politically similar to those who do have land lines --  
>>a fact not in evidence. If there is a study out there that gives a  
>>demographic or political profile of the CPO population, I'd be grateful to  
>>someone to point me toward it. And if this group is not in a survey in the  
>>first place -- because they could not be polled -- then they cannot be  
>>weighted up to their proper proportion. Can we afford to take the stance  
>>that since we SUSPECT that the CPO population is like other younger people  
>>who have land lines, we can ASSUME that weighting will correct for their  
>>absence? Not, I think, for much longer.

>>

>>Phil Trounstine  
>>Survey and Policy Research Institute  
>>at San Jose State University  
>>408-924-6993  
>>phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>  
>>10/10/2004 01:57 PM  
>>

>> To: phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>> cc:  
>> Subject: Re: SF Chronicle on cellphones  
>>

>>The discussion about cell phones misleading election polls is a red  
>>herring  
>>for the 2004 election. Arianna and others don't know what they are talking  
>>  
>>about. Cell phones will be a big worry in the future, but this year their  
>>effect on the national election polls will be negligible. If cell  
>>phones-only users are 5% of total phones, and the turnout for their owners  
>>  
>>is the same as for other voters, a 20-point difference in their voting  
>>compared to the other 95%, will only change the overall margin by only  
>>1-point.

>>Mitigating against even this effect are two things: 1) If these phones  
>>belong to young people their turnout will be less than other age groups;  
>>2)  
>>weighting to age will reduce undercoverage of this group.  
>>warren mitofsky

>>At 04:27 PM 10/10/2004, Phillip J. Trounstine wrote:  
>>  
>>

>>>World of the wireless stymies political pollsters  
>>>Those who use only cell phones difficult to track for surveys  
>>>James Sterngold, Chronicle Staff Writer  
>>>Sunday, October 10, 2004  
>>>

>>>The surging number of people who are "cutting the cord," abandoning wired  
>>>telephone lines for cellular phones, is suddenly presenting political  
>>>pollsters with a vexing problem -- the prospect that their surveys may be  
>>>undercounting younger voters in this election who have decamped for a  
>>>wireless lifestyle.

>>>The American Association for Public Opinion Research, a trade group  
>>>representing professional pollsters, is so concerned that it has run  
>>>seminars on the subject this year. The federal government, one of the  
>>>

>>>  
>>most  
>>  
>>  
>>>voracious users of polling data, has conducted in-depth research to learn  
>>>more about the growing number of cell phone-only people, who are excluded  
>>>  
>>>  
>>>from traditional polls.  
>>  
>>  
>>>"It's a new wrinkle to us, and we don't know how it'll play out," said  
>>>Cliff Zukin, a polling expert at Rutgers University and the  
>>>president-elect of the public opinion research group. "It's worrisome."  
>>>Polling has been refined over the years into a tightly disciplined  
>>>  
>>>  
>>science  
>>  
>>  
>>>-- with plenty of touches of art -- of calling randomly selected, wired  
>>>phone lines and then tabulating and adjusting the responses using  
>>>sophisticated computer models in an effort to construct the opinions of  
>>>the broader population.  
>>>Capturing the preferences of younger voters has always been a problem,  
>>>pollsters say, because they are frequently on the go, but the rapid  
>>>increase in the numbers of people who rely solely on their cell phones  
>>>  
>>>  
>>has  
>>  
>>  
>>>accentuated the concerns.  
>>>Because of federal restrictions and practical hurdles, such as the lack  
>>>  
>>>  
>>of  
>>  
>>  
>>>large-scale directories, pollsters do not call cell phones.  
>>>"Cell phones are a problem," said independent pollster John Zogby. "It  
>>>could become a crisis. If you have a greater proliferation of cell  
>>>  
>>>  
>>phones,  
>>  
>>  
>>>you could find you're missing lots of people, and we will have to figure  
>>>out how to get to them."  
>>>Some polls suggest that under-30 voters appear to prefer Kerry over Bush  
>>>by a small margin, so missing cell-phone-only young voters might, polling  
>>>experts say, slightly undercount Kerry's support.  
>>>In addition, there are strong indications that young voters are more  
>>>engaged with this presidential race than other recent elections, and may



>>>turn out in larger numbers on Nov. 2, making an accurate analysis of  
>>>  
>>>  
>>their  
>>  
>>  
>>>likely voting patterns even more important in a tight race.  
>>>"In a close election, in close states, two percentage points can be a big  
>>>deal," said Zukin. "It's just not good to have a (polling) bias in there  
>>>in a close election." A recent telephone survey conducted by CBS News on  
>>>behalf of the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and  
>>>Engagement at the University of Maryland, and MTV, found that 18- to  
>>>29-year-old voters were following the race closely and that 46 percent  
>>>said they planned to vote for Kerry, with 40 percent preferring Bush.  
>>>According to the federal Bureau of Labor Statistics, about 6 percent of  
>>>Americans rely solely on their cell phones, a group that is heavily young  
>>>and urban.  
>>>But a study earlier this year by In-Stat/MDR, a market research company,  
>>>projected that the figure is likely to reach nearly 30 percent by the  
>>>  
>>>  
>>next  
>>  
>>  
>>>presidential election, in 2008.  
>>>"If you get to that level, it is major," said Phil Trounstone, the  
>>>director of the Survey and Policy Research Institute at San Jose State  
>>>University. "The concern we have is that if you miss this group, you  
>>>understate their point of view."  
>>>Pollsters have long known that some households have no wired phones --  
>>>about 5 percent of all households -- and have not worried about failing  
>>>  
>>>  
>>to  
>>  
>>  
>>>reach them because research has shown their election turnout is  
>>>  
>>>  
>>relatively  
>>  
>>  
>>>low. But cell-phone-only voters may be another matter.  
>>>The federal study found that the cell-only users were most likely to be  
>>>between 15 and 24 years old, to be renters rather than homeowners, to  
>>>  
>>>  
>>live  
>>  
>>  
>>>in apartment buildings rather than single-family dwellings, and to be  
>>>unmarried. They are also concentrated in city centers.  
>>>"The cell-only households are different and growing," the study  
>>>

>>>>  
>>concluded.  
>>  
>>  
>>>Scott Keeter, the director of survey research at the Pew Center for  
>>>  
>>>  
>>People  
>>  
>>  
>>>and the Press, cited the growing cell phone use among young people as one  
>>>of several factors that he and other experts are worried about in the  
>>>presidential race.  
>>>"It's not a fatal flaw in polling numbers, but there's a lot of  
>>>  
>>>  
>>discussion  
>>  
>>  
>>>among pollsters in the back rooms about what we should do about it, "  
>>>  
>>>  
>>said  
>>  
>>  
>>>Keeter. "We can see the trend, and we're concerned. There is a potential  
>>>for bias, but we don't know yet what it is."  
>>>Typical of the kind of people pollsters are concerned about is Michael  
>>>Russo.  
>>>Russo is a 19-year-old sophomore at the University of Southern California  
>>>who has relied solely on his cell phone, he says, for about a year. The  
>>>world that he and his peers live in has changed dramatically.  
>>>"The days of having a cell phone as a status symbol are gone for us,"  
>>>  
>>>  
>>said  
>>  
>>  
>>>Russo, who added that he hardly has any friends with wired lines. "This  
>>>really is how we communicate all the time now."  
>>>Also, like many of his friends, Russo's area code has nothing to do with  
>>>where he finds himself living; his area code, 812, is from Indiana, where  
>>>his family lives. This drives pollsters crazy, because they use area  
>>>  
>>>  
>>codes  
>>  
>>  
>>>as one way of ensuring they are reaching geographically diverse  
>>>  
>>>  
>>samplings.  
>>  
>>

>>>One potential solution to the problem is using interactive polling, in  
>>>which voters are contacted through the Internet and e-mail. A number of  
>>>pollsters have developed methods for interactive surveys and say the  
>>>results have been reliable.

>>>Zogby said his company has been experimenting with interactive polling

>>>

>>>

>>for

>>

>>

>>>six years and has found that the results do not differ from the results

>>>

>>>

>>of

>>

>>

>>>traditional telephone polling, with one difference -- fewer undecided

>>>voters tend to respond to the interactive surveys.

>>>And, he added, there is one other difference.

>>>"Unlike the response with traditional phones, the response rates are much

>>>better among younger people with interactive surveys," said Zogby.

>>>E-mail James Sterngold at [jsterngold@sfchronicle.com](mailto:jsterngold@sfchronicle.com).

>>>Page A - 4

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

---

>>>Phil Trounstine

>>>Survey and Policy Research Institute

>>>at San Jose State University

>>>408-924-6993

>>>[phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu](mailto:phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu)

>>>

>>>-----

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

>>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>>

>>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>-----

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

>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>

>>

>>

---

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

---

Date: Mon, 11 Oct 2004 10:53:02 -0700  
Reply-To: Mike Dennis <mdennis@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mike Dennis <mdennis@KNOWLEDGENETWORKS.COM>  
Subject: Position Available  
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Please see below the description for a new Senior Research Director = position available at Knowledge Networks in Government and Academic = Research.

This position requires the skills of a senior survey research = professional who will thrive in a growing, fast-paced, multi-project = environment using innovative techniques in the areas of questionnaire = design, sampling, and Internet-based data collection. The position = requires a passion for customer service and survey research. The = position will require substantial design-focused interaction with = university-based researchers from across the social and medical = sciences, as well as with other government and academic customers that = demand high quality survey data and superb project management. =20

The successful candidate will be responsible for working directly with = customers in designing questionnaires, survey samples, data collection = plans, and analytical reports for complex projects using the Knowledge = Networks web-enabled panel. In addition, the successful candidate will = supervise a small team of project directors and research analysts who = are responsible for implementing panel surveys in the Government and = Academic Research Area of Knowledge Networks. The candidate will also = be responsible for monitoring the cost accounting and invoicing schedule = for panel surveys. The ability to expand existing business and support = the VP Managing Director in pursuit of new business is a requisite.

The successful candidate must have 10 or more years experience in = managing complex statistical surveys, with in-depth experience in survey = project planning, questionnaire design, data collection strategies for = gaining cooperation, respondent incentives, data file preparation and = documentation, and survey data analysis. In addition, it is desirable = (but not required) for the successful candidate to:

- have a Ph.D. in a social science discipline or statistics, with a = preference for Psychology, or else a M.A. with 10+ years with relevant = working experience;
- have working experience in designing self-administered questionnaires = and data collection strategies used in mail and Internet surveys;
- have experience in designing and managing surveys addressing public = policy and political issues;
- have experience in conducting methodological research in one or more = areas such as non-response bias, data collection mode effects, = respondent incentives, reliability and validity, etc.;
- have successfully directed or managed statistical surveys funded by = EPA, NIH, NSF, or other Federal entities;

-have experience in managing or designing surveys using contingent =  
valuation methodology;  
-have experience in budgeting complex surveys;  
-be familiar with the quality and statistical standards adopted for =  
Federally sponsored surveys.

The position will be based in the Menlo Park, CA office of Knowledge =  
Networks.

Knowledge Networks, Inc., based in Menlo Park, California, is an AA/EEO =  
employer. Knowledge Networks maintains the only Internet-based survey =  
solution based on probability sampling. Please send a r=E9sum=E9 to =  
Mike Dennis at mdennis@knowledgenetworks.com for consideration. More =  
information about Knowledge Networks and Government and Academic =  
Research may be found at <http://www.knowledgenetworks.com/ganp/>.

Knowledge  
N E T W O R K S

J. Michael Dennis  
Vice President & Managing Director  
Government & Academic Research  
mdennis@knowledgenetworks.com

1350 Willow Road, Suite 102 Menlo Park, CA 94025 =20  
Phone 650.289.2160 Fax 650.289.2001 Mobile 650.537.7950  
[www.knowledgenetworks.com/ganp](http://www.knowledgenetworks.com/ganp)=20

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

=====  
Date: Mon, 11 Oct 2004 13:12:17 -0700  
Reply-To: [executivestaff@votewatch.us](mailto:executivestaff@votewatch.us)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Votewatch Executive Staff <[executivestaff@VOTEWATCH.US](mailto:executivestaff@VOTEWATCH.US)>  
Organization: Votewatch  
Subject: Re: voting fraud studies ?  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Comments: cc: [RFunk787@AOL.COM](mailto:RFunk787@AOL.COM)  
In-Reply-To: <[15c.40bdae12.2e9bca59@aol.com](mailto:15c.40bdae12.2e9bca59@aol.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=Windows-1252  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Dear Ray,

Votewatch is deploying a comprehensive citizen-driven system of =

=93real-time=94

election monitoring and reporting to identify problems with voting and develop a QUANTITATIVE data set in our target states. Using = statistically appropriate field research methodology, teams of trained volunteers, monitors, staff and others will be on hand to observe polling place activities, conduct exit polling and gather data that will be used to evaluate voting procedures nationwide and improve the process in future elections.

Votewatch, founded in 2002, is the nation=92s first non-partisan, citizen-driven election monitoring organization that utilizes field = research methodologies and statistical data analysis. A non-profit corporation, Votewatch brings together citizens, researchers and technologies to = promote fair, transparent and accurate elections.=20

For more information, see the report we delivered at AAPOR this year:  
<http://votewatch.us/reports/report.2004-08-13.3864411970/view?searchterm=3D=Non>  
e

Also, please don't hesitate to contact me personally if you would like additional information.

---

Steven Hertzberg  
Votewatch Corporation  
2269 Chestnut Street, 611  
San Francisco, California 94123  
T: 650-373-4960  
F: 650.429.2150

<http://www.votewatch.us>  
Your Eye on Elections =20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of G. Ray Funkhouser  
Sent: Monday, October 11, 2004 4:37 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: voting fraud studies ?

Is anyone aware of any QUANTITATIVE studies or estimates of voting fraud = in American elections ? I've seen only anecdotal accounts of it. Given = that Harry Truman and Lyndon Johnson both owed their Senate seats, and thus = by extension their presidencies, to outright ballot-box stuffing, this is = by no mean a trivial issue in American politics . . . even today. E.g., the = NY

Daily News reported 46,000 people registered to vote in both NY and FLA. And there's that Indian reservation in South Dakota that mysteriously enabled the Democrat senatorial candidate to eke out a win in 2002 (and = may enable Daschle to save his seat in 2004). This seems to be an undiscussed (perhaps because undiscussable?) facet of American electoral politics. Vote fraud is, I think, a federal crime punishable by a fine of up to \$10,000. Yet everyone . . . = at least, the mainstream media . . . seems to blow it off.

Ray Funkhouser

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

---  
Incoming mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.775 / Virus Database: 522 - Release Date: 10/8/2004  
=20

---  
Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.775 / Virus Database: 522 - Release Date: 10/8/2004  
=20

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

---

Date: Mon, 11 Oct 2004 16:27:31 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Measure of a meaningful poll story  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

From the SF Chronicle

Measure of a meaningful poll story  
- Dick Rogers  
Sunday, October 10, 2004

ONE OF the more useful political stories in The Chronicle this year didn't make Page One and didn't break news. Instead it shed light on a common question in the presidential campaign: Why can't polls agree on who is ahead and by how much?

## SNIP

Some "polls" do attempt to distort the picture, but legitimate opinion research tries to give a snapshot of the political landscape.

How can you tell the difference? Insist on your readers' bill of rights: Don't trust any poll story that doesn't give you the basic information you need to size it up.

Based on interviews, outside reading and my two attempts to pass a Statistics 101 class, I suggest that you look for at least the following:

**Margin of error:** When a story tells you that Thomas Dewey is leading Harry Truman by a 52-48 margin, ask yourself: What's the margin of error ("confidence interval" in stats-speak)? If the paper doesn't answer the question, the numbers are useless. A 4 percentage-point margin of error, for example, means that Dewey could be as much as 8 points ahead. But he also might be in a dead heat.

**Sample size:** The story should tell you the size of the sample, which can relate to the accuracy of the poll. As the experts say, you don't have to eat a whole pot of soup to know what it tastes like. A spoonful will do, so long as you stir the pot. So it is with polls. A truly random sample, sufficiently big, will give statistically reliable results. Pollsters can scientifically sample fewer than 1,000 people nationwide and be 95 percent sure their results are accurate to plus or minus 3 or 4 percentage points.

**Sample description:** Who's in the sample? Were they picked randomly? Were they registered voters or likely voters? You need to know because likely voters might behave differently from those who registered but plan to sit out the election.

**Who did the poll:** The story should say whether the survey was done by a nonpartisan pollster with a good track record, or by a group working for one campaign or another.

**Dates of the survey:** Polls don't predict. They capture a moment in time. If the poll was conducted two weeks before an important event, such as a debate, it might not mean much if it is published afterward.

How well does the paper do on these points? The library archive shows that 161 stories this year were at least partly about polls. Of those, 39 clearly indicated the error margins, sample sizes and dates of polling. Many stories were only a few paragraphs long, and some were results from the paper's sfgate.com online polls, which aren't scientific and should be regarded as good water-cooler material, not statistically valid.



That leaves too many stories that don't tell readers enough to judge the results. In June The Chronicle's stylebook, a usage guide for the paper, was updated to require all the previous qualities for any story based on polling. Still, some stories fall short. The paper can do better. I'll help if you will. In the remaining weeks until the election, insist on poll coverage that meets the basic tests. If you don't see it, let me know and I'll channel your comments to the key editors.

P.S.: This just scratches the surface. For more information and other indicators of good polling coverage, check out the National Council on Public Polls, [www.ncpp.org](http://www.ncpp.org), and the American Association for Public Opinion Research, [www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org).

P.P.S.: You can find John Wildermuth's story on The Chronicle's Web site, [sfgate.com](http://sfgate.com). Click on "Search in: Archive" and enter his name in the byline area.

Dick Rogers is The Chronicle's readers' representative. E-mail him at [readerrep@sfnchronicle.com](mailto:readerrep@sfnchronicle.com).

Page E - 5

URL:

<http://sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/2004/10/10/EDGMV952LR1.DTL>

--

Leo G. Simonetta  
Research Director  
Art & Science Group, LLC  
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
Baltimore MD 21209

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Mon, 11 Oct 2004 15:20:26 -0700  
Reply-To: Steven Hertzberg <[steven@VOTEWATCH.US](mailto:steven@VOTEWATCH.US)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Steven Hertzberg <[steven@VOTEWATCH.US](mailto:steven@VOTEWATCH.US)>  
Subject: Positions Available: Election Day Field Supervisors  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=Windows-1252  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Dear AAPOR members:

=20  
Votewatch is seeking the help of experienced survey professionals who =  
are  
willing to travel to key swing states (Ohio and New Mexico) on November =  
2nd  
to assist us with our exit polling activities in these states on =

election  
day. Votewatch is deploying teams of volunteers at randomly selected  
polling locations in OH & NM; survey professionals will supervise and  
oversee volunteer operations at these locations. These are paid =  
positions  
and travel expenses will be reimbursed accordingly.

=20  
Please contact us at [contact@votewatch.us](mailto:contact@votewatch.us) if you are interested in this  
unique opportunity or if you can refer a field research organization =  
that  
may be able to assist Votewatch in its mission. We are seeking to =  
recruit  
50 individuals in each state.

About Votewatch:

=20  
Votewatch ([www.votewatch.us](http://www.votewatch.us)) is a 501c(3) non-profit and non-partisan  
organization that adheres to the AAPOR code of conduct. Votewatch=92s  
comprehensive citizen-driven system of =93real-time=94 election =  
monitoring and  
reporting identifies election system problems, including issues that =  
result  
from voting equipment. Using statistically appropriate field research  
methodology, teams of trained volunteers, monitors, staff and others =  
will be  
on hand to observe polling place activities and gather data that will be  
used to objectively evaluate voting procedures nationwide and improve =  
the  
process in future elections.

=20  
Thank you.

---

Steven Hertzberg  
Votewatch Corporation  
San Francisco, California 94123  
T: 650-373-4960  
F: 650.429.2150

<http://www.votewatch.us> <<http://www.votewatch.us/>>=20  
Your Eye on Elections =20

---  
Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.775 / Virus Database: 522 - Release Date: 10/8/2004  
=20

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

Date: Tue, 12 Oct 2004 09:29:22 -0400  
Reply-To: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>  
Subject: Preserving data at Michigan  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear AAPOR Members:

In case you missed it, here is good news posted on our own AAPOR website Vox Box. Kudos to U of M, Myron Gutmann and everyone who had a hand in this.

Nancy Belden  
Partner, Belden Russonello & Stewart  
President, American Association for Public Opinion Research

1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
202.822.6090

Sept. 30, 2004

U-M leads \$4 million project to preserve poll and survey data  
ANN ARBOR, Mich.-In the thick of a presidential election, the latest findings from surveys and polls are reported on a daily basis. But much of the data behind the news on American public opinion is literally here today and gone tomorrow.

"At least half the survey and poll data collected since the 1940s has disappeared," said historian Myron Gutmann, director of the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research. "We're not sure yet if it's gone permanently or not."

Gutmann is the principal investigator on a new \$4.1 million project to acquire and preserve data from opinion polls, voting records, large-scale surveys and other social science studies. Funded primarily by the Library of Congress, the world's largest library, the three-year project is a broad-based partnership between ICPSR, the world's largest academic social science data archive, and five other institutions.

Other institutions involved in the project are the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research at the University of Connecticut, the Howard W. Odum Institute at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, the Henry A. Murray Research Center at Harvard's Radcliffe Institute, the National Archives and Records Administration, and the Harvard-MIT Data Center.

"This effort will ensure that future generations of Americans have access to vital material that will allow them to understand their nation, its social organization and its policies and politics," Gutmann said.

For three-quarters of a century, public opinion polls, social surveys and other kinds of structured interviews have tracked people's values, attitudes, knowledge and behavior. Surveys have done more than predict the outcomes of elections or tell us when presidents gain or lose popularity. They inform us about aging, health and health care, race relations, women's

rights, employment and family life-the full story of the social and cultural tapestry that makes up our nation. They provide the data necessary for sound, empirically based policy-making.

But a huge quantity of this data is missing or at-risk. "It has not been archived and without aggressive activities to locate and preserve it, it will disappear for good," Gutmann said. "This at-risk data can be found on the computers of individual researchers and research institutions, in bookcases and libraries, even in boxes of punched cards stored in warehouses. Some data reside on websites that don't have truly persistent URLs."

The good news, Gutmann says, is that the missing material has left tracks that researchers affiliated with the new project will follow, in the form of news releases, public grant announcements and publications describing the research. After identifying and finding at-risk content, the project aims to acquire the data, assure its security and prepare public use files that safeguard confidentiality.

"Our goal is to assure that the material remains accessible, complete, uncorrupted and usable over time," Gutmann said. "Rapid technological change will always threaten the viability of digital materials produced in previous years under obsolete technological conditions. But this project will greatly enhance our ability to preserve important data collections."

Established in 1948, the Institute for Social Research (ISR) is among the world's oldest survey research organizations, and a world leader in the development and application of social science methodology. ISR conducts some of the most widely-cited studies in the nation, including the Survey of Consumer Attitudes, the National Election Studies, the Monitoring the Future Study, the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, the Health and Retirement Study, the Columbia County Longitudinal Study and the National Survey of Black Americans. ISR researchers also collaborate with social scientists in more than 60 nations on the World Values Surveys and other projects, and the Institute has established formal ties with universities in Poland, China, and South Africa. ISR is also home to the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), the world's largest computerized social science data archive. Visit the ISR Web site at [www.isr.umich.edu](http://www.isr.umich.edu) for more information.

Through its National Digital Library (NDL) Program, the Library of Congress is one of the leading providers of noncommercial intellectual content on the Internet ([www.loc.gov](http://www.loc.gov)). The NDL Program's flagship American Memory project, in collaboration with other institutions nationwide, makes freely available more than 8.5 million American historical items. In December 2000, Congress authorized the Library of Congress to develop and execute a congressionally approved plan for a National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program. A \$99.8 million congressional appropriation was made to establish the program. The goal is to build a network throughout the country of committed partners working through a preservation architecture with defined roles and responsibilities. The complete text of the "Plan for the National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program" is available at [www.digitalpreservation.gov](http://www.digitalpreservation.gov). This includes an explanation of how the plan was developed, who the Library worked with to develop the plan and the key components of the digital preservation infrastructure. The plan was approved by Congress in December 2002.

Contact: Diane Swanbrow

E-mail: [Swanbrow@umich.edu](mailto:Swanbrow@umich.edu)

Phone: (734) 647-9069

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
=====

Date: Tue, 12 Oct 2004 09:59:34 -0400  
Reply-To: "Bryant, Barbara" <bryantb@BUS.UMICH.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Bryant, Barbara" <bryantb@BUS.UMICH.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Preserving data at Michigan  
Comments: To: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Note that Roper Center for Public Opinion Research at Univ of =  
Connecticut is also one of the archives involved in this good news =  
project

-----  
From: AAPORNET on behalf of Nancy Belden  
Sent: Tue 10/12/2004 9:29 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Preserving data at Michigan

Dear AAPOR Members:

In case you missed it, here is good news posted on our own AAPOR website =  
Vox  
Box. Kudos to U of M, Myron Gutmann and everyone who had a hand in =  
this.

Nancy Belden  
Partner, Belden Russonello & Stewart  
President, American Association for Public Opinion Research

1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
202.822.6090

Sept. 30, 2004

U-M leads \$4 million project to preserve poll and survey data  
ANN ARBOR, Mich.-In the thick of a presidential election, the latest  
findings from surveys and polls are reported on a daily basis. But much =  
of  
the data behind the news on American public opinion is literally here =  
today

and gone tomorrow.

"At least half the survey and poll data collected since the 1940s has disappeared," said historian Myron Gutmann, director of the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of

Michigan Institute for Social Research. "We're not sure yet if it's gone permanently or not."

Gutmann is the principal investigator on a new \$4.1 million project to acquire and preserve data from opinion polls, voting records, large-scale surveys and other social science studies. Funded primarily by the Library of

Congress, the world's largest library, the three-year project is a broad-based partnership between ICPSR, the world's largest academic social science data archive, and five other institutions.

Other institutions involved in the project are the Roper Center for Public

Opinion Research at the University of Connecticut, the Howard W. Odum Institute at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, the Henry A. Murray Research Center at Harvard's Radcliffe Institute, the National Archives and Records Administration, and the Harvard-MIT Data Center.

"This effort will ensure that future generations of Americans have access to

vital material that will allow them to understand their nation, its social

organization and its policies and politics," Gutmann said.

For three-quarters of a century, public opinion polls, social surveys and

other kinds of structured interviews have tracked people's values, attitudes, knowledge and behavior. Surveys have done more than predict the

outcomes of elections or tell us when presidents gain or lose popularity.

They inform us about aging, health and health care, race relations, women's

rights, employment and family life-the full story of the social and cultural

tapestry that makes up our nation. They provide the data necessary for sound, empirically based policy-making.

But a huge quantity of this data is missing or at-risk. "It has not been archived and without aggressive activities to locate and preserve it, it will disappear for good," Gutmann said. "This at-risk data can be found on

the computers of individual researchers and research institutions, in bookcases and libraries, even in boxes of punched cards stored in warehouses. Some data reside on websites that don't have truly persistent URLs."

The good news, Gutmann says, is that the missing material has left tracks

that researchers affiliated with the new project will follow, in the form of

news releases, public grant announcements and publications describing =  
the  
research. After identifying and finding at-risk content, the project =  
aims to  
acquire the data, assure its security and prepare public use files that  
safeguard confidentiality.  
"Our goal is to assure that the material remains accessible, complete,  
uncorrupted and usable over time," Gutmann said. "Rapid technological =  
change  
will always threaten the viability of digital materials produced in =  
previous  
years under obsolete technological conditions. But this project will =  
greatly  
enhance our ability to preserve important data collections."

Established in 1948, the Institute for Social Research (ISR) is among =  
the  
world's oldest survey research organizations, and a world leader in the  
development and application of social science methodology. ISR conducts =  
some  
of the most widely-cited studies in the nation, including the Survey of  
Consumer Attitudes, the National Election Studies, the Monitoring the =  
Future  
Study, the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, the Health and Retirement =  
Study,  
the Columbia County Longitudinal Study and the National Survey of Black  
Americans. ISR researchers also collaborate with social scientists in =  
more  
than 60 nations on the World Values Surveys and other projects, and the  
Institute has established formal ties with universities in Poland, =  
China,  
and South Africa. ISR is also home to the Inter-University Consortium =  
for  
Political and Social Research (ICPSR), the world's largest computerized  
social science data archive. Visit the ISR Web site at [www.isr.umich.edu](http://www.isr.umich.edu) =  
for  
more information.  
Through its National Digital Library (NDL) Program, the Library of =  
Congress  
is one of the leading providers of noncommercial intellectual content on =  
the  
Internet ([www.loc.gov](http://www.loc.gov)). The NDL Program's flagship American Memory =  
project,  
in collaboration with other institutions nationwide, makes freely =  
available  
more than 8.5 million American historical items. In December 2000, =  
Congress  
authorized the Library of Congress to develop and execute a =  
congressionally  
approved plan for a National Digital Information Infrastructure and  
Preservation Program. A \$99.8 million congressional appropriation was =  
made  
to establish the program. The goal is to build a network throughout the  
country of committed partners working through a preservation =

architecture  
with defined roles and responsibilities. The complete text of the "Plan =  
for  
the National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation =  
Program" is  
available at [www.digitalpreservation.gov](http://www.digitalpreservation.gov). This includes an explanation =  
of  
how the plan was developed, who the Library worked with to develop the =  
plan  
and the key components of the digital preservation infrastructure. The =  
plan  
was approved by Congress in December 2002.  
Contact: Diane Swanbrow  
E-mail: [Swanbrow@umich.edu](mailto:Swanbrow@umich.edu)  
Phone: (734) 647-9069

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Date: Tue, 12 Oct 2004 08:01:46 -0700  
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Subject: european income categories  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Hi everybody,

We'd like to conduct a survey for european consumers, leaning toward the well-to-do side. Does anyone know of standard classifications? I know there isn't as much variance (not as much disparity between the very rich and everyone else), but I'm wondering if I can just convert US dollar categories to the local currency. I tried searching on the web, but didn't find anything.

Thanks  
Leora

Dr. Leora Lawton, Principal  
TechSociety Research  
2342 Shattuck Avenue PMB 362, Berkeley, CA 94704  
(510) 548-6174; fax (510) 548-6175; cell (510) 928-7572  
[www.techsociety.com](http://www.techsociety.com)



-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Tue, 12 Oct 2004 08:48:10 -0700  
Reply-To: "Stephen J. Blumberg" <swb5@CDC.GOV>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Stephen J. Blumberg" <swb5@CDC.GOV>  
Subject: Re: cellphones

FYI, the 2004 AAPOR meeting also included a paper by my colleagues and myself on National Center for Health Statistics data on the population parameters of the cell-phone only population. These data predated those from the CPS, showing that 3.6% of US civilian households and 3.0% of US noninstitutionalized civilian adults had only cell phones when interviewed in 2003. The largest group was adults living with unrelated roommates (10.3%) followed by renters (7.4%). Controlling for all demographics (including age), the cell-phone only adults were still more likely to have had five or more alcoholic drinks on one occasion and to be a smoker, were more likely to be uninsured, were more likely to have had an HIV test, were less likely to have a usual place for medical care, and were less likely to have received an influenza vaccination in the past 12 months. (Sorry, we don't have any info on political leanings.)

Using the National Health Interview Survey, a face-to-face survey which is continuously in the field, NCHS continues to monitor the size and characteristics (demographic and health) of this population.

Copies of the AAPOR paper are available on request.

--Stephen--

Stephen J. Blumberg, Ph.D.  
National Center for Health Statistics  
sblumberg@cdc.gov

On Mon, 11 Oct 2004 07:56:12 -0400, Lavrakas, Paul  
<Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM> wrote:

>There was a Cell Phone Sampling Summit held in NYC in 2003 which was  
>reported at AAPOR 2003. It led to first ever population parameters being  
>gathered by the Jan/Feb 2004 CPS showing cell phone only HHs making up about  
>6% of US HHs at that time (Tucker and Brick, AAPOR 2004 paper); renters were  
>the demo group most likely to be cell phone only at 12%. There were three  
>back-to-back paper session at AAPOR 2004 on cell phone and telephone  
>surveying.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Tue, 12 Oct 2004 13:56:26 -0500  
Reply-To: "Charles H. Franklin" <franklin@POLISCI.WISC.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Charles H. Franklin" <franklin@POLISCI.WISC.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Preserving data at Michigan  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <MAIN\_SERVERRWZtYc0g0000004c@MAIN\_SERVER.pdc.brspoll.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I'd like to take the opportunity to encourage everyone involved in data collection to consider depositing the data with one of the archives. The commercial value declines rapidly but the value for addressing questions that have sparked debate here-- the volatility of party id, the differences in likely vs. registered voter samples, problems of weighting--- are all issues where we collectively benefit from having data from as many sources as possible and as comprehensive a set as possible. Analysis in AAPOR papers (and others) rests on having these data available.

This is especially crucial because we need the individual level data, not just the top line, which is all we can usually get from public sources such as Polling Report.

ICPSR and Roper are great places to deposit your data, once you are done with it. (I'm on the ICPSR Council but both archives are terrific-- deposit data early and often!)

If anyone has questions about how to submit data please contact either or both archives. If you have trouble I'd be happy to help get you in touch with the right people.

Charles

Charles H. Franklin  
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Nancy Belden wrote:

- > Dear AAPOR Members:
- > In case you missed it, here is good news posted on our own AAPOR website Vox
- > Box. Kudos to U of M, Myron Gutmann and everyone who had a hand in this.
- >
- > Nancy Belden
- > Partner, Belden Russonello & Stewart
- > President, American Association for Public Opinion Research
- >
- > 1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700
- > Washington, DC 20036
- > 202.822.6090
- >
- >
- > Sept. 30, 2004
- >

> U-M leads \$4 million project to preserve poll and survey data  
> ANN ARBOR, Mich.-In the thick of a presidential election, the latest  
> findings from surveys and polls are reported on a daily basis. But much of  
> the data behind the news on American public opinion is literally here today  
> and gone tomorrow.  
> "At least half the survey and poll data collected since the 1940s has  
> disappeared," said historian Myron Gutmann, director of the Inter-university  
> Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of  
> Michigan Institute for Social Research. "We're not sure yet if it's gone  
> permanently or not."  
> Gutmann is the principal investigator on a new \$4.1 million project to  
> acquire and preserve data from opinion polls, voting records, large-scale  
> surveys and other social science studies. Funded primarily by the Library of  
> Congress, the world's largest library, the three-year project is a  
> broad-based partnership between ICPSR, the world's largest academic social  
> science data archive, and five other institutions.  
> Other institutions involved in the project are the Roper Center for Public  
> Opinion Research at the University of Connecticut, the Howard W. Odum  
> Institute at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, the Henry A.  
> Murray Research Center at Harvard's Radcliffe Institute, the National  
> Archives and Records Administration, and the Harvard-MIT Data Center.  
> "This effort will ensure that future generations of Americans have access to  
> vital material that will allow them to understand their nation, its social  
> organization and its policies and politics," Gutmann said.  
> For three-quarters of a century, public opinion polls, social surveys and  
> other kinds of structured interviews have tracked people's values,  
> attitudes, knowledge and behavior. Surveys have done more than predict the  
> outcomes of elections or tell us when presidents gain or lose popularity.  
> They inform us about aging, health and health care, race relations, women's  
> rights, employment and family life-the full story of the social and cultural  
> tapestry that makes up our nation. They provide the data necessary for  
> sound, empirically based policy-making.  
> But a huge quantity of this data is missing or at-risk. "It has not been  
> archived and without aggressive activities to locate and preserve it, it  
> will disappear for good," Gutmann said. "This at-risk data can be found on  
> the computers of individual researchers and research institutions, in  
> bookcases and libraries, even in boxes of punched cards stored in  
> warehouses. Some data reside on websites that don't have truly persistent  
> URLs."  
> The good news, Gutmann says, is that the missing material has left tracks  
> that researchers affiliated with the new project will follow, in the form of  
> news releases, public grant announcements and publications describing the  
> research. After identifying and finding at-risk content, the project aims to  
> acquire the data, assure its security and prepare public use files that  
> safeguard confidentiality.  
> "Our goal is to assure that the material remains accessible, complete,  
> uncorrupted and usable over time," Gutmann said. "Rapid technological change  
> will always threaten the viability of digital materials produced in previous  
> years under obsolete technological conditions. But this project will greatly  
> enhance our ability to preserve important data collections."  
>  
> Established in 1948, the Institute for Social Research (ISR) is among the  
> world's oldest survey research organizations, and a world leader in the  
> development and application of social science methodology. ISR conducts some

> of the most widely-cited studies in the nation, including the Survey of  
> Consumer Attitudes, the National Election Studies, the Monitoring the Future  
> Study, the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, the Health and Retirement Study,  
> the Columbia County Longitudinal Study and the National Survey of Black  
> Americans. ISR researchers also collaborate with social scientists in more  
> than 60 nations on the World Values Surveys and other projects, and the  
> Institute has established formal ties with universities in Poland, China,  
> and South Africa. ISR is also home to the Inter-University Consortium for  
> Political and Social Research (ICPSR), the world's largest computerized  
> social science data archive. Visit the ISR Web site at [www.isr.umich.edu](http://www.isr.umich.edu) for  
> more information.  
> Through its National Digital Library (NDL) Program, the Library of Congress  
> is one of the leading providers of noncommercial intellectual content on the  
> Internet ([www.loc.gov](http://www.loc.gov)). The NDL Program's flagship American Memory project,  
> in collaboration with other institutions nationwide, makes freely available  
> more than 8.5 million American historical items. In December 2000, Congress  
> authorized the Library of Congress to develop and execute a congressionally  
> approved plan for a National Digital Information Infrastructure and  
> Preservation Program. A \$99.8 million congressional appropriation was made  
> to establish the program. The goal is to build a network throughout the  
> country of committed partners working through a preservation architecture  
> with defined roles and responsibilities. The complete text of the "Plan for  
> the National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program" is  
> available at [www.digitalpreservation.gov](http://www.digitalpreservation.gov). This includes an explanation of  
> how the plan was developed, who the Library worked with to develop the plan  
> and the key components of the digital preservation infrastructure. The plan  
> was approved by Congress in December 2002.  
> Contact: Diane Swanbrow  
> E-mail: [Swanbrow@umich.edu](mailto:Swanbrow@umich.edu)  
> Phone: (734) 647-9069

>  
>  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Tue, 12 Oct 2004 15:57:47 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Preserving data at Michigan  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[416C28DA.6000804@polisci.wisc.edu](mailto:416C28DA.6000804@polisci.wisc.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

And especially for those of you who do state polls don't forget - The Odum

## Institute's Data Archive

"The Odum Institute maintains one of the oldest and largest archives of machine-readable data in the U.S. Its Louis Harris Data Center is the exclusive national repository for Louis Harris public opinion data. The Institute has an extensive collection of U.S. Census data, including one of the most complete holdings for 1970 Census files. Other major sources of data include the North Carolina State Data Center, which distributes North Carolina census data; and the National Center for Health Statistics. Its National Network of State Polls archive is recognized as the largest available collection of state-level surveys. Also available are data from studies conducted by UNC social science faculty."

[http://www.irss.unc.edu/data\\_archive/home.asp](http://www.irss.unc.edu/data_archive/home.asp)

--

Leo G. Simonetta  
Research Director  
Art & Science Group, LLC  
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
Baltimore MD 21209

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Charles

> H. Franklin

> Sent: Tuesday, October 12, 2004 2:56 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: Preserving data at Michigan

>

> I'd like to take the opportunity to encourage everyone  
> involved in data collection to consider depositing the data  
> with one of the archives. The commercial value declines  
> rapidly but the value for addressing questions that have  
> sparked debate here-- the volatility of party id, the  
> differences in likely vs. registered voter samples, problems of  
> weighting--- are all issues where we collectively benefit  
> from having data from as many sources as possible and as  
> comprehensive a set as possible. Analysis in AAPOR papers  
> (and others) rests on having these data available.

>

> This is especially crucial because we need the individual  
> level data, not just the top line, which is all we can  
> usually get from public sources such as Polling Report.

>

> ICPSR and Roper are great places to deposit your data, once  
> you are done with it. (I'm on the ICPSR Council but both  
> archives are terrific-- deposit data early and often!)

>

> If anyone has questions about how to submit data please  
> contact either or both archives. If you have trouble I'd be  
> happy to help get you in touch with the right people.

>

> Charles

>

> Charles H. Franklin  
> University of Wisconsin, Madison  
>  
>  
>  
> Nancy Belden wrote:  
>> Dear AAPOR Members:  
>> In case you missed it, here is good news posted on our own AAPOR  
>> website Vox Box. Kudos to U of M, Myron Gutmann and  
> everyone who had a hand in this.  
>>  
>> Nancy Belden  
>> Partner, Belden Russonello & Stewart  
>> President, American Association for Public Opinion Research  
>>  
>> 1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700  
>> Washington, DC 20036  
>> 202.822.6090  
>>  
>>  
>> Sept. 30, 2004  
>>  
>> U-M leads \$4 million project to preserve poll and survey data ANN  
>> ARBOR, Mich.-In the thick of a presidential election, the latest  
>> findings from surveys and polls are reported on a daily basis. But  
>> much of the data behind the news on American public opinion is  
>> literally here today and gone tomorrow.  
>> "At least half the survey and poll data collected since the  
> 1940s has  
>> disappeared," said historian Myron Gutmann, director of the  
>> Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social  
> Research (ICPSR)  
>> at the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research. "We're  
>> not sure yet if it's gone permanently or not."  
>> Gutmann is the principal investigator on a new \$4.1 million  
> project to  
>> acquire and preserve data from opinion polls, voting records,  
>> large-scale surveys and other social science studies.  
> Funded primarily  
>> by the Library of Congress, the world's largest library, the  
>> three-year project is a broad-based partnership between ICPSR, the  
>> world's largest academic social science data archive, and  
> five other institutions.  
>> Other institutions involved in the project are the Roper Center for  
>> Public Opinion Research at the University of Connecticut,  
> the Howard  
>> W. Odum Institute at the University of North  
> Carolina-Chapel Hill, the Henry A.  
>> Murray Research Center at Harvard's Radcliffe Institute,  
> the National  
>> Archives and Records Administration, and the Harvard-MIT  
> Data Center.  
>> "This effort will ensure that future generations of Americans have  
>> access to vital material that will allow them to understand their

>> nation, its social organization and its policies and  
> politics," Gutmann said.  
>> For three-quarters of a century, public opinion polls,  
> social surveys  
>> and other kinds of structured interviews have tracked  
> people's values,  
>> attitudes, knowledge and behavior. Surveys have done more  
> than predict  
>> the outcomes of elections or tell us when presidents gain  
> or lose popularity.  
>> They inform us about aging, health and health care, race relations,  
>> women's rights, employment and family life-the full story of the  
>> social and cultural tapestry that makes up our nation. They provide  
>> the data necessary for sound, empirically based policy-making.  
>> But a huge quantity of this data is missing or at-risk. "It has not  
>> been archived and without aggressive activities to locate  
> and preserve  
>> it, it will disappear for good," Gutmann said. "This  
> at-risk data can  
>> be found on the computers of individual researchers and research  
>> institutions, in bookcases and libraries, even in boxes of  
> punched cards stored in  
>> warehouses. Some data reside on websites that don't have  
> truly persistent  
>> URLs."  
>> The good news, Gutmann says, is that the missing material has left  
>> tracks that researchers affiliated with the new project  
> will follow,  
>> in the form of news releases, public grant announcements and  
>> publications describing the research. After identifying and finding  
>> at-risk content, the project aims to acquire the data, assure its  
>> security and prepare public use files that safeguard  
> confidentiality.  
>> "Our goal is to assure that the material remains  
> accessible, complete,  
>> uncorrupted and usable over time," Gutmann said. "Rapid  
> technological  
>> change will always threaten the viability of digital materials  
>> produced in previous years under obsolete technological conditions.  
>> But this project will greatly enhance our ability to  
> preserve important data collections."  
>>  
>> Established in 1948, the Institute for Social Research  
> (ISR) is among  
>> the world's oldest survey research organizations, and a  
> world leader  
>> in the development and application of social science  
> methodology. ISR  
>> conducts some of the most widely-cited studies in the nation,  
>> including the Survey of Consumer Attitudes, the National Election  
>> Studies, the Monitoring the Future Study, the Panel Study of Income  
>> Dynamics, the Health and Retirement Study, the Columbia County  
>> Longitudinal Study and the National Survey of Black Americans. ISR  
>> researchers also collaborate with social scientists in more than 60

>> nations on the World Values Surveys and other projects, and the  
>> Institute has established formal ties with universities in Poland,  
>> China, and South Africa. ISR is also home to the Inter-University  
>> Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), the world's  
>> largest computerized social science data archive. Visit the  
> ISR Web site at [www.isr.umich.edu](http://www.isr.umich.edu) for more information.  
>> Through its National Digital Library (NDL) Program, the Library of  
>> Congress is one of the leading providers of noncommercial  
> intellectual  
>> content on the Internet ([www.loc.gov](http://www.loc.gov)). The NDL Program's flagship  
>> American Memory project, in collaboration with other institutions  
>> nationwide, makes freely available more than 8.5 million American  
>> historical items. In December 2000, Congress authorized the  
> Library of  
>> Congress to develop and execute a congressionally approved  
> plan for a  
>> National Digital Information Infrastructure and  
> Preservation Program.  
>> A \$99.8 million congressional appropriation was made to  
> establish the  
>> program. The goal is to build a network throughout the country of  
>> committed partners working through a preservation architecture with  
>> defined roles and responsibilities. The complete text of  
> the "Plan for  
>> the National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation  
>> Program" is available at [www.digitalpreservation.gov](http://www.digitalpreservation.gov). This  
> includes an  
>> explanation of how the plan was developed, who the Library  
> worked with  
>> to develop the plan and the key components of the digital  
> preservation infrastructure. The plan was approved by  
> Congress in December 2002.  
>> Contact: Diane Swanbrow  
>> E-mail: [Swanbrow@umich.edu](mailto:Swanbrow@umich.edu)  
>> Phone: (734) 647-9069

>>  
>>  
>>  
>> -----  
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>  
-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Tue, 12 Oct 2004 14:00:13 -0700  
Reply-To: Douglas Strand <[dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU](mailto:dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU)>



Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Douglas Strand <dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Preserving data at Michigan  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <MAIN\_SERVERRWZtYc0g0000004c@MAIN\_SERVER.pdc.brspoll.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Congratulations to those organizations involved.

But I don't believe this press release described the scope of the responsibilities of this enterprise.

I can think of 2 questions: (1) will gathering survey data from U.S. state polls be included in the mission? (2) will it just be U.S., or will there be a substantial effort to get data from abroad, i.e., single-nation and crossnational studies?

Anyone know? Just curious.

Thanks,  
Doug Strand

-----  
Douglas Strand, Ph.D.  
Project Director  
Public Agendas and Citizen Engagement Survey (PACES)  
Survey Research Center  
2538 Channing Way, #5100  
Berkeley, CA 94720-5100

Phone: 510-642-0508  
Fax:

At 06:29 AM 10/12/2004, Nancy Belden wrote:

>Dear AAPOR Members:  
>In case you missed it, here is good news posted on our own AAPOR website Vox  
>Box. Kudos to U of M, Myron Gutmann and everyone who had a hand in this.  
>  
>Nancy Belden  
>Partner, Belden Russonello & Stewart  
>President, American Association for Public Opinion Research  
>  
>1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700  
>Washington, DC 20036  
>202.822.6090  
>  
>  
>Sept. 30, 2004  
>  
>U-M leads \$4 million project to preserve poll and survey data  
>ANN ARBOR, Mich.-In the thick of a presidential election, the latest  
>findings from surveys and polls are reported on a daily basis. But much of  
>the data behind the news on American public opinion is literally here today

>and gone tomorrow.

>"At least half the survey and poll data collected since the 1940s has  
>disappeared," said historian Myron Gutmann, director of the Inter-university  
>Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of  
>Michigan Institute for Social Research. "We're not sure yet if it's gone  
>permanently or not."

>Gutmann is the principal investigator on a new \$4.1 million project to  
>acquire and preserve data from opinion polls, voting records, large-scale  
>surveys and other social science studies. Funded primarily by the Library of  
>Congress, the world's largest library, the three-year project is a  
>broad-based partnership between ICPSR, the world's largest academic social  
>science data archive, and five other institutions.

>Other institutions involved in the project are the Roper Center for Public  
>Opinion Research at the University of Connecticut, the Howard W. Odum  
>Institute at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, the Henry A.  
>Murray Research Center at Harvard's Radcliffe Institute, the National  
>Archives and Records Administration, and the Harvard-MIT Data Center.

>"This effort will ensure that future generations of Americans have access to  
>vital material that will allow them to understand their nation, its social  
>organization and its policies and politics," Gutmann said.

>For three-quarters of a century, public opinion polls, social surveys and  
>other kinds of structured interviews have tracked people's values,  
>attitudes, knowledge and behavior. Surveys have done more than predict the  
>outcomes of elections or tell us when presidents gain or lose popularity.  
>They inform us about aging, health and health care, race relations, women's  
>rights, employment and family life-the full story of the social and cultural  
>tapestry that makes up our nation. They provide the data necessary for  
>sound, empirically based policy-making.

>But a huge quantity of this data is missing or at-risk. "It has not been  
>archived and without aggressive activities to locate and preserve it, it  
>will disappear for good," Gutmann said. "This at-risk data can be found on  
>the computers of individual researchers and research institutions, in  
>bookcases and libraries, even in boxes of punched cards stored in  
>warehouses. Some data reside on websites that don't have truly persistent  
>URLs."

>The good news, Gutmann says, is that the missing material has left tracks  
>that researchers affiliated with the new project will follow, in the form of  
>news releases, public grant announcements and publications describing the  
>research. After identifying and finding at-risk content, the project aims to  
>acquire the data, assure its security and prepare public use files that  
>safeguard confidentiality.

>"Our goal is to assure that the material remains accessible, complete,  
>uncorrupted and usable over time," Gutmann said. "Rapid technological change  
>will always threaten the viability of digital materials produced in previous  
>years under obsolete technological conditions. But this project will greatly  
>enhance our ability to preserve important data collections."

>

>Established in 1948, the Institute for Social Research (ISR) is among the  
>world's oldest survey research organizations, and a world leader in the  
>development and application of social science methodology. ISR conducts some  
>of the most widely-cited studies in the nation, including the Survey of  
>Consumer Attitudes, the National Election Studies, the Monitoring the Future  
>Study, the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, the Health and Retirement Study,  
>the Columbia County Longitudinal Study and the National Survey of Black

>Americans. ISR researchers also collaborate with social scientists in more  
>than 60 nations on the World Values Surveys and other projects, and the  
>Institute has established formal ties with universities in Poland, China,  
>and South Africa. ISR is also home to the Inter-University Consortium for  
>Political and Social Research (ICPSR), the world's largest computerized  
>social science data archive. Visit the ISR Web site at [www.isr.umich.edu](http://www.isr.umich.edu) for  
>more information.

>Through its National Digital Library (NDL) Program, the Library of Congress  
>is one of the leading providers of noncommercial intellectual content on the  
>Internet ([www.loc.gov](http://www.loc.gov)). The NDL Program's flagship American Memory project,  
>in collaboration with other institutions nationwide, makes freely available  
>more than 8.5 million American historical items. In December 2000, Congress  
>authorized the Library of Congress to develop and execute a congressionally  
>approved plan for a National Digital Information Infrastructure and  
>Preservation Program. A \$99.8 million congressional appropriation was made  
>to establish the program. The goal is to build a network throughout the  
>country of committed partners working through a preservation architecture  
>with defined roles and responsibilities. The complete text of the "Plan for  
>the National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program" is  
>available at [www.digitalpreservation.gov](http://www.digitalpreservation.gov). This includes an explanation of  
>how the plan was developed, who the Library worked with to develop the plan  
>and the key components of the digital preservation infrastructure. The plan  
>was approved by Congress in December 2002.

>Contact: Diane Swanbrow  
>E-mail: [Swanbrow@umich.edu](mailto:Swanbrow@umich.edu)  
>Phone: (734) 647-9069

>  
>  
>

>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Tue, 12 Oct 2004 18:55:18 -0400  
Reply-To: Nancy Belden <[nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM](mailto:nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nancy Belden <[nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM](mailto:nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM)>  
Subject: MSNBC and Luntz  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear AAPOR Netters:

Ex Presidents Betsy Martin and Diane Colasanto brought the following bit  
write up on the news about MSNBC canceling Frank Luntz. Those new to AAPOR  
may not recall or know that we sanctioned Luntz a number of years ago (see  
website). As Betsy pointed out to the Council, "the effects of our  
standards procedures may be slow in coming, but perhaps pursuing standards

cases is not as futile as it sometimes seems." - Nancy Belden, AAPOR  
President

MSNBC fires Luntz

by kos

Thu Sep 30th, 2004 at 00:34:24 GMT

Wow, it's nice to see what a little pressure can accomplish. MSNBC bowed to common sense and ditched Republican pollster Luntz. From the subscription-only Roll Call:

The watchdog organization Media Matters for America was none too pleased that MSNBC had scheduled GOP pollster Frank Luntz conduct on-air focus groups following tonight's presidential debate.

In a letter to MSNBC President Richard Kaplan, Media Matters President David Brock (who used to call himself a conservative), said he hoped the network would disclose Luntz's "partisan Republican ties and history of questionable scientific methodology."

Brock cited a number of examples, including Luntz's work on the 1994 Republican "Contract with America," pointing out that Luntz was reprimanded by the American Association for Public Opinion Research for refusing to disclose data on how he surmised that 60 percent of Americans supported the Contract. Brock also noted Luntz's published remarks counseling swing-state Republicans on what to say about Iraq and homeland security.

Looks like the letter had an impact. Although MSNBC did not respond to Brock, a spokeswoman for the network told HOH late Wednesday that the network has decided "not to go with Frank for the debate." In fact, MSNBC won't conduct polling at all now, she said.

Brock was delighted to hear the news. "It is encouraging that MSNBC responded to criticism in a constructive way. Clearly they realized that employing a partisan pollster does not reflect well on them as a responsible media outlet."

So congrats to Media Matters who made this an issue, and congrats to all of you who let your voice be heard at MSNBC HQ. Given the importance of the post-debate sping cycle in determining the "winner" of the debate, getting a partisan pollster out of that process, especially one masquerading as a neutral measurer of public opinion, is huge.

Nancy Belden

Partner, Belden Russonello & Stewart

President, American Association for Public Opinion Research

1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700

Washington, DC 20036

202.822.6090

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Tue, 12 Oct 2004 18:25:12 -0500  
Reply-To: Rob Daves <daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Rob Daves <daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM>  
Subject: New Minnesota Poll results  
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

Colleagues...

For those of you who have an interest in the battleground state of Minnesota, you might be interested in taking a look at the results of the newest Minnesota Poll. You can find an early, online version of the news story at

<http://www.startribune.com>

By Wednesday morning, the more complete newspaper version of the story also will be online.

All best wishes...

Rob Daves, director  
The Minnesota Poll  
Star Tribune  
425 Portland Av. S.  
Minneapolis MN 55419  
612-673-7278  
daves@startribune.com

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Tue, 12 Oct 2004 20:39:37 -0400  
Reply-To: "Lawrence T. McGill" <lmcgill@PRINCETON.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Lawrence T. McGill" <lmcgill@PRINCETON.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Preserving data at Michigan  
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"  
Content-transfer-encoding: base64

Li4uQW5kIHdoaWxlIHdlJ3JIIGF0IGl0LCBtaWdodCBJIGVuY291cmFnZSBhbGwgb2YgeW91IHdo

byBoYXZlIGRhdGEgc2V0cyBvbiB0b3BpY3MgcmVsYXRlZCB0byBhcnRzLCBjdWx0dXJlIGFuZCB0  
aGUgaHVtYW5pdGllcyB0byBjb25zaWRlciBkZXBvc2l0aW5nIHlvdXIgZGF0YSB3aXRoIENQU5E  
QSBhdCBQcmlyY2V0b24gVW5pdmVyc2l0eSwgdGhlIEN1bHRlcmFsIFBvbGljeSAmIHRoZSBBcnRz  
IE5hdGlvbmFsIERhdGEgQXJjaGl2ZSAod3d3LmNwYW5kYS5vcmcplG0KIA0KTGFycnkgTWNHaWxs  
DQpEaXJlY3RvciwgUmVzZWYy2ggJiBQbGFubmluZw0KQ1BBTkRBDQo=

---

Date: Wed, 13 Oct 2004 05:40:34 -0500  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: Chicago Tribune Poll - IA, MN, OH & WI  
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Below are links to a Chicago Tribune/WGN-TV poll we conducted last Friday through Monday in Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin. 500 likely voters were interviewed in each state.

A topline analysis is available.

Story here:  
<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/specials/elections/chi-041012poll-story.story>

Front page here:  
<http://www.chicagotribune.com/>

The results:

#### IOWA

George Bush 47%  
John Kerry 45%  
Ralph Nader 1%  
Other \*  
Undecided 7%

#### MINNESOTA

John Kerry 45%  
George Bush 43%  
Ralph Nader 2%  
Other 3%  
Undecided 6%

#### OHIO

John Kerry 49%  
George Bush 45%  
Other 1%  
Undecided 5%

#### WISCONSIN

John Kerry 47%  
George Bush 43%  
Ralph Nader 2%  
Other \*  
Undecided 8%

WISCONSIN, U.S. Senate race.

Russ Feingold 57%  
Tim Michels 33%  
Other 1%  
Undecided 10%

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
=====

Date: Wed, 13 Oct 2004 07:44:15 -0400  
Reply-To: Scott Keeter <keeters@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Scott Keeter <keeters@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG>  
Subject: Census Says Impasse Over Funds Threatens Survey  
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

This issue is of great relevance to AAPOR members:

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A28101-2004Oct12.html>

Census Says Impasse Over Funds Threatens Survey  
By D'Vera Cohn

Washington Post Staff Writer  
Wednesday, October 13, 2004; Page A02=20

The Census Bureau will have to abandon years of work it has conducted on a household survey that is intended to replace the long form in the 2010 census unless Congress acts soon to provide adequate funding for the project, the agency's director said yesterday.=20

The Bush administration's budget requested \$165 million for the survey this fiscal year. The House appropriations bill that funds the Commerce, Justice and State departments provided \$146 million. A bill approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee gave it \$65 million.

<snip>

Scott Keeter  
Pew Research Center for the People and the Press  
1150 18th St. N.W., Suite 975  
Washington, DC 20036  
=A0 Voice 202 293 3126 x16

=A0 Personal fax 206 600 5448  
E-mail keeters@people-press.org  
Web site <http://pollcats.net>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
=====

Date: Wed, 13 Oct 2004 09:03:57 -0700  
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Subject: Re: european income categories  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Many thanks to everyone who responded to my request for help. At the end of this email I've put together the responses I got for others to see.

best,  
Leora

Dr. Leora Lawton, Principal  
TechSociety Research  
2342 Shattuck Avenue PMB 362, Berkeley, CA 94704  
(510) 548-6174; fax (510) 548-6175; cell (510) 928-7572  
[www.techsociety.com](http://www.techsociety.com)

\*\*\*\*\*

Date: Wed, 13 Oct 2004 16:16:32 +0200  
From: Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik <[hoffmeyer-zlotnik@zuma-mannheim.de](mailto:hoffmeyer-zlotnik@zuma-mannheim.de)>  
To: [lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)  
Subject: European income categories

The best European survey with a lot of socio-demographic variables is the European Social Survey (ESS). The questionnaire as well as the data you can download.

<http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/>  
for information (the questionnaire is done by input harmonization)  
<http://ess.nsd.uib.no>  
for the data.

But the income categories used in ESS are not good in poor or rich countries. They are good for countries like UK or Germany. In poor countries like Portugal or Poland you need a better specification in the lower income categories, in the richer countries like Luxembourg you need a better specification in the upper income categories.

About standard classification of socio-demographic variables in cross-national comparison you can find a lot in our book.  
Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik, Jrgen H.P.; Wolf, Christof (eds.): Advances in Cross-National Harmonisation. A European Working Book for Demographic and Socio-Economic Variables. 2003, New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum



Publishers. ISBN # 0-306-47731-9

Very helpful for understanding national income categories is the Report of the Canberra Group

<http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/citygroup/canberra.htm>

for general information

<http://www.lisproject.org/links/canbaccess.htm>

for reports

\*\*\*\*\*

From: Matthias Kretschmer <MKretschmer@gmx.net>

To: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>

Subject: Re: european income categories

You might want to go with the income categories that Eurobarometer employs.

If you need help or further advice, please let me know. Also, it might be helpful to go by employment categories instead of income categories, at least that's what we partly do in Germany when we conduct surveys with 'deciders'.

\*\*\*\*\*

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>

To: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>

Subject: Re: european income categories

The Economist magazine tackles this issue every so often and generally shies away from direct comparisons in terms of Dollars (or Euros, for that matter) because of the wide discrepancies in purchasing power for different necessities in different countries.

There is a wealth of articles that address economic issues in Europe in the archives they make available to subscribers of their online edition (<http://www.economist.com>). You just might find what you want there, but they may have better information in one of the specialized publications or reports that their business intelligence unit will be more than happy to sell you.

\*\*\*\*\*

From: MFasano@ictgroup.com

To: lawton@techsociety.com

Subject: RE: european income categories

Hello Leora.

I don't know if these are considered standard, but we recently did some interviewing for a German client and they provided the following categories (stated in Euro):

20,000-39,000

40,000-60,000

61,000-80,000  
81,000-120,000  
121,000 EURO +

Also, did you try [www.esomar.org](http://www.esomar.org) -- they may have some info for you there.

Also, Nick Moon of NOPWorld sent me an attached survey form of English data, and attachments don't go through on this list.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Wed, 13 Oct 2004 15:12:45 -0400  
Reply-To: m.hunt@NEU.EDU  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Matthew O. Hunt" <m.hunt@NEU.EDU>  
Subject: terror warnings and Bush's approval ratings  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Thought the results of this study might be of interest:

<http://www.news.cornell.edu/releases/Oct04/terrorist.Bush.ssl.html>

Matt Hunt

--  
Matthew O. Hunt  
Associate Professor  
Department of Sociology  
Northeastern University  
500 Holmes Hall  
Boston, MA 02115

E-mail: [m.hunt@neu.edu](mailto:m.hunt@neu.edu)  
Phone: 617.373.4997  
Fax: 617.373.2688

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Wed, 13 Oct 2004 18:06:39 -0400  
Reply-To: MMBlum@AOL.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark Blumenthal <MMBlum@AOL.COM>  
Subject: Wireless Phones and NES / NEP

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Quick question: Does anyone know if either the National Election Study or the Edison/Mitofsky National Exit poll is planning to include items on wireless/home telephone service this year?

Thanks  
Mark

---

Mark M. Blumenthal  
www.mysterypollster.com  
Bennett, Petts & Blumenthal  
1010 Wisconsin NW, Suite 208  
Washington, DC 20007  
202-342-0700  
202-342-0330 (fax)  
mdblum@aol.com

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Wed, 13 Oct 2004 15:06:29 -0700  
Reply-To: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Shapard Wolf <shap.wolf@ASU.EDU>  
Subject: Job opening at Arizona State University SRL  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

There is an opening at the ASU Survey Research Laboratory. Details are at:  
[http://www.hr.asu.edu/vacancy\\_notice/vacancy\\_posting.asp?id=3D117479.=20](http://www.hr.asu.edu/vacancy_notice/vacancy_posting.asp?id=3D117479.=20)

(The form says Sociology but the job will be in the SRL within the new Institute for Social Science Research; we just don't have our own HR # yet).

The ISSR is a new and growing operation with opportunities for career advancement and research. The Survey Research Laboratory has been at ASU since 1976 and has a distinguished record of achievement in carrying out social policy/social problem studies by phone, mail, in-person, and over the web. The SRL is in new quarters with a 34-station CATI facility, two focus group rooms, excellent training facilities, and new computer equipment.

Resumes and cover letters may be submitted to Sara Pennak, Assistant Director of the ISSR at [sara.pennak@asu.edu](mailto:sara.pennak@asu.edu). For further information on

this position please see the link above or contact Human Resources at ASU: <http://www.asu.edu/hr/>.

Best,  
Shap

Shap Wolf  
AAPORNET volunteer coordinator  
Associate Chair, AAPOR Publications & Information  
Director, Arizona State University SRL=20  
[shap.wolf@asu.edu](mailto:shap.wolf@asu.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Wed, 13 Oct 2004 23:37:08 -0400  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Pollsters flip flop  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Gallup now has Kerry with a 1 point lead among likely voters, while TIPP shows Bush with a 3 point lead, This neatly reverses the results that led to much controversy a few weeks ago.

Perhaps Doug Henwood can entertain us with some conspiratorial take on the issue (Did Karl Rove instruct his lackeys at Gallup to lull the Democrats into a false sense of security?).

Meanwhile, the rest of us can only marvel once again at how easy it is to be fooled by randomness.

Jan Werner

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 14 Oct 2004 03:40:42 -0400  
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <[cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU](mailto:cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Colleen Porter <[cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU](mailto:cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU)>  
Subject: Debate "viewers"?  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

So I've been looking at the first polling results from the final presidential debate, and I gotta ask:

What did it mean to "watch" the debate? Was this entirely self-definition from the respondent, or did surveys actually ask about the duration and consistency of viewing?

This issue seems particularly important for this particular debate, given that some folks wanted to watch a little white ball being tossed back and forth, as well as the political barbs. The NPR report this afternoon interviewed several people (including a political consultant) who intended to do a lot of channel flipping, and this certainly was what I observed around my house.

Also, I have to add that I am in awe of the quick turnaround time that y'all give on these surveys. Hats off to Langer, Merkle and the rest of you who do such fine work under such tight deadlines.

Colleen

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

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 14 Oct 2004 07:12:40 -0400  
Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
Organization: Queens College CUNY  
Subject: NYC's Creative Class  
Comments: To: "Qcsoclis@Qc. Edu" <[qcsoclis@qc.edu](mailto:qcsoclis@qc.edu)>,  
AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>,  
Community Urban List <[comurb\\_r21@email.rutgers.edu](mailto:comurb_r21@email.rutgers.edu)>,  
CUNY UFS Discussion Forum <[SENATE-FORUM@LISTSERV.CUNY.EDU](mailto:SENATE-FORUM@LISTSERV.CUNY.EDU)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

My October Gotham Gazette Column is on-line.

New York's Creative Class  
by Andrew Beveridge  
October, 2004

New York City is a world center for the creative arts: drama, music, dance, entertainment of every kind, art, photography, writing and publishing. Those hoping to be successful in these fields flock to New York City. These creative New Yorkers make the city distinctive in many ways - not just as a cauldron for innovation in the arts, and a magnet for tourism and conventions, but also as an engine of the economy: A new study for Lincoln Center found that the arts complex generated \$1.52 billion in sales and employed 15,200 workers. Some argue that urban economic development and growth depend upon "The Creative Class."

Who are the individuals that make New York City the creative center that it is? Where do they come from, how are they faring? By analyzing census data we can get some answers.

<http://www.gothamgazette.com/article/demographics/20041014/5/1147>

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

---

Date: Thu, 14 Oct 2004 07:21:35 -0500  
Reply-To: "Moore, David" <[David\\_Moore@GALLUP.COM](mailto:David_Moore@GALLUP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Moore, David" <[David\\_Moore@GALLUP.COM](mailto:David_Moore@GALLUP.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Debate "viewers"?  
Comments: To: Colleen Porter <[cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU](mailto:cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

In the CNN/USA Today/Gallup survey of 511 debate viewers, people who had been contacted in the two days leading up to the debate and indicated they expected to watch the debate and agreed to be interviewed afterwards, 86% said they had watched "all or most" of the debate, 9% "about half," and 5% "only some."

David

David W. Moore  
Senior Editor, The Gallup Poll  
502 Carnegie Center, Suite 300  
Princeton, NJ 08542  
609-924-9600

=20

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Colleen Porter  
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2004 3:41 AM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: Debate "viewers"?

So I've been looking at the first polling results from the final presidential debate, and I gotta ask:

What did it mean to "watch" the debate? Was this entirely self-definition from the respondent, or did surveys actually ask about the duration and consistency of viewing?

This issue seems particularly important for this particular debate, given that some folks wanted to watch a little white ball being tossed back and forth, as well as the political barbs. The NPR report this afternoon interviewed several people (including a political consultant) who intended to do a lot of channel flipping, and this certainly was what I observed around my house.

Also, I have to add that I am in awe of the quick turnaround time that y'all give on these surveys. Hats off to Langer, Merkle and the rest of you who do such fine work under such tight deadlines.

Colleen

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

---

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

---

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

---

Date: Thu, 14 Oct 2004 13:37:10 +0100  
Reply-To: [worc@MORI.COM](mailto:worc@MORI.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Robert Worcester <[worc@MORI.COM](mailto:worc@MORI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Debate "viewers"?  
Comments: To: "Moore, David" <[David\\_Moore@GALLUP.COM](mailto:David_Moore@GALLUP.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Hey, I agree with Colleen! I've given three speeches in the last 24 hours to groups of interested British and a few American

s=20here=20in=20London  
on=20the=20American=20election,=20and=20people=20here=20are=20watching=20t=  
his=20tight=20race  
with=20great=20interest.=20=20I'm=20able=20to=20keep=20the=20Brits=20bang=20=  
up=20to=20date=20with  
your=20fantastic=20turnaround=20and=20great=20web=20sites,=20yours'=20and=20=  
everybody  
else's.

But=20one=20thing=20I=20can't=20seem=20to=20tell=20and=20get=20asked=2040=20=  
times=20a=20day=20(just  
now=20on=20BBC=20radio):=20=20who's=20going=20to=20win?

Bob=20Worcester=20

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

From:=20Moore,=20David=20[mailto:David\_Moore@GALLUP.COM]=20  
Sent:=2014=20October=202004=2013:22  
To:=20AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject:=20Re:=20Debate=20"viewers"?

In=20the=20CNN/USA=20Today/Gallup=20survey=20of=20511=20debate=20viewers,=20=  
people=20who=20had  
been=20contacted=20in=20the=20two=20days=20leading=20up=20to=20the=20debat=  
e=20and=20indicated  
they=20expected=20to=20watch=20the=20debate=20and=20agreed=20to=20be=20int=  
erviewed  
afterwards,=2086%=20said=20they=20had=20watched=20"all=20or=20most"=20of=20=  
the=20debate,=209%  
"about=20half,"=20and=205%=20"only=20some."

David

David=20W.=20Moore  
Senior=20Editor,=20The=20Gallup=20Poll  
502=20Carnegie=20Center,=20Suite=20300  
Princeton,=20NJ=20008542  
609-924-9600

=20

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

From:=20AAPORNET=20[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]=20On=20Behalf=20Of=20Colleen=20=  
Porter  
Sent:=20Thursday,=20October=202014,=202004=20203:41=20AM  
To:=20AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject:=20Debate=20"viewers"?

So=20I've=20been=20looking=20at=20the=20first=20polling=20results=20from=20=  
the=20final  
presidential=20debate,=20and=20I=20gotta=20ask:

What=20did=20it=20mean=20to=20"watch"=20the=20debate?=20=20Was=20this=20en=





Disclaimer

This e-mail is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of MORI Limited. If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this e-mail in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please either notify the MORI Systems Helpdesk by telephone on 244 (0) 20 20 207347 203000 or respond to this e-mail with WRONG RECIPIENT in the title line.

=====

This e-mail has been scanned for viruses for MORI by MessageLabs. For further information visit <http://www.mci.com>

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

---

Date: Thu, 14 Oct 2004 08:59:22 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leve, Jay" <[jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM](mailto:jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Leve, Jay" <[jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM](mailto:jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Debate "viewers"?  
Comments: To: "Moore, David" <[David\\_Moore@GALLUP.COM](mailto:David_Moore@GALLUP.COM)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

SurveyUSA, which does not pre-recruit respondents in advance of the debate, but which dials RDD (immediately at the conclusion of the debate, into MT and PT time zones, and then the next day, into ET and CT time zones, for polls of individuals states), asks the question this way:

"Did you watch none of the debate? Some of it? Or all of it?"

Only those respondents who say watched "all of it," are included.

SurveyUSA's follow-up question is then worded this way:

"Did Bush clearly win the debate? Did Kerry clearly win? Or, would you say there was no clear winner?"

Results from first two debates are posted; results from last night's debate will be posted by day's end.

//leve

Jay H. Leve  
SurveyUSA  
15 Bloomfield Ave.  
Verona, NJ 07044

973-857-8500 x 551  
Fax: 973-857-7595

jleve@surveyusa.com  
www.surveyusa.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Moore, David  
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2004 8:22 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Debate "viewers"?

In the CNN/USA Today/Gallup survey of 511 debate viewers, people who had been contacted in the two days leading up to the debate and indicated they expected to watch the debate and agreed to be interviewed afterwards, 86% said they had watched "all or most" of the debate, 9% "about half," and 5% "only some."

David

David W. Moore  
Senior Editor, The Gallup Poll  
502 Carnegie Center, Suite 300  
Princeton, NJ 08542  
609-924-9600

=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Colleen Porter  
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2004 3:41 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Debate "viewers"?

So I've been looking at the first polling results from the final presidential debate, and I gotta ask:

What did it mean to "watch" the debate? Was this entirely self-definition from the respondent, or did surveys actually ask about

the duration and consistency of viewing?

This issue seems particularly important for this particular debate, given that some folks wanted to watch a little white ball being tossed back and forth, as well as the political barbs. The NPR report this afternoon interviewed several people (including a political consultant) who intended to do a lot of channel flipping, and this certainly was what I observed around my house.

Also, I have to add that I am in awe of the quick turnaround time that y'all give on these surveys. Hats off to Langer, Merkle and the rest of you who do such fine work under such tight deadlines.

Colleen

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

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

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

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 14 Oct 2004 09:03:40 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Wireless Phones and NES / NEP  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[46.5a817970.2e9f00ef@aol.com](mailto:46.5a817970.2e9f00ef@aol.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

If they are not at present it seems to me that it would seem to be a good idea to consider.

--

Leo G. Simonetta

Research Director

Art & Science Group, LLC

As always opinions expressed are solely those of the author.

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Mark Blumenthal

> Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2004 6:07 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Wireless Phones and NES / NEP

>

> Quick question: Does anyone know if either the National  
> Election Study or the Edison/Mitofsky National Exit poll is  
> planning to include items on wireless/home telephone service  
> this year?

>

> Thanks

> Mark

>

>

> \_\_\_\_\_  
> Mark M. Blumenthal

> www.mysterypollster.com

> Bennett, Petts & Blumenthal

> 1010 Wisconsin NW, Suite 208

> Washington, DC 20007

> 202-342-0700

> 202-342-0330 (fax)

> mdblum@aol.com

>

> -----

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

> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 14 Oct 2004 10:37:45 -0400

Reply-To: MMBlum@AOL.COM

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Mark Blumenthal <MMBlum@AOL.COM>

Subject: Can you help me contact?....

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I am writing to ask for a bit of help. I am working on a series of posts fo=

r=20

my blog, [www.MysteryPollster.com](http://www.MysteryPollster.com), about the various methods of selecting or modeling likely voters used by the most prominent public polls. I want to help guide readers as they struggle to interpreting the various likely voter results they see, and convey the underlying message that few likely voter models are created equal.

I will be trying to contact the following organizations about their likely voter screens over the next few days:

CBS News/New York Times  
GWU Battleground  
Harris  
ICR Communications  
LA Times  
Marist College Poll  
Mason Dixon  
Newsweek  
Pew Research Center  
Quinnipiac  
Rasmussen  
Time  
Washington Post  
Zogby

(I have been in contact already with ABC News, American Research Group, AP-IPSOS, Democracy Corps, Fox News/Opinion Dynamics, Gallup, IBD/TIPP, NBC News/WSJ, SurveyUSA)

In that regard, I am asking for your help. If you work for one of these organizations and can be of assistance, could you please email me off the list? Less than three weeks before the elections, everyone is obviously quite busy and phone calls or emails from strangers often go unanswered. I have a very short list of questions about LV screens that should not require more than five minutes and can be answered either by telephone or email.

Thank you!

Mark

---

Mark M. Blumenthal  
[www.mysterypollster.com](http://www.mysterypollster.com)  
Bennett, Petts & Blumenthal  
1010 Wisconsin NW, Suite 208  
Washington, DC 20007  
202-342-0700  
202-342-0330 (fax)  
[mdblum@aol.com](mailto:mdblum@aol.com)

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

Date: Thu, 14 Oct 2004 09:51:08 -0500  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject: Position Available  
Comments: To: [AAPORNet@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Please respond directly to the contact information listed at the end of  
this posting. =20  
=20

SURVEY METHODOLOGIST / RESEARCH ASSOCIATE

=20

TURNING DATA INTO QUALITY OF LIFE

=20

The Education Statistics Service Institute (ESSI) of the American  
Institutes for Research (AIR) provides developmental, analytical and  
operation support for its client the National Center for Education  
Statistics (NCES). ESSI works with NCES to conceptualize and develop  
breakthroughs in survey design and management.

=20

Right now, NCES offers a challenging opportunity for you to support NCES  
in its management of data collection activities related to school crime  
surveys, particularly the Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS).  
Responsibilities involve survey instrument and item development,  
sampling design, survey administration, and data quality checks.

=20

To qualify, you must have a Bachelor's or Master's degree; at least 2  
years' related experience; and in-depth knowledge of survey research  
methods and survey operations. Position requires excellent  
communication skills, a strong team spirit, and a detail-orientation.  
Experience an/or an interest in education, school crime and safety  
issues a plus.

Choose AIR...because together we can do great things. We offer excellent compensation, full benefits, and talented professional colleagues...some of the best and brightest in the field today. Please e-mail your resume with cover letter, a writing sample, availability and Ref. Code: ESSI-04310 to: resumes@air.org <mailto:resumes@air.org> or forward to: American Institutes for Research, Human Resources-ESSI-04310, Education Statistics Service Institute, 1000 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20007-3835, Fax: (202) 403-5454. EEO

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

---

Date: Thu, 14 Oct 2004 11:00:01 -0400  
Reply-To: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>  
Subject: Well, it appears our friend Arianna has spoken her, um,  
mind again....

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

"The dirty little secret of the polling industry is that, all too often, its findings are based on flawed methodology and dubious assumptions."

<http://www.ariannaonline.com/columns/column.php?id=3D737>

I've been wanting to weigh in for a while now on the negative - indeed, the downright dangerous - impact that public opinion polls are having on our democracy, but have held off until the numbers turned in John Kerry's favor lest I be accused of following in the footsteps of my Greek ancestors by killing the messenger.=20

But now that the post-debate figures have swung Kerry's way, let me jump on the chance to say: It's time to pull the plug on the media's obsession with treating polling results as if Moses had just brought them down from the mountaintop.

Over the last month, media coverage of the presidential race has been driven by wildly vacillating poll numbers. For example, Newsweek has Kerry going from 11 points down in its Sept. 4 poll to 2 points up in this week's poll, while Gallup went from Kerry trailing by 14 points on Sept. 16 to dead even on Oct. 4.=20

Of course, at the same time that Gallup had Bush 14 points ahead, the Pew Center poll had the race all tied up; and now that Gallup has Kerry pulling even with Bush, Pew has the president holding a 7-point



advantage.

But no one in the media says, "Hey, wait a minute. What's going on here? Both of you can't be right!" They just dutifully report the latest numbers and set out to explain what they "mean" - without any attempt to account for the huge disparities.

After all, for the big swings in the Newsweek and Gallup polls to be true, close to 16 million voters would have had to change their minds. In four weeks' time. Not even J-Lo is that fickle.=20

Sure, Kerry was strong in the first debate and Bush was shaky - but for that many voters to switch sides that fast, Kerry would have had to deliver Osama Ben Forgotten's head on a silver platter during his closing statement.

And, unless I really spaced out, that didn't happen.

The dirty little secret of the polling industry is that, all too often, its findings are based on flawed methodology and dubious assumptions.

Take that mid-September Gallup poll that found Kerry had plummeted 14 points behind Bush. It sure made it seem as if Kerry were as good as done for, right? And that's the way it was widely reported by everybody, especially Gallup's media partners, USA Today and CNN. The problem is, the poll was absurdly weighted in favor of GOP voters, assuming that on Election Day 40 percent of those casting a ballot will be Republicans and only 33 percent will be Democrats - a turnout breakdown that will only happen in Karl Rove's dreams.=20

Democrats have accounted for 39 percent of those voting in the last two presidential elections, while Republicans accounted for no more than 35 percent in either 1996 or 2000.

It's like they say about computers: garbage in, garbage out. With polls, it's faulty data in, faulty findings out.=20

Yet polls are now firmly entrenched as the lingua franca of political analysis. Dissecting the latest numbers is so much easier than actually, y'know, digging for the truth. Cable shows love turning the campaign into a horse race. And it's so much easier if you can parade fatuous numbers as hardcore facts to prove Who's Hot and Who's Not.

Trouble is, these "snapshots of the electorate" quickly harden into portraits, and, in the blink of an eye, guesstimates become the conventional wisdom.=20

And in politics, as in sports, everybody loves a winner. Thus, as soon as the pollsters delivered Bush his hyper-inflated post-convention bounce, many of the Democratic faithful started seeing the ghosts of Mike Dukakis and Fritz Mondale lurking around every corner. By the same light, now that Bush has supposedly hit the polling skids, the shadow of his Dad's one-and-done presidency has begun to darken the GOP base's doorstep.=20

These kinds of poll-induced mood swings can have a profound impact on a campaign. The sense that a candidate is tanking - or on a roll - can make the difference between a potential donor making a contribution or keeping his checkbook in his pocket. It can also tip the scales for a would-be volunteer deciding whether to give up more free time to go door-to-door registering voters or work the phones to get out the vote.

I saw firsthand the effect that manufactured momentum has as I traveled around the country speaking. Again and again last month, I was told by Kerry supporters that the gloomy poll numbers hanging over their man's campaign had made them less likely to donate their time and money.=20

This is how polls morph from meaningless farce into potential tragedy - self-fulfilling prophecies that end up making more likely whatever results they predict while, at the same time, undermining the democratic process.=20

But despite mounting evidence that poll results can't be trusted, pundits and politicians continue to treat them with a reverence ancient Romans reserved for chicken entrails, ignoring the fact that pollsters are finding it increasingly difficult to get people to talk to them. Thanks to answering machines, caller ID and telemarketers, polling response rates have plunged to 30 percent - and lower. It's pretty hard getting a good read on the public's opinion when people keep hanging up on you.

Plus, pollsters never call cell phones - of which there are now close to 170 million. And even though most cell phone users also have a hard line, a growing number don't - especially young people, an underpolled and hard-to-gauge demographic that could easily turn out to be the margin of difference in this year's race.=20

Most important, no pollsters, no matter how polished their crystal balls, really know who are going to be the likely voters this November and how many of the unlikely ones are going to turn out at the polls.=20

Our media mavens obviously know all this, but choose to ignore it. Coming clean about polls would mean taking them off the front pages and sticking them where they belong - back among the horoscopes and comic strips.

And then what would the chattering class chatter about?

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 14 Oct 2004 13:33:11 -0400

Reply-To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>

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

From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>

Subject: Re: Well, it appears our friend Arianna has spoken her, um,

mind again....

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To: <F4819BE66F9FE84EA57E47695FC797D1933647@b1.ex.logicworks.net>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Jason Boxt wrote:

>"The dirty little secret of the polling industry is that, all too often,  
>its findings are based on flawed methodology and dubious assumptions."  
>  
><http://www.ariannaonline.com/columns/column.php?id=737>

Ok, time to have the ritual bashing of Arianna. Something to add to your arsenal: when she was young and working in publishing in London, she was nicknamed the most upwardly mobile Greek since Icarus.

I posted something the other day which, to my non-surprise, elicited no reaction. But let me try again. When reputable economists do statistical work, they run their models in multiple specifications - different variables, lags, time periods, etc. - to see how robust their findings are. And, if they're honest, they report the differences and analyze them. Perhaps other social scientists do the same thing; I'm most familiar with the econ literature.

Why don't pollsters do that? Why are the polls reporting such disparate results? How can one poll - Gallup - go from something like a 12-point Republican advantage to a 2-point Dem advantage in less than a week? How can one post-debate polls report a 1 or 2 point Kerry advantage (as did ABC) and another (Gallup) report something like a 12 or 13 point Kerry advantage? (Sorry for the imprecise numbers - I'm doing this from memory.) Sure the sample sizes are small, but what's going on? How can horserace polls taken at the same time show variations of 10 or 15 points?

Doesn't all this make anyone wonder about methodology? Why don't pollsters report more about their weightings and other techniques? Why don't we see comparisons of how the same sample would look if processed with different assumptions and techniques?

If you want to build credibility with a skeptical public, you've got to be more open and less defensive.

--

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>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)  
=====

Date: Thu, 14 Oct 2004 14:43:58 -0400  
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Well, it appears our friend Arianna has spoken her, um,  
mind again...  
Comments: To: Jason Boxt <[jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM](mailto:jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[F4819BE66F9FE84EA57E47695FC797D1933647@b1.ex.logicworks.net](mailto:F4819BE66F9FE84EA57E47695FC797D1933647@b1.ex.logicworks.net)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Since we are discussing this issue, I would like to speculate in a somewhat different direction about poll disparities and swings. Rather than making accusations, ideological or otherwise, about why the polls have shown such varying results, I would like to suggest another possibility. I'm not sure if anyone has discussed an old notion (some would say "quaint") in Political Science called a "critical election"-- one in which the agenda and party coalitions shift dramatically and stay shifted for thirty years or so. Key introduced the idea (I believe in about 1956) and Key's student Walter Dean Burnham wrote the classic text on the subject in 1970. What Burnham basically argued is that presidential elections go through cycles of approximately 36 years (give or take). This began with mass enfranchisement and the birth of political parties in 1824; it occurred again with the birth of the Republican party as an anti-slavery party in 1860; it occurred again with the addition of the emerging corporate interests to the Republican party in 1896; it occurred again with the rise of the New Deal coalition under FDR in 1932; and it resulted in the dealignment in 1968 when we no longer had a majority party due to the increasing numbers of independents.

By this elementary math, if critical elections occur on schedule the next one should be-- you guessed it-- 2004. What are the characteristics of a "critical election"; borrowing from Burnham, they include: abnormally high intensity, an increase in the ideological polarization, and an abnormally high turnout of voters (Burnham, 1970:6-9). The first two we definitely have, and the third seems likely given the massive increase in voter registration.

The question is: how might this impact polling? My response is that it is possible that the polling instruments we have developed, or the methods of sampling we have used, are insufficient to measure what is going on in the electorate during such a period. Does that mean a landslide for either Kerry or Bush, or a very close election? Truly, I do not know. But I have the feeling that there is something going on in the electorate that our traditional methods, for whatever reason, can't get their hands around, since we may be dealing with a situation that is entirely new to us (or at least that we have not seen recently).

The analogy that comes to mind-- and forgive my half-joking here-- is when the first "Star Trek" would have the Enterprise go into a mysterious and uncharted area of the universe. The first thing that typically happened was that all the instruments "would go crazy." Perhaps we are in an uncharted political environment that is making our instruments less reliable, so that it isn't a matter of any particular surveys being "wrong", but rather that they are measuring different pieces of a phenomenon that we have not yet been able to discern. At any rate, I suspect that any survey that actually does tend to be right, if the disparities and swings continue, will just be so because they happened by some means to capture the essential clue that tell us something of what is going on.

Frank Rusciano

Jason Boxt wrote:

>"The dirty little secret of the polling industry is that, all too often,  
>its findings are based on flawed methodology and dubious assumptions."  
>  
><http://www.ariannaonline.com/columns/column.php?id=737>  
>  
>I've been wanting to weigh in for a while now on the negative - indeed,  
>the downright dangerous - impact that public opinion polls are having on  
>our democracy, but have held off until the numbers turned in John  
>Kerry's favor lest I be accused of following in the footsteps of my  
>Greek ancestors by killing the messenger.  
>  
>But now that the post-debate figures have swung Kerry's way, let me jump  
>on the chance to say: It's time to pull the plug on the media's  
>obsession with treating polling results as if Moses had just brought  
>them down from the mountaintop.  
>  
>Over the last month, media coverage of the presidential race has been  
>driven by wildly vacillating poll numbers. For example, Newsweek has  
>Kerry going from 11 points down in its Sept. 4 poll to 2 points up in  
>this week's poll, while Gallup went from Kerry trailing by 14 points on  
>Sept. 16 to dead even on Oct. 4.  
>  
>Of course, at the same time that Gallup had Bush 14 points ahead, the  
>Pew Center poll had the race all tied up; and now that Gallup has Kerry  
>pulling even with Bush, Pew has the president holding a 7-point  
>advantage.  
>  
>But no one in the media says, "Hey, wait a minute. What's going on here?  
>Both of you can't be right!" They just dutifully report the latest  
>numbers and set out to explain what they "mean" - without any attempt to  
>account for the huge disparities.  
>  
>After all, for the big swings in the Newsweek and Gallup polls to be  
>>true, close to 16 million voters would have had to change their minds.  
>In four weeks' time. Not even J-Lo is that fickle.  
>

>Sure, Kerry was strong in the first debate and Bush was shaky - but for  
>that many voters to switch sides that fast, Kerry would have had to  
>deliver Osama Ben Forgotten's head on a silver platter during his  
>closing statement.  
>  
>And, unless I really spaced out, that didn't happen.  
>  
>The dirty little secret of the polling industry is that, all too often,  
>its findings are based on flawed methodology and dubious assumptions.  
>  
>Take that mid-September Gallup poll that found Kerry had plummeted 14  
>points behind Bush. It sure made it seem as if Kerry were as good as  
>done for, right? And that's the way it was widely reported by everybody,  
>especially Gallup's media partners, USA Today and CNN. The problem is,  
>the poll was absurdly weighted in favor of GOP voters, assuming that on  
>Election Day 40 percent of those casting a ballot will be Republicans  
>and only 33 percent will be Democrats - a turnout breakdown that will  
>only happen in Karl Rove's dreams.  
>  
>Democrats have accounted for 39 percent of those voting in the last two  
>presidential elections, while Republicans accounted for no more than 35  
>percent in either 1996 or 2000.  
>  
>It's like they say about computers: garbage in, garbage out. With polls,  
>it's faulty data in, faulty findings out.  
>  
>Yet polls are now firmly entrenched as the lingua franca of political  
>analysis. Dissecting the latest numbers is so much easier than actually,  
>y'know, digging for the truth. Cable shows love turning the campaign  
>into a horse race. And it's so much easier if you can parade fatuous  
>numbers as hardcore facts to prove Who's Hot and Who's Not.  
>  
>Trouble is, these "snapshots of the electorate" quickly harden into  
>portraits, and, in the blink of an eye, guesstimates become the  
>conventional wisdom.  
>  
>And in politics, as in sports, everybody loves a winner. Thus, as soon  
>as the pollsters delivered Bush his hyper-inflated post-convention  
>bounce, many of the Democratic faithful started seeing the ghosts of  
>Mike Dukakis and Fritz Mondale lurking around every corner. By the same  
>light, now that Bush has supposedly hit the polling skids, the shadow of  
>his Dad's one-and-done presidency has begun to darken the GOP base's  
>doorstep.  
>  
>These kinds of poll-induced mood swings can have a profound impact on a  
>campaign. The sense that a candidate is tanking - or on a roll - can  
>make the difference between a potential donor making a contribution or  
>keeping his checkbook in his pocket. It can also tip the scales for a  
>would-be volunteer deciding whether to give up more free time to go  
>door-to-door registering voters or work the phones to get out the vote.  
>  
>I saw firsthand the effect that manufactured momentum has as I traveled  
>around the country speaking. Again and again last month, I was told by  
>Kerry supporters that the gloomy poll numbers hanging over their man's

>campaign had made them less likely to donate their time and money.  
>  
>This is how polls morph from meaningless farce into potential tragedy -  
>self-fulfilling prophesies that end up making more likely whatever  
>results they predict while, at the same time, undermining the democratic  
>process.  
>  
>But despite mounting evidence that poll results can't be trusted,  
>pundits and politicians continue to treat them with a reverence ancient  
>Romans reserved for chicken entrails, ignoring the fact that pollsters  
>are finding it increasingly difficult to get people to talk to them.  
>Thanks to answering machines, caller ID and telemarketers, polling  
>response rates have plunged to 30 percent - and lower. It's pretty hard  
>getting a good read on the public's opinion when people keep hanging up  
>on you.  
>  
>Plus, pollsters never call cell phones - of which there are now close to  
>170 million. And even though most cell phone users also have a hard  
>line, a growing number don't - especially young people, an underpolled  
>and hard-to-gauge demographic that could easily turn out to be the  
>margin of difference in this year's race.  
>  
>Most important, no pollsters, no matter how polished their crystal  
>balls, really know who are going to be the likely voters this November  
>and how many of the unlikely ones are going to turn out at the polls.  
>  
>Our media mavens obviously know all this, but choose to ignore it.  
>Coming clean about polls would mean taking them off the front pages and  
>sticking them where they belong - back among the horoscopes and comic  
>strips.  
>  
>And then what would the chattering class chatter about?

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

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

Date: Thu, 14 Oct 2004 12:36:52 -0700  
Reply-To: [jdrovers@sfsu.edu](mailto:jdrovers@sfsu.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: John Rogers <[jdrovers@SFSU.EDU](mailto:jdrovers@SFSU.EDU)>  
Organization: Public Research Institute  
Subject: Re: Well, it appears our friend Arianna has spoken her, um,  
mind again...  
Comments: To: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[416EC8EE.9020001@rider.edu](mailto:416EC8EE.9020001@rider.edu)>

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

Not to knock the interesting notion of critical elections, but it seems =  
to  
me that a simpler explanation is that the polling industry routinely  
underestimates the precision of its results, which undermines public  
confidence in polling (and all survey research). It's a classic =  
"tragedy of  
the commons" situation that will not be easily solved.

John Rogers

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Frank Rusciano  
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2004 10:44 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Well, it appears our friend Arianna has spoken her, um, =  
mind  
again....

Since we are discussing this issue, I would like to speculate in a =  
somewhat  
different direction about poll disparities and swings. Rather than =  
making  
accusations, ideological or otherwise, about why the polls have shown =  
such  
varying results, I would like to suggest another possibility. I'm not =  
sure  
if anyone has discussed an old notion (some would say "quaint") in =  
Political  
Science called a "critical election"-- one in which the agenda and party  
coalitions shift dramatically and stay shifted for thirty years or so. =  
Key  
introduced the idea (I believe in about 1956) and Key's student Walter =  
Dean  
Burnham wrote the classic text on the subject in 1970. What Burnham  
basically argued is that presidential elections go through cycles of  
approximately 36 years (give or take). This began with mass =  
enfranchisement  
and the birth of political parties in 1824; it occurred again with the =  
birth  
of the Republican party as an anti-slavery party in 1860; it occurred =  
again  
with the addition of the emerging corporate interests to the Republican  
party in 1896; it occurred again with the rise of the New Deal coalition  
under FDR in 1932; and it resulted in the dealignment in 1968 when we no  
longer had a majority party due to the increasing numbers of =  
independents.

[SNIP]



Frank Rusciano

Jason Boxt wrote:

>"The dirty little secret of the polling industry is that, all too=20  
>often, its findings are based on flawed methodology and dubious=20  
>assumptions."  
>  
><http://www.ariannaonline.com/columns/column.php?id=3D737>  
>  
>I've been wanting to weigh in for a while now on the negative - indeed, =  
  
>the downright dangerous - impact that public opinion polls are having=20  
>on our democracy, but have held off until the numbers turned in John=20  
>Kerry's favor lest I be accused of following in the footsteps of my=20  
>Greek ancestors by killing the messenger.

[SNIP]

>Most important, no pollsters, no matter how polished their crystal=20  
>balls, really know who are going to be the likely voters this November=20  
>and how many of the unlikely ones are going to turn out at the polls.  
>  
>Our media mavens obviously know all this, but choose to ignore it.=20  
>Coming clean about polls would mean taking them off the front pages and =  
  
>sticking them where they belong - back among the horoscopes and comic=20  
>strips.  
>  
>And then what would the chattering class chatter about?  
>

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

---

Date: Thu, 14 Oct 2004 12:41:44 -0700  
Reply-To: Shapard Wolf <[shap.wolf@ASU.EDU](mailto:shap.wolf@ASU.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Shapard Wolf <[shap.wolf@ASU.EDU](mailto:shap.wolf@ASU.EDU)>  
Subject: AAPORNET outage this Friday night  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Due to system maintenance on the server that hosts Listserv and AAPORNET at ASU, AAPORNET will be unavailable this coming Friday, Oct 15th, from 6:00 PM to 9:00 PM MST.

Users will be affected as follows:

(1) Posts to AAPORNET will be delayed until after the outage.  
(2) Listserv's web interface (<http://lists.asu.edu>) will be unavailable and commands sent to=20  
Listserv via e-mail will be delayed. The AAPORNET archives at <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html> will be unavailable.

IT always reserves a three-hour window, but they usually finish quicker, so don't be surprised if messages start flowing before 9pm MST.

Best,  
Shap

Shap Wolf  
AAPORNET volunteer coordinator  
Associate Chair, Publications & Information  
Arizona State University SRL=20  
[shap.wolf@asu.edu](mailto:shap.wolf@asu.edu)

---

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

---

Date: Thu, 14 Oct 2004 14:38:56 -0700  
Reply-To: [jdrogers@sfsu.edu](mailto:jdrogers@sfsu.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: John Rogers <[jdrogers@SFSU.EDU](mailto:jdrogers@SFSU.EDU)>  
Organization: Public Research Institute  
Subject: Re: Well, it appears our friend Arianna has spoken her, um, mind again...  
Comments: To: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[416EC8EE.9020001@rider.edu](mailto:416EC8EE.9020001@rider.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Correction: It has been pointed out to me that I really meant to say "routinely overestimates the precision..." My apologies for the error.

John

---

Not to knock the interesting notion of critical elections, but it seems =  
to me that a simpler explanation is that the polling industry routinely underestimates the precision of its results, which undermines public confidence in polling (and all survey research). It's a classic =  
"tragedy of the commons" situation that will not be easily solved.

John Rogers

---

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Thu, 14 Oct 2004 17:16:11 -0500

Reply-To: "Michael B. Conaway" <Michael.Conaway@UA.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Michael B. Conaway" <Michael.Conaway@UA.EDU>

Subject: Re: Well, it appears our friend Arianna has spoken her, um,  
mind again....

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

In-Reply-To: <F4819BE66F9FE84EA57E47695FC797D1933647@b1.ex.logicworks.net>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Pardon my quibble, but wasn't killing the messenger primarily a Roman practice; while it may have happened from time to time in Greece of old, I wasn't aware that the Greeks were known to be particularly partial to the killing of messengers as certain Roman emperors were. If I recall correctly, diplomatic immunity arose (perhaps only in part) under Roman law or its derivatives to protect diplomats of another country bearing unpleasant news.

At 10:00 AM 10/14/2004, Jason Boxt wrote:

>"The dirty little secret of the polling industry is that, all too often,  
>its findings are based on flawed methodology and dubious assumptions."

>

><http://www.ariannaonline.com/columns/column.php?id=737>

>

>I've been wanting to weigh in for a while now on the negative - indeed,  
>the downright dangerous - impact that public opinion polls are having on  
>our democracy, but have held off until the numbers turned in John  
>Kerry's favor lest I be accused of following in the footsteps of my  
>Greek ancestors by killing the messenger.

>

>But now that the post-debate figures have swung Kerry's way, let me jump  
>on the chance to say: It's time to pull the plug on the media's  
>obsession with treating polling results as if Moses had just brought  
>them down from the mountaintop.

>

>Over the last month, media coverage of the presidential race has been  
>driven by wildly vacillating poll numbers. For example, Newsweek has  
>Kerry going from 11 points down in its Sept. 4 poll to 2 points up in  
>this week's poll, while Gallup went from Kerry trailing by 14 points on  
>Sept. 16 to dead even on Oct. 4.

>

>Of course, at the same time that Gallup had Bush 14 points ahead, the  
>Pew Center poll had the race all tied up; and now that Gallup has Kerry  
>pulling even with Bush, Pew has the president holding a 7-point  
>advantage.

>

>But no one in the media says, "Hey, wait a minute. What's going on here?  
>Both of you can't be right!" They just dutifully report the latest  
>numbers and set out to explain what they "mean" - without any attempt to

>account for the huge disparities.

>

>After all, for the big swings in the Newsweek and Gallup polls to be  
>>true, close to 16 million voters would have had to change their minds.

>In four weeks' time. Not even J-Lo is that fickle.

>

>Sure, Kerry was strong in the first debate and Bush was shaky - but for  
>that many voters to switch sides that fast, Kerry would have had to  
>deliver Osama Ben Forgotten's head on a silver platter during his  
>closing statement.

>

>And, unless I really spaced out, that didn't happen.

>

>The dirty little secret of the polling industry is that, all too often,  
>its findings are based on flawed methodology and dubious assumptions.

>

>Take that mid-September Gallup poll that found Kerry had plummeted 14  
>points behind Bush. It sure made it seem as if Kerry were as good as  
>done for, right? And that's the way it was widely reported by everybody,  
>especially Gallup's media partners, USA Today and CNN. The problem is,  
>the poll was absurdly weighted in favor of GOP voters, assuming that on  
>Election Day 40 percent of those casting a ballot will be Republicans  
>and only 33 percent will be Democrats - a turnout breakdown that will  
>only happen in Karl Rove's dreams.

>

>Democrats have accounted for 39 percent of those voting in the last two  
>presidential elections, while Republicans accounted for no more than 35  
>percent in either 1996 or 2000.

>

>It's like they say about computers: garbage in, garbage out. With polls,  
>it's faulty data in, faulty findings out.

>

>Yet polls are now firmly entrenched as the lingua franca of political  
>analysis. Dissecting the latest numbers is so much easier than actually,  
>y'know, digging for the truth. Cable shows love turning the campaign  
>into a horse race. And it's so much easier if you can parade fatuous  
>numbers as hardcore facts to prove Who's Hot and Who's Not.

>

>Trouble is, these "snapshots of the electorate" quickly harden into  
>portraits, and, in the blink of an eye, guesstimates become the  
>conventional wisdom.

>

>And in politics, as in sports, everybody loves a winner. Thus, as soon  
>as the pollsters delivered Bush his hyper-inflated post-convention  
>bounce, many of the Democratic faithful started seeing the ghosts of  
>Mike Dukakis and Fritz Mondale lurking around every corner. By the same  
>light, now that Bush has supposedly hit the polling skids, the shadow of  
>his Dad's one-and-done presidency has begun to darken the GOP base's  
>doorstep.

>

>These kinds of poll-induced mood swings can have a profound impact on a  
>campaign. The sense that a candidate is tanking - or on a roll - can  
>make the difference between a potential donor making a contribution or  
>keeping his checkbook in his pocket. It can also tip the scales for a

>would-be volunteer deciding whether to give up more free time to go  
>door-to-door registering voters or work the phones to get out the vote.  
>  
>I saw firsthand the effect that manufactured momentum has as I traveled  
>around the country speaking. Again and again last month, I was told by  
>Kerry supporters that the gloomy poll numbers hanging over their man's  
>campaign had made them less likely to donate their time and money.  
>  
>This is how polls morph from meaningless farce into potential tragedy -  
>self-fulfilling prophesies that end up making more likely whatever  
>results they predict while, at the same time, undermining the democratic  
>process.  
>  
>But despite mounting evidence that poll results can't be trusted,  
>pundits and politicians continue to treat them with a reverence ancient  
>Romans reserved for chicken entrails, ignoring the fact that pollsters  
>are finding it increasingly difficult to get people to talk to them.  
>Thanks to answering machines, caller ID and telemarketers, polling  
>response rates have plunged to 30 percent - and lower. It's pretty hard  
>getting a good read on the public's opinion when people keep hanging up  
>on you.  
>  
>Plus, pollsters never call cell phones - of which there are now close to  
>170 million. And even though most cell phone users also have a hard  
>line, a growing number don't - especially young people, an underpolled  
>and hard-to-gauge demographic that could easily turn out to be the  
>margin of difference in this year's race.  
>  
>Most important, no pollsters, no matter how polished their crystal  
>balls, really know who are going to be the likely voters this November  
>and how many of the unlikely ones are going to turn out at the polls.  
>  
>Our media mavens obviously know all this, but choose to ignore it.  
>Coming clean about polls would mean taking them off the front pages and  
>sticking them where they belong - back among the horoscopes and comic  
>strips.  
>  
>And then what would the chattering class chatter about?  
>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

-----  
Michael B. Conaway, J.D.  
Institute for Social Science Research  
University of Alabama  
Box 870216  
Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0216  
(205) 348-9649 Telephone  
(205) 348-2849 Facsimile  
-----

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

---

Date: Thu, 14 Oct 2004 17:30:04 -0500  
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Flanagan <[MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM](mailto:MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM)>  
Subject: Job Opportunity  
Comments: To: [AAPORNet@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Please refer to the referenced website to respond to this position:=20  
=20  
Department of Public Policy

University of Connecticut

Assistant Professors

=20

The Department of Public Policy (DPP) at the University of Connecticut seeks to fill two tenure-track faculty positions in public management/human resource management and methods/program evaluation to support masters programs in survey research and public administration. We seek individuals with a demonstrated record of, or potential for, scholarly excellence based on rigorous social science research methodologies. The successful candidates will be expected to carry on programs of high quality research and to publish in the best journals in their field. Preference will be given to applicants who have demonstrated teaching excellence and are comfortable with a wide array of analytical methods. Application information can be found at our website: <http://www.dpp.uconn.edu>. We encourage applications from under-represented groups, including minorities, women, and people with disabilities. (Search #'s 05A191, 05A192)

=20

=20

=20

---

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

---

Date: Thu, 14 Oct 2004 22:45:09 -0400  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>

From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: New Yorker Magazine on Zogby (and AAPOR)  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The October 18 issue of The New Yorker contains a profile of John Zogby by staff writer Larissa MacFarquhar that contains many unflattering comments about AAPOR, described as primarily an insider's club for leaders of the polling establishment. It includes rambling digressions about Nancy Belden and Stanley Presser that have little to do with the topic at hand, but seem to be intended mainly to show off the author's knowledgeability when discussing polls and pollsters.

As is all too often the case in The New Yorker, the article manages to get most (but not all) of its factual details right while missing the mark on the ostensible subject.

Unfortunately, this article is not posted on the magazine's web site.

Jan Werner

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 15 Oct 2004 09:51:49 +0200  
Reply-To: Lyberg Lars VL-S <lars.lyberg@SCB.SE>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Lyberg Lars VL-S <lars.lyberg@SCB.SE>  
Subject: Self-administered surveys of children  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

There is a literature on interviewing children. But does anyone have = knowledge of any work where data collection from children has been = conducted using self-administered mode?

Lars Lyberg  
Statistics Sweden

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Fri, 15 Oct 2004 07:00:43 -0400  
Reply-To: [lindeman@BARD.EDU](mailto:lindeman@BARD.EDU)  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>

Subject: Re: New Yorker Magazine on Zogby (and AAPOR)  
Comments: To: jwerner@JWDP.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <416F39B5.90601@jwdp.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

Quoting Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>:

> The October 18 issue of The New Yorker contains a profile of John Zogby  
> by staff writer Larissa MacFarquhar that contains many unflattering  
> comments about AAPOR, described as primarily an insider's club for  
> leaders of the polling establishment. [...]

For what it's worth, I didn't read the article that way. Here's what seems to be the most pertinent paragraph on AAPOR itself:

"Zogby is not wrong to talk about the polling establishment as a club. It is a club -- in fact, it set out consciously to become one. George Gallup used to invite pollsters out to his farm in New Jersey once a year to meet each other and sit at the feet of the master. AAPOR, which was founded in 1947, is a much larger group now, but it retains its old sense of camaraderie. It recently put together a book, which consisted in part of social reminiscences ('First experience in the Poconos,' the book relates of its second annual conference, in 1948. 'They don't appreciate our singing, drinking, late hours') and the lyrics to songs that were sung on such occasions ('Je vous aime, AAPOR!'). Indeed, several of the association's current members are the sons and daughters of its founding generation." (There follows a reasonably straightforward description of Nancy Belden's work with her father, and of the idealism of Gallup and other early pollsters.)

It's not the way we would write the press release, but I read it as more flattering than unflattering. I'm sure others will read it differently. My wife, a librarian, reports that librarians are sharply divided over whether the Nancy Pearl shushing Librarian Action Figure (see e.g. <http://www.mcphee.com/amusements/current/11247.html>) is endearingly funny or insultingly stereotypical, but the official ALA newsletter leans toward the latter view (much to my wife's regret). Hmm... an AAPOR action figure....

Mark Lindeman

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Fri, 15 Oct 2004 10:04:29 -0400



Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Subject: Re: New Yorker Magazine on Zogby (and AAPOR)  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <416F39B5.90601@jwdp.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Jan Werner wrote:

>The October 18 issue of The New Yorker contains a profile of John Zogby  
> by staff writer Larissa MacFarquhar that contains many unflattering  
>comments about AAPOR, described as primarily an insider's club for  
>leaders of the polling establishment.

I'm shocked! You'd almost think that AAPOR members view critiques coming from outside as (choose one) impertinent, conspiracy theory, ignorant, sleazy, or a form of lese majeste!

--

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>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Fri, 15 Oct 2004 10:08:01 -0400  
Reply-To: "Frankovic, Kathleen" <KAF@CBSNEWS.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Frankovic, Kathleen" <KAF@CBSNEWS.COM>  
Subject: Re: New Yorker Magazine on Zogby (and AAPOR)  
Comments: To: "lindeman@BARD.EDU" <lindeman@BARD.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

I can't resist a response to this excerpt from the New Yorker article:

"It [AAPOR} recently put together a book, which consisted in part of social reminiscences ('First experience in the Poconos,' the book relates of its second annual conference, in 1948. 'They don't appreciate our singing, drinking, late hours') and the lyrics to songs that were sung on such occasions ('Je vous aime, AAPOR!')."

Can 1992 (the date "A Meeting Place" was published) really be described as "recently?"

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Fri, 15 Oct 2004 15:08:46 +0100  
Reply-To: "Moon, Nick" <nmoon@NOPWORLD.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Moon, Nick" <nmoon@NOPWORLD.COM>  
Subject: Re: New Yorker Magazine on Zogby (and AAPOR)  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

> I'm shocked! You'd almost think that AAPOR members view critiques  
> coming from outside as (choose one) impertinent, conspiracy theory,  
> ignorant, sleazy, or a form of lese majeste!

guess it depends how much they rely on fact rather than supposition

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*\*\*

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Fri, 15 Oct 2004 10:32:05 -0400  
Reply-To: [jmellis@vcu.edu](mailto:jmellis@vcu.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Jim Ellis <jmellis@VCU.EDU>  
Organization: SERL  
Subject: Survey ratings and "localness"  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I'd actually prefer to combine some thoughts about Star Trek, librarian =  
and  
AAPOR action figures, and political polling, but those threads are =  
moving  
way too fast for my feeble brain.

I will ask a different question, possibly a dumb one:

It seems well established that survey respondents tend to give lower  
quality/satisfaction ratings to Congress generally than to their own  
representatives. The same is true for ratings of school quality in =  
general  
versus local schools. The same is probably well established for a number =  
of  
other things. I imagine the difference between firsthand and secondhand  
knowledge has been proposed as an explanation, as well as cognitive  
dissonance. But is there a name for this phenomenon as it appears in  
surveys? A literature? An explanation supported by research? It's one of  
those things that seems so obvious, I am a bit embarrassed that I can't =  
seem  
to latch on to the literature after some journal searches and scans of =  
some  
books I have on hand.

Jim Ellis  
Virginia Commonwealth University

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Fri, 15 Oct 2004 09:45:30 -0500  
Reply-To: "Moore, David" <David\_Moore@GALLUP.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Moore, David" <David\_Moore@GALLUP.COM>  
Subject: Re: Survey ratings and "localness"  
Comments: To: jmellis@vcu.edu, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

My phrase for this...is the "BIMBY" phenomenon...I think it is my  
phrase...

"Better In My Back Yard"....

Not to be confused with the more widely known NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard) phrase, referring to support, say, for nuclear power plants or Wal-Marts, as long as they are not in one's own town or location...

David  
=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jim Ellis  
Sent: Friday, October 15, 2004 10:32 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Survey ratings and "localness"

I'd actually prefer to combine some thoughts about Star Trek, librarian and AAPOR action figures, and political polling, but those threads are moving way too fast for my feeble brain.

I will ask a different question, possibly a dumb one:

It seems well established that survey respondents tend to give lower quality/satisfaction ratings to Congress generally than to their own representatives. The same is true for ratings of school quality in general versus local schools. The same is probably well established for a number of other things. I imagine the difference between firsthand and secondhand knowledge has been proposed as an explanation, as well as cognitive dissonance. But is there a name for this phenomenon as it appears in surveys? A literature? An explanation supported by research? It's one of those things that seems so obvious, I am a bit embarrassed that I can't seem to latch on to the literature after some journal searches and scans of some books I have on hand.

Jim Ellis  
Virginia Commonwealth University

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Fri, 15 Oct 2004 11:26:17 -0400  
Reply-To: Donald Green <donald.green@YALE.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Donald Green <donald.green@YALE.EDU>  
Subject: Samplemiser time again  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To:  
<06C64DE644F85843A90884803225A80704CED1B7@exchng12.noam.gallup.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Now that tracking polls have accumulated an appreciable number of daily (or really 3-day) readings, I invite poll-tracking junkies to drop these results into our web-based Kalman Filter program at [www.samplemiser.com](http://www.samplemiser.com). The program is designed to distinguish day-to-day fluctuations associated with sampling error from those associated with true underlying change in opinion.

For example, cut and paste the following numbers from ABC News Tracking poll into samplemiser (as reported in [pollingreport.com](http://pollingreport.com)) using the format day-N-percent:

```
1 1200 51
4 1200 49
7 1200 50
11 1200 48
```

Click the button to "estimate the disturbance variance" and get the following output:

```
Date ( timeunits in days )      1      4      7      11
      ----  ----  ----  ----
Observed percentages: input    51.00  49.00  50.00  48.00
Filtered percentages: output*  51.00  49.98  49.99  49.40
Standard error: filtered est.   1.44   1.03   0.86   0.80
Smoothed percentages: output** 49.59  49.53  49.49  49.40
Standard error: Smoothed pct.   0.79   0.75   0.75   0.80
```

On day 11 (October 11), the observed results were 48% for Bush. The best guess of Bush's actual percentage was, however, 49.4%. The nominal standard error of the last poll would ordinarily be calculated as around 1.4%, but the optimal estimate has a much smaller standard error, 0.8%. In effect, using the information from a stream of (independent) polls augments the precision of any given poll estimate without increasing sample size, hence the name "samplemiser."

The "smoothed" series shows that Bush has drifted downward very slightly over this period, notwithstanding the apparent bouncing around in the polls.

Have fun,  
Don

---

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

---

email address: [donald.green@yale.edu](mailto:donald.green@yale.edu)  
Web: [research.yale.edu/vote](http://research.yale.edu/vote)  
Fax 203-432-3296

Voice 203-432-3237

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Fri, 15 Oct 2004 08:38:01 -0700  
Reply-To: Sharon Yates <[syates@ZAGAT.COM](mailto:syates@ZAGAT.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Sharon Yates <[syates@ZAGAT.COM](mailto:syates@ZAGAT.COM)>  
Subject: NYAAPOR Oct. 19 Workshop: A Researcher's Guide to Survey  
Implementation

Scott Crawford will be conducting this workshop, "A RESEARCHER'S GUIDE TO SURVEY IMPLEMENTATION". For more details, see our website posting: <http://www.nyaapor.org/Events.htm>.

Sharon Yates  
NYAAPOR Program Chair

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Fri, 15 Oct 2004 11:52:21 -0400  
Reply-To: Jeanette Janota <[JJanota@ASHA.ORG](mailto:JJanota@ASHA.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jeanette Janota <[JJanota@ASHA.ORG](mailto:JJanota@ASHA.ORG)>  
Subject: Incentive size  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: multipart/mixed; boundary="Boundary\_(ID\_/esRLzMEe61viMBYchri1w)"

This is a MIME message. If you are reading this text, you may want to consider changing to a mail reader or gateway that understands how to properly handle MIME multipart messages.

--Boundary\_(ID\_/esRLzMEe61viMBYchri1w)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

I'm looking for feedback from you experts about incentives. We read and hear about the smallest dollar amount that's effective for surveys or focus groups. Does anyone have any input on what happens when the incentive is too large? And what constitutes too large?

A client is strongly recommending that we offer an incentive of several hundred dollars for a 20 minute on-line survey. An even higher amount (\$500) has been suggested for participation in a 90 minute focus group. The survey population is senior, mostly university-based researchers.

I know we're establishing a social contract and not trying to pay people a wage, and I realize that "too large" varies by the

respondent/participant burden and by the demographics of the respondent,  
but some feedback would be helpful.

Thanks to all of you wizened researchers!

Jeanette

Jeanette O. Janota, Ph.D.  
Senior Research Associate/Statistician  
American Speech-Language-Hearing Association  
10801 Rockville Pike  
Rockville, MD 20852

Telephone: 301-897-5700, ext. 4175  
Fax: 301-468-9742  
Email: [jjanota@asha.org](mailto:jjanota@asha.org)  
Professional Web site: <http://professional.asha.org>  
Consumer Web site: [www.asha.org](http://www.asha.org)

ASHA - Making a Difference in Communication  
Renew online at <http://www.asha.org/renew.htm>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

--Boundary\_(ID\_/esRLzMEe61viMBYchri1w)  
Content-type: text/plain; name="Jeanette Janota.vcf"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit  
Content-disposition: attachment; filename="Jeanette Janota.vcf"

BEGIN:VCARD  
VERSION:2.1  
X-GWTYPE:USER  
FN:Jeanette Janota  
TEL;WORK:4175  
EMAIL;WORK;PREF;NGW:JJanota@asha.org  
N:Janota;Jeanette  
TITLE:Senior Research Assoc/Statistician  
ADR;DOM;WORK;PARCEL;POSTAL::Second Floor North  
LABEL;DOM;WORK;PARCEL;POSTAL;ENCODING=QUOTED-PRINTABLE:Jeanette Janota=0A=  
Second Floor North  
ORG:Senior Research Assoc/Statistician  
END:VCARD

BEGIN:VCARD  
VERSION:2.1  
X-GWTYPE:USER  
FN:Jeanette Janota  
TEL;WORK:4175  
ORG::Sci&Res.

EMAIL;WORK;PREF;NGW:JJanota@asha.org  
N:Janota;Jeanette  
TITLE:Senior Research Assoc/Statistician  
ADR;DOM;WORK;PARCEL;POSTAL::Second Floor North  
LABEL;DOM;WORK;PARCEL;POSTAL;ENCODING=QUOTED-PRINTABLE:Jeanette Janota=0A=  
Second Floor North  
END:VCARD

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

--Boundary\_(ID\_/esRLzMEe61viMBYchri1w)--

=====  
Date: Fri, 15 Oct 2004 08:58:54 -0700  
Reply-To: Margaret Roller <[rmr@ROLLERRESEARCH.COM](mailto:rmr@ROLLERRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Margaret Roller <[rmr@ROLLERRESEARCH.COM](mailto:rmr@ROLLERRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Re: New Yorker Magazine on Zogby (and AAPOR)

The latest New Yorker landed in my mailbox yesterday and last night I delayed dinner until I finished reading the Zogby article. I agree with Mark. I didn't find the article offensive and, if anything, I think it helped to emphasize the integrity of AAPOR's standards (the 'rolling of the eyes' quote from Andy didn't hurt).

Margaret Roller  
Roller Marketing Research  
[rmr@rollerresearch.com](mailto:rmr@rollerresearch.com)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Fri, 15 Oct 2004 11:58:11 -0400  
Reply-To: Donald Green <[donald.green@YALE.EDU](mailto:donald.green@YALE.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Donald Green <[donald.green@YALE.EDU](mailto:donald.green@YALE.EDU)>  
Subject: samplemiser web address  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

My apologies, go to

<http://research.yale.edu/vote/samplemiser.html>

instead of [samplemiser.com](http://samplemiser.com)

--Don

-----



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

---

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

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

---

Date: Fri, 15 Oct 2004 13:18:23 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Who's ahead? Take your choice in latest prez poll  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Who's ahead? Take your choice in latest prez poll  
By THOMAS HARGROVE and GUIDO H. STEMPEL III  
Scripps Howard News Service  
October 14, 2004  
[http://www.newspolls.org/story.php?story\\_id=33](http://www.newspolls.org/story.php?story_id=33)

- Democrat John Kerry leads President Bush by 5 percentage points, yet Bush is ahead of Kerry by 4 points.

Both statements are true even though they're based on the same poll.

The latest survey conducted at Ohio University's Scripps Survey Research Center offers a rare glimpse into the extremely close 2004 presidential race and the impact that different assumptions about likely voters have on survey results.

Unlike most other polls that report just one set of figures on the presidential race, this survey of 1,022 adult residents of the United States provides so-called "horse-race" data for Kerry and Bush based on a variety of methods. These somewhat conflicting findings offer insight into the mechanics of public opinion research.

SNIP

And the data is downloadable at  
[http://www.newspolls.org/survey.php?survey\\_id=17](http://www.newspolls.org/survey.php?survey_id=17)

--

Leo G. Simonetta  
Research Director  
Art & Science Group, LLC  
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
Baltimore MD 21209

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
=====

Date: Fri, 15 Oct 2004 10:40:26 -0700  
Reply-To: Stanley Presser <[spresser@SOCY.UMD.EDU](mailto:spresser@SOCY.UMD.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Stanley Presser <[spresser@SOCY.UMD.EDU](mailto:spresser@SOCY.UMD.EDU)>  
Subject: new yorker article  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I regret that the question wording experiments in The New Yorker=92s profile=

of Zogby are described as mine with =93a colleague.=94 As most AAPOR member=

s

know, I was the junior author on Questions and Answers (the book in which the experiments were reported) and Howard Schuman was the senior author. I indicated that to the magazine (indeed said I was a graduate student at the time) and am very sorry that Howard was not given proper credit in the article. I am sending a letter to the New Yorker in hopes they will correct the record.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
=====

Date: Fri, 15 Oct 2004 10:52:02 -0700  
Reply-To: Sharon Yates <[syates@ZAGAT.COM](mailto:syates@ZAGAT.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Sharon Yates <[syates@ZAGAT.COM](mailto:syates@ZAGAT.COM)>  
Subject: NYAAPOR Oct. 19 Workshop: A Researcher's Guide to WEB Survey Implementation

Please note this workshop is on WEB survey implementation.

Scott Crawford will be conducting this workshop, "A RESEARCHER'S GUIDE TO WEB SURVEY IMPLEMENTATION". For more details, see our website posting:  
<http://www.nyaapor.org/Events.htm>.

Sharon Yates  
NYAAPOR Program Chair

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Fri, 15 Oct 2004 16:34:41 -0400  
Reply-To: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>  
Subject: auto dialers  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Does anyone have information/analysis comparing data from auto dialed, recorded voice interviewing to that from live interviewers? Especially how close the different methods have been in pre-election polling? Thanks very much. Nancy

Nancy Belden  
Partner, Belden Russonello & Stewart  
President, American Association for Public Opinion Research

1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
202.822.6090

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Fri, 15 Oct 2004 18:11:42 -0400  
Reply-To: "Leve, Jay" <jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Leve, Jay" <jleve@SURVEYUSA.COM>  
Subject: Re: auto dialers (Professionally Voiced Election Polls)  
Comments: To: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Nancy,

There is as much difference in methodology among those who use recorded voice to conduct pre-election opinion polls as there is difference in methodology among those who use headset operators to interview respondents.

Therefore: you cannot draw (generic) conclusions about (all) recorded voice companies, in the same way that you cannot draw generic conclusions about all "traditional" telephone pollsters (some traditional houses employ their own professionally trained interviewers

to ask questions; some outsource to a call center; some use college students; some use RDD sample, some use RBS, some use phone books; some weight to party ID, some don't; etc ... just as the standards vary widely among "live operator" telephone houses, the standards vary widely among recorded-voice houses).

SurveyUSA (which, alone, uses the voice of TV news anchors to ask poll questions) has forecast the outcome of 529 election contests to date, and for each contest, we have compared the results of our final pre-election poll with the results of the final pre-election poll from all other polling firms (academic and commercial; phone, web-based and U.S. mail).

The results of our comparisons and analyses are posted to the SurveyUSA website for all to see, in a series of scorecards and interactive tools that allow the user run hypotheticals to study the precision of different pollsters using different measures of precision. For example, we allow you to study the precision of our work by any or all of six different Mosteller measures, or instead by the measure developed by Traugott, Martin & Kennedy.

All of SurveyUSA's election work is posted to the web (the good, the bad and the ugly; every race we've gotten "wrong"; every race we've gotten "right"; none are hidden). We believe this disclosure allows others to form their own conclusions about the precision of SurveyUSA's work.

Here's the link to the page on our website that contains the scorecards (which are static) and the interactive tools (which you can open and manipulate):=20

<http://surveyusa.com/electiontrackrecord.html>

Within a few days of 11/2/04, all of these documents will be updated to include the 60 election contests that SurveyUSA is polling this cycle.

//leve

Jay H. Leve  
SurveyUSA  
15 Bloomfield Ave.  
Verona, NJ 07044

973-857-8500 x 551  
Fax: 973-857-7595

[jleve@surveyusa.com](mailto:jleve@surveyusa.com)  
[www.surveyusa.com](http://www.surveyusa.com)

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

From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Nancy Belden  
Sent: Friday, October 15, 2004 4:35 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: auto dialers

Does anyone have information/analysis comparing data from auto dialed, recorded voice interviewing to that from live interviewers? Especially how close the different methods have been in pre-election polling? Thanks very much. Nancy

Nancy Belden  
Partner, Belden Russonello & Stewart  
President, American Association for Public Opinion Research

1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
202.822.6090

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Fri, 15 Oct 2004 20:03:21 -0400  
Reply-To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Incentive size  
Comments: To: Jeanette Janota <JJanota@ASHA.ORG>, AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
In-Reply-To: <s16fb9fe.041@external.asha.org>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

Richard Bolstein and an associate had an article some years ago that looked at the effect of a \$50 incentive in a mail-out survey. As I recall, they found that in the \$50 treatment, open-ended questions were not only longer, but showed significantly more favorable responses to issues connected in some way to the survey's sponsor. Or at least, that's how I remember this article, which I haven't re-read but is to be found at:

James, J. and R. Bolstein. 1992. "Large monetary incentives and their effect on mail survey response rates." Public Opinion Quarterly 56:442-53.  
Tom Guterbock

--On Friday, October 15, 2004 11:52 AM -0400 Jeanette Janota <JJanota@ASHA.ORG> wrote:

> I'm looking for feedback from you experts about incentives. We read and  
> hear about the smallest dollar amount that's effective for surveys or  
> focus groups. Does anyone have any input on what happens when the  
> incentive is too large? And what constitutes too large?

- >
- > A client is strongly recommending that we offer an incentive of several
- > hundred dollars for a 20 minute on-line survey. An even higher amount
- > (\$500) has been suggested for participation in a 90 minute focus group.
- > The survey population is senior, mostly university-based researchers.
- >
- > I know we're establishing a social contract and not trying to pay
- > people a wage, and I realize that "too large" varies by the
- > respondent/participant burden and by the demographics of the respondent,
- > but some feedback would be helpful.
- >
- > Thanks to all of you wizened researchers!

> Jeanette

> Jeanette O. Janota, Ph.D.  
> Senior Research Associate/Statistician  
> American Speech-Language-Hearing Association  
> 10801 Rockville Pike  
> Rockville, MD 20852  
>  
> Telephone: 301-897-5700, ext. 4175  
> Fax: 301-468-9742  
> Email: [jjanota@asha.org](mailto:jjanota@asha.org)  
> Professional Web site: <http://professional.asha.org>  
> Consumer Web site: [www.asha.org](http://www.asha.org)

> ASHA - Making a Difference in Communication  
> Renew online at <http://www.asha.org/renew.htm>

> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
Director                      CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
Center for Survey Research              FAX: (434)243-5233  
University of Virginia      EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2400 Old Ivy Road  
P. O. Box 400767                      Suite 223  
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767      Charlottesville, VA 22903  
e-mail: [TomG@virginia.edu](mailto:TomG@virginia.edu)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Fri, 15 Oct 2004 23:16:31 -0400  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: AAPOR, Zogby & The New Yorker  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

First of all, I don't think that unflattering comments are per se offensive, and, while I \*DO\* consider the New Yorker article on John Zogby to be generally unflattering to AAPOR, most of the statements made about the organization are either true or matters of opinion. I was more irritated by the unfocused and rambling nature of the writing, as well as by the author's lack of knowledge of her topic, than by the content.

That said, there is still much in the article that is either incorrect or misleading. For example:

But it is also true that [Zogby] uses techniques that are frowned upon by AAPOR, the American Association for Public Opinion Research as unscientific or unethical. For instance, in order to save time and therefore money, Zogby uses only listed phone numbers; most pollsters program their phones to dial digits randomly, in order to capture unlisted phone numbers as well.

While many AAPOR members may well frown on the use of listed telephone numbers as poor sampling methodology for political polls, this is neither unscientific nor unethical and AAPOR does not take any position on it. One can even capture unlisted phone numbers by the simple expedient of adding a 1- or 2-digit number to numbers sampled from the list. On a technical note, most pollsters do not program their phones to dial digits randomly -- they purchase lists of randomly generated phone numbers in selected exchanges from specialized firms that screen out many of the non-residential and other unusable numbers.

I'm also getting tired of reading things like "After 1936, the new breed of pollsters such as Gallup, Archibald Crossley and Elmo Roper canvassed random samples of a few thousand in person rather than non-random millions through the mail." This is not true, as all of the pollsters mentioned used quotas and were pretty far off the mark too, although they at least got the winner right. Random sampling did not become prevalent until the late 1940's in U.S. political polling, while quotas are still used by many European pollsters. One might have expected the vaunted New Yorker fact checkers to have caught this well-known canard.

While AAPOR may well still have been a "club" when I joined it over a quarter of a century ago, it definitely is not one today, as anyone who has attended a recent national conference can readily attest. This very mailing list is a testimonial to the open nature of today's AAPOR and the willingness of members to help others learn about their craft.

I myself do not have a very high opinion of Zogby, but that is more the result of his perceived venality -- which the New Yorker article does

touch on -- than any methodological failings. I certainly enjoyed hearing him speak in person at an AAPOR conference a few years ago.

Jan Werner

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Sat, 16 Oct 2004 09:15:38 -0700  
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>  
Subject: FW: Voter Registrations in Nevada Possibly Trashed / KLAS TV / 12

October 2004

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Another take on "likely voters".

marc

Marc Sapir MD, MPH  
Executive Director  
Retro Poll  
[www.retropoll.org](http://www.retropoll.org)

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

From: Karen Lee Wald [mailto:[kwald@california.com](mailto:kwald@california.com)]  
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2004 6:12 PM  
To: Undisclosed-Recipient:;  
Subject: Voter Registrations in Nevada Possibly Trashed / KLAS TV / 12  
October 2004

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

From: "Howard Keylor" <[howardkeylor@comcast.net](mailto:howardkeylor@comcast.net)>  
To: <Undisclosed-Recipient:;>  
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2004 6:48 PM  
Subject: Voter Registrations in Nevada Possibly Trashed / KLAS TV / 12  
October 2004

Editor's Note: Please note the beginning of the final paragraph of this story: "The company has been largely, if not entirely funded, by the Republican National Committee." The story below reports that this company



has fled Nevada and is currently registering voters in Oregon.

In how many states has this company been allowed to register Democratic voters? How many ballots have been trashed? Please forward this story to anyone you know who cares about free elections in America. - wrp

[Go to Original](#)

Voter Registrations Possibly Trashed  
By George Knapp  
KLAS TV

Tuesday 12 October 2004

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA | Employees of a private voter registration company allege that hundreds, perhaps thousands of voters who may think they are registered will be rudely surprised on election day. The company claims hundreds of registration forms were thrown in the trash.

Anyone who has recently registered or re-registered to vote outside a mall or grocery store or even government building may be affected.

The I-Team has obtained information about an alleged widespread pattern of potential registration fraud aimed at democrats. The focus of the story is a private registration company called Voters Outreach of America, AKA America Votes.

The out-of-state firm has been in Las Vegas for the past few months, registering voters. It employed up to 300 part-time workers and collected hundreds of registrations per day, but former employees of the company say that Voters Outreach of America only wanted Republican registrations.

Two former workers say they personally witnessed company supervisors rip up and trash registration forms signed by Democrats.

"We caught her taking Democrats out of my pile, handed them to her assistant and he ripped them up right in front of us. I grabbed some of them out of the garbage and she tells her assistant to get those from me," said Eric Russell, former Voters Outreach employee.

Eric Russell managed to retrieve a pile of shredded paperwork

including signed voter registration forms, all from Democrats. We took them to the Clark County Election Department and confirmed that they had not, in fact, been filed with the county as required by law.

So the people on those forms who think they will be able to vote on Election Day are sadly mistaken. We attempted to speak to Voters Outreach but found that its office has been rented out to someone else.

The landlord says Voters Outreach was evicted for non-payment of rent. Another source said the company has now moved on to Oregon where it is once again registering voters. It's unknown how many registrations may have been tossed out, but another ex-employee told Eyewitness News she had the same suspicions when she worked there.

It's going to take a while to sort all of this out, but the immediate concern for voters is to make sure you really are registered.

Call the Clark County Election Department at 455-VOTE or click here to see if you are registered.

The company has been largely, if not entirely funded, by the Republican National Committee. Similar complaints have been received in Reno where the registrar has asked the FBI to investigate.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Sun, 17 Oct 2004 11:43:01 -0400  
Reply-To: Ken Sherrill <ken@KENSHERILL.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Ken Sherrill <ken@KENSHERILL.COM>  
Subject: Cinci Enquirer/WCPO Poll on attitudes toward lgbt people and rights  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Forwarded from another list.

Ken Sherrill

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

From: marriage-bounces@lists.qrd.org

[mailto:marriage-bounces@lists.qrd.org] On Behalf Of John Wilkinson  
Sent: Sunday, October 17, 2004 9:34 AM  
To: marriage@lists.qrd.org  
Subject: [\*M\*] OH: Enquirer/WCPO poll

Cincinnati Enquirer, OH, October 17, 2004  
[http://www.enquirer.com/editions/2004/10/17/loc\\_gaypoll.html](http://www.enquirer.com/editions/2004/10/17/loc_gaypoll.html)  
Enquirer/WCPO poll  
Complete results of survey

The Enquirer and WCPO surveyed 500 area adults about their attitudes and perceptions of gays and lesbians in Cincinnati. Here are the results:

Do you think a business owners should be allowed to refuse to hire someone because of their sexual orientation?

Yes 28%  
No 63%  
Not sure 9%

Would you support or oppose the expansion of existing laws to specifically protect gays and lesbians from discrimination in the workplace?

Support 37%  
Oppose 47%  
Not sure 16%

What rights do you think same-sex couples should have for legal recognition of their unions? No recognition at all? The right to civil unions? Or the right to marriage?

None at all 47%  
Civil unions 35%  
Marriage 14%  
Not sure 4%

Would you support or oppose changing the United State constitution to define marriage as a union only between a man and woman?

Support 58%  
Oppose 33%  
Not sure 9%

Do you think it is appropriate or inappropriate for same sex couples to raise children?

Appropriate 33%  
Inappropriate 57%

Not sure 10%

How accepted do you think gays and lesbians are by your community? Very accepted? Somewhat accepted? Not very accepted? Or not at all accepted?

Very 6%  
Somewhat 46%  
Not very 37%  
Not at all 10%  
Not sure 1%

How accepted do you think gays and lesbians are in the Greater Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky region?

Very 8%  
Somewhat 46%  
Not very 35%  
Not at all 5%  
Not sure 6%

Which one of the following statement best describes how you feel?

1. I believe gays and lesbians should be accepted socially and have legal protections.
2. I believe gays and lesbians should be accepted socially, but should not have legal protections.
3. I believe gays and lesbians should not be accepted socially, but should have legal protections. Or,
4. I believe gays and lesbians should not be accepted socially and should not have legal protections.

Accepted & protected 34%  
Accepted, not protected 32%  
Not accepted, protected 12%  
Not accepted, not protected 20%  
Not sure 2%

Would you be upset if a child of yours was gay?

Yes 53%  
No 31%  
Not sure 16%

Do you personally know someone who is gay?

Know gay person 81%  
Do not know 16%  
Not sure 3%

Do you personally have any close friends who are gay?

Gay friends 32%

No gay friends 63%

Not sure 5%

To see these results in chart form, or to see a demographic breakdown of these results, please download the PDF.

(<http://www.enquirer.com/editions/2004/10/17/survey.pdf>)

. Survey conducted by Survey USA.

---

marriage mailing list

To post to the list, send to:

[marriage@lists.qrd.org](mailto:marriage@lists.qrd.org)

To subscribe/unsubscribe/change options:

<http://lists.qrd.org/mailman/listinfo/marriage>

admin/moderator contact:

[marriage-admin@lists.qrd.org](mailto:marriage-admin@lists.qrd.org)

Free hosting by <http://www.mutualaid.org>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 2004 06:18:04 -0500

Reply-To: Glenn Roberts <[ghroberts@MCHSI.COM](mailto:ghroberts@MCHSI.COM)>

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

From: Glenn Roberts <[ghroberts@MCHSI.COM](mailto:ghroberts@MCHSI.COM)>

Subject: Re: New Yorker Magazine on Zogby (and AAPOR)

Comments: To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset=iso-8859-1; reply-type=response

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I've read the New Yorker promotional piece about Zogby. This point stood me up!

" Zogby wants to be the Gallup of his generation--the brand name in polling all over the world."

Sorry, John. I knew George Gallup and you are no George Gallup!

Glenn H. Roberts

6519 Washington Ave., Des Moines, IA 50322

Phone & Fax 515-276-7002

Email: [ghroberts@mchsi.com](mailto:ghroberts@mchsi.com)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 2004 08:07:14 -0400  
Reply-To: Ande271@AOL.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jeanne Anderson <Ande271@AOL.COM>  
Subject: Re: Incentive size  
Comments: To: JJanota@ASHA.ORG, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

My experience with incentives for focus group studies is that, if the incentive is greater than \$50, participants feel they are obligated to be "helpful." They behave as though they had been hired as consultants. They weigh suggestions before voicing them. They think of the downside of each idea that they endorse, perhaps remaining silent on ideas that they feel would cost too much or otherwise have too much downside. They reason together in a sort of cost/benefit analysis.

In one of our studies, some participants thought the entire process was a joke since we were paying more than what they thought was "the market." Their manner and tone of voice implied that the sponsors of the study were naive and not good money managers. Not helpful to the moderator.

All in all, clients should be persuaded that professional researchers know best how to set incentives. For one focus group, \$50 is almost more than necessary to bring people out. They still may feel they have a responsibility to solve the entire problem, which works against the value of the discussion.

Jeanne L. Anderson, Ph.D.  
(formerly) Principal  
Jeanne Anderson Research

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 2004 09:11:50 -0400  
Reply-To: "Dimitropoulos, Linda L." <lld@RTI.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Dimitropoulos, Linda L." <lld@RTI.ORG>  
Subject: Re: Incentive size  
Comments: To: Ande271@AOL.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I agree with Jeanne, if the incentive is too large it changes the way participants view the task and their behavior in the group. I would like to add a couple of points--the impact of \$50 varies depending on geography and type of participant. In some areas \$50 may be viewed as a large sum but in downtown Chicago or Manhattan, it may be barely enough to cover the costs of getting to the site (transportation, babysitters, etc). It's also important to consider the population--it's difficult to get Physicians or other professionals for lower incentives (but not impossible). Finally, firms specializing in focus group recruiting always suggest higher incentives because it makes it easier to recruit participants. =20

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

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jeanne Anderson  
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2004 7:07 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Incentive size

My experience with incentives for focus group studies is that, if the incentive is greater than \$50, participants feel they are obligated to be "helpful." They behave as though they had been hired as consultants. They weigh suggestions before voicing them. They think of the downside of each idea that they endorse, perhaps remaining silent on ideas that they feel would cost too much or otherwise have too much downside. They reason together in a sort of cost/benefit analysis.

In one of our studies, some participants thought the entire process was a joke since we were paying more than what they thought was "the market." Their manner and tone of voice implied that the sponsors of the study were naive and not good money managers. Not helpful to the moderator.

All in all, clients should be persuaded that professional researchers

know  
best how to set incentives. For one focus group, \$50 is almost more  
than  
necessary to bring people out. They still may feel they have a  
responsibility  
to solve the entire problem, which works against the value of the  
discussion.

Jeanne L. Anderson, Ph.D.  
(formerly) Principal  
Jeanne Anderson Research

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Mon, 18 Oct 2004 09:36:05 -0400  
Reply-To: Paul Braun <[pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM](mailto:pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Paul Braun <[pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM](mailto:pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Chris Matthews  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

To all,

I think it should be noted that on recent Chris Matthews programs,  
including his coverage of the debates, Mr. Matthews often refers to  
surveys conducted properly as "the scientific ones", and he goes out of  
his way to reveal that the "vote on-line", or the "vote by calling into  
this 800 number" are for fun and not scientific.

What he has said is important and not always understood by the public,  
and should be applauded.

Regards to all,

Paul A. Braun  
Braun Research, Inc.  
271 Wall Street  
Princeton, NJ 08540

Office: (609) 279-1600 x 110  
Fax : (609) 279-1318  
Cell: (609) 658-1434

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



-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
=====

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 2004 10:01:40 -0400  
Reply-To: Mike Donatello <[mdonatello@COX.NET](mailto:mdonatello@COX.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike Donatello <[mdonatello@COX.NET](mailto:mdonatello@COX.NET)>  
Subject: Registered voters by state  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Anyone know where I can QUICKLY lay my hands on a state-by-state breakdown of registered voters by gender and age? I tried both the FEC and Census. The former has totals, and the latter has state-by-age and state-by-gender, but neither has exactly what I'm looking for. Doesn't have to be a free source, as long as it's accurate and quick.

Thanks!

--  
Mike Donatello  
703.582.5680  
[MDonatello@cox.net](mailto:MDonatello@cox.net)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
=====

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 2004 14:42:20 -0400  
Reply-To: [RFunk787@AOL.COM](mailto:RFunk787@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "G. Ray Funkhouser" <[RFunk787@AOL.COM](mailto:RFunk787@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: odd statement by Ed Rendell  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Ed Rendell, current Democrat governor of Pennsylvania, was asked on one of the talk programs about Bush pulling ahead in polls of registered voters. With a straight face, Rendell explained that there had been a huge upsurge in Democrat registrations lately, but there hadn't been time enough for the pollsters to get their phone numbers, so they weren't showing up in the polls. I thought respondent status was determined by screening questions. Does any polling organization use such lists of phone numbers in their surveys of registered voters (are they even available)? Or is this more . . . ?

Ray Funkhouser

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 2004 15:09:11 -0400  
Reply-To: [agreenberg@greenbergresearch.com](mailto:agreenberg@greenbergresearch.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Anna Greenberg <[agreenberg@GREENBERGRESEARCH.COM](mailto:agreenberg@GREENBERGRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Re: odd statement by Ed Rendell  
Comments: To: "G. Ray Funkhouser" <[RFunk787@AOL.COM](mailto:RFunk787@AOL.COM)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[192.315abfe9.2ea5688c@aol.com](mailto:192.315abfe9.2ea5688c@aol.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Most state polling conducted by political pollsters use voter files, which would miss new registrants depending on how quickly they update their files and get the updates to list vendors. The screening question on registration is just for RDD samples.

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

From: G. Ray Funkhouser [<mailto:RFunk787@AOL.COM>]  
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2004 2:42 PM  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
Subject: odd statement by Ed Rendell

Ed Rendell, current Democrat governor of Pennsylvania, was asked on one of the talk programs about Bush pulling ahead in polls of registered voters.

With a straight face, Rendell explained that there had been a huge upsurge in Democrat registrations lately, but there hadn't been time enough for the pollsters to get their phone numbers, so they weren't showing up in the polls. I thought respondent status was determined by screening questions. Does any polling organization use such lists of phone numbers in their surveys of registered voters (are they even available)? Or is this more . . . ?

Ray Funkhouser

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 2004 12:08:15 -0700  
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM>  
Subject: Re: odd statement by Ed Rendell  
Comments: To: "G. Ray Funkhouser" <RFunk787@AOL.COM>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <192.315abfe9.2ea5688c@aol.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I was wondering about the upsurge in registration: if the screener for 'likely voters' includes recent, past voting behavior, then wouldn't these new registrants be excluded? If they are, as some feel, more likely to be democrats than republicans, then the 'likely voter' sampling frame would underestimate Kerry's votes.

Leora Lawton

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Mon, 18 Oct 2004 14:39:46 -0500  
Reply-To: Rob Daves <daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Rob Daves <daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM>  
Subject: Re: odd statement by Ed Rendell  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu, lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=Windows-874  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-disposition: inline

In reply to Leora=27s question:

If researchers use past vote behavior or current registration status in their =22hard screen,=22 that is, one that results in interviews with only the resulting =22likely voters,=22 then it could underestimate newly-registered voters of any party. However, not everyone uses such a hard screen, but may in fact use those two questions =97 . There are many other methods that use those variables that also could include them. For example...

1. Gallup=27s index cutoff method, which uses a series of questions, including those two. The new voter could potentially score high enough on the index to be included as a likely voter. =20
2. A method that uses past vote and registration status as part of a hard screen. For example, one public polling firm uses those two as hard screens unless the respondent is young enough not to have voted, then uses a 10-point scale on self-professed probability of voting to decide whether to keep the younger potential respondent in or not.
3. The weighting method, which uses a scale created from a number of variables, including perhaps past vote and registration status, to

create case weights for each respondent: Those who report positively correlated voting behavior (high interest, definitely will vote, registered, and voted in 2000) get the highest weights, and those who report less positively correlated voting behavior get smaller weights.

>>> Leora Lawton <lawton=40TECHSOCIETY.COM> 10/18/04 02:08PM >>>

I was wondering about the upsurge in registration: if the screener for likely voters includes recent, past voting behavior, then wouldn't these new registrants be excluded? If they are, as some feel, more likely to be democrats than republicans, then the likely voter sampling frame would underestimate Kerry's votes.

Leora Lawton

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 2004 14:55:59 -0500  
Reply-To: Rob Daves <daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Rob Daves <daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM>  
Subject: Re: odd statement by Ed Rendell  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu, lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

Sorry about posting an incomplete message earlier: I didn't get quite finished before my thick, too-fast fingers hit the send key. This is my more complete response to Leora's question:

If researchers use past vote behavior or current registration status in their "hard screen," that is, one that results in interviews with only the resulting "likely voters," then it could underestimate newly-registered voters of any party. However, not everyone uses such a hard screen, even though they include those two questions in their likely voter modeling. There are many other methods that use those variables that also could include them. For example...

1. Gallup's index cutoff method uses a series of questions, including those two. The new voter might potentially score high enough on the

index to be included as a likely voter, even though he or she didn't vote in 2000 or is not included on registration rolls yet.

2. A method that uses past vote and registration status as only part of a hard screen. For example, one public polling firm uses those two as hard screens unless the respondent is young enough not to have voted, then uses a 10-point scale on self-professed probability of voting to decide whether to keep the younger potential respondent in as a likely voter or not.

3. The weighting method, which uses a scale created from a number of variables, including perhaps past vote and registration status, to create case weights for each respondent: Those who score high on likely voter measures (high interest, definitely will vote, registered, and voted in 2000) get the highest weights, and those who report less positively correlated voting behavior or attitudes get smaller weights.

Hard screens may be more useful when a more exact definition about the likely electorate is known, such as in primary elections, or in states where secretaries of state keep good, up-to-date records (how many of those are there?), or very close to Election Day. But there are places where hard screens are more suspect. For example, in the battleground state of Minnesota, people can register to vote at the polls on Election Day; a hard screen containing those two questions might contribute to coverage error in polls conducted in states with Election Day registration.

As others have pointed out, there's no single industry standard for modeling a likely electorate.

Again, sorry about posting an incomplete message earlier.

Rob Daves, director  
The Minnesota Poll

>>> Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM> 10/18/04 02:08PM >>>

I was wondering about the upsurge in registration: if the screener for 'likely voters' includes recent, past voting behavior, then wouldn't these new registrants be excluded? If they are, as some feel, more likely to be democrats than republicans, then the 'likely voter' sampling frame would underestimate Kerry's votes.

Leora Lawton

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 2004 16:25:57 -0400  
Reply-To: Eric Plutzer <exp12@PSU.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Eric Plutzer <exp12@PSU.EDU>  
Subject: Early voting  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
In-Reply-To: <200410160445.i9FJjbaO169992@f05n16.cac.psu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Colleagues,

Early voting has begun in swing states Florida, Iowa, Nevada, and Colorado -- among others. "Turnout" in Florida today surprised and swamped some county election officials, leading to long lines:  
<http://www.reuters.com/newsArticle.jhtml?type=topNews&storyID=6532854>

I am curious how those doing state polls and national tracking polls are taking this into account. Any estimates on the number of voters who will not be among the population of those eligible for exit polls? If someone says they already voted, does that make them a likely voter no matter what they answer to likely voter screens? Are you finding that those that have voted are less likely to report their vote choice? Is this just a small nuisance this year or could early voting be a major challenge to accurate polling?

Curious in Pennsylvania,  
Eric

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 2004 20:27:27 -0400  
Reply-To: jtanur@NOTES.CC.SUNYSB.EDU  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Judith Tanur <jtanur@NOTES.CC.SUNYSB.EDU>  
Subject: Conference in honor of Jim Press  
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Apologies for Cross-Posting

---

Statistics Conference in Honor of Jim Press  
The Department of Statistics  
at the University of California, Riverside (UCR) will be hosting a  
one-day conference in honor of Professor S. James (Jim) Press to  
commemorate the occasion of his 28 years of distinguished service at

UCR, and his 50 years in the mathematics/statistics profession.

The conference will take place at UCR, on Saturday, May 14, on the UCR campus, approximately 8:30-5:30. Then, a sit-down banquet, followed by a poster session. The night before (May 13), there will be a party at his home in Riverside for colleagues, students, visitors, friends, and family.

Topics for the conference reflect the wide-ranging interests of Professor Press, particularly in Bayesian Analysis, Multivariate Analysis, and Cognitive Aspects of Sample Surveys.

The keynote speakers for the conference are

• Ingram Olkin, Professor of Education and Statistics, Stanford University

• Judith Tanur, Distinguished Teaching Professor of Sociology, State University of New York at Stony Brook

• Arnold Zellner, H.G.B. Alexander Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus of Economics and Statistics, University of Chicago

Participants already include: Barry Arnold, Bob Beaver, Hamparsum Bozdogun, Norman Bradburn, Mark Ghamsary, Wesley Johnson, Jay Kadane,

Ruben Klein, Sang Lee, Ingram Olkin, Dale Poirier, John Rolph, Kazuo

Shigemasa, Hal Stern, Judy Tanur, Liangwei Wang, and Arnold Zellner.

The Chair of the conference is Professor Subir Ghosh (ghosh@ucrac1.ucr.edu). Information about the program, travel, accommodations, and registration will be available on the conference

website: <http://statistics.ucr.edu>, when the website has been completed.

#### First Call For Submissions

This meeting will consist of invited talks and a poster session. If you would like to present at the conference please submit a title and abstract to [cecelias@ucr.edu](mailto:cecelias@ucr.edu)

=

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
=====

Date: Mon, 18 Oct 2004 21:28:48 -0700  
Reply-To: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)>  
Subject: position announcement: Dir of Public Policy  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Director of Public Policy  
Job Announcement

Mills College is seeking a Director of its undergraduate Public Policy program. This will be a full-time, tenure-track position which will carry the rank of associate or full Professor of Public Policy, beginning August 2005. The Public Policy program is located within the Social Sciences Division.

The Director should have professional interests in policy education, and have a continuing research program in key areas of the field. Applicants should have a Ph.D. in a public policy related field and expertise in domestic, international and/or global public policy-making processes - this includes the relationship of policy making to political, social, economic and cultural systems and the impacts on policy-making of factors such as gender, class, race and ethnicity. The Director will teach core courses within the public policy program, as well as pursue active research and scholarship.

Applicants should have college-level teaching experience and a demonstrated ability to develop academic programs, including building and expanding upon existing curricula and resources. In addition, the Director will help develop and implement a proposed graduate degree component to the program, should this be approved by the faculty of the College. The Director's duties also include but are not limited to: teaching, program development, advising students, student recruiting, guiding internships, cross-campus and extramural communications, community outreach, grant and foundation writing, supervision of quarter-time staff member and work study students, and program budgeting.

Applicants may send a preliminary letter of inquiry or statement of interest, CV, and contact information for three professional references to:

Professor Andrew Workman, Chair, Public Policy Search Committee, Division of Social Sciences, Mills College, Oakland, CA 94613. The closing date for applications is January 15, 2005.

Located in the San Francisco Bay Area, Mills College is a selective liberal arts college for women with coeducational graduate programs (see <http://www.mills.edu>). Persons of color and those committed to working in



a multicultural environment are encouraged to apply.

MILLS COLLEGE IS AN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION/EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Tue, 19 Oct 2004 08:09:28 -0400  
Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>  
Organization: Queens College CUNY  
Subject: Kudos to Belden  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear All:

You should all read the NY Times article by Ruttenberg today, which extensively quotes Ms. Belden.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/10/19/politics/campaign/19poll.html>

Here is a sample

But when Newsweek, for instance, looked not at registered voters but at "likely voters," Mr. Bush's lead grew to six points, from just two - still within the poll's margin of error, though a more impressive-sounding lead to the average voter.

Similarly, when the Gallup Organization applied its formula, Mr. Bush's three-point lead among registered voters grew to eight points among "likely voters." With a four-point margin of error on each candidate's result, even this seemingly larger lead was at the edge of the poll's margin of error.

Pollsters say they have to look closely at likely voters because many registered voters do not show up come Election Day. In 2000, for instance, more than 30 percent of registered voters did not vote.

But pollsters acknowledge that the winnowing process calls for more art than science.

"Science is put in place and then the pollster has to exercise judgment about how to define likely voters," said Nancy Belden, president of the American Association for Public Opinion Research. "And every polling organization may define a likely voter slightly differently, or in some cases, more than slightly differently than the next polling organizations."

Ms. Belden added, "Each organization is doing its best to try to define the voters in the way that that organization thinks is closest to the truth."

Andrew A. Beveridge  
Professor of Sociology  
Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 2004 07:42:02 -0500  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: Is Bush better off today...  
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

..than he was four years ago?

Here is another interesting table from the Polling Report.

<http://www.pollingreport.com/wh2genT.htm>

The date in 2000 that corresponds to today is October 24 - two weeks out from election day November 7.

At about this time four years ago (October 23-25) results were mixed, the Bush minus Gore margins ranged from +5 to -3.

Over next two weeks there were no negative Bush margins. Bush ranged from 0 to +9. It took until the last two days before the more established pollsters had margins ranging from +2 to -2.

Election day is still a long way off.

Nick

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 2004 09:51:11 -0400  
Reply-To: Nancy Belden <[nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM](mailto:nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nancy Belden <[nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM](mailto:nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM)>  
Subject: Primer on pre-election polling on website  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

AAPOR members:

Cliff Zukin has prepared a Primer on Sources of Variation in Published Election Polling to help answer many of the press and other questions that we are getting. It is up on the AAPOR website and I hope it will be useful to others. It is Cliff's thinking (not an official AAPOR statement) meant to help illuminate for others what it is that we do, and many other AAPOR members were very helpful in reviewing drafts. Thanks to them all.

As president, I am getting several calls from members of the media everyday now, and I am sure many of you are as well as the election draws near and our work is so visible. Please send us your clips!

Nancy

Nancy Belden  
Partner, Belden Russonello & Stewart  
President, American Association for Public Opinion Research

1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
202.822.6090

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 2004 10:08:45 -0400  
Reply-To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>  
Subject: Re: odd statement by Ed Rendell  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="UTF-8"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

This is why I think the race differs so much poll to poll--each pollster=20 using a different method where some would qualify, some would disqualify the= same=20 respondent.

Is it REALLY true that MOST pollsters use registered voters rather than RDD=20 in a general election? Beyond the problem with getting an updated list, unl= ess=20 the registrant volunteers a phone number, you can only get a listed number=20 match. JAS

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

visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)

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

In a message dated 10/18/2004 3:01:06 PM Central Daylight Time, daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM writes:  
In reply to Leora's question:

If researchers use past vote behavior or current registration status in their "hard screen," that is, one that results in interviews with only the resulting "likely voters," then it could underestimate newly-registered voters of any party. However, not everyone uses such a hard screen, but may in fact use those two questions. There are many other methods that use those variables that also could include them. For example...

1. Gallup's index cutoff method, which uses a series of questions, including those two. The new voter could potentially score high enough on the index to be included as a likely voter.

2. A method that uses past vote and registration status as part of a hard screen. For example, one public polling firm uses those two as hard screens unless the respondent is young enough not to have voted, then uses a 10-point scale on self-professed probability of voting to decide whether to keep the younger potential respondent in or not.

3. The weighting method, which uses a scale created from a number of variables, including perhaps past vote and registration status, to create case weights for each respondent: Those who report positively correlated voting behavior (high interest, definitely will vote, registered, and voted in 2000) get the highest weights, and those who report less positively correlated voting behavior get smaller weights.

>>> Leora Lawton <[lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM](mailto:lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM)> 10/18/04 02:08PM >>>

I was wondering about the upsurge in registration: if the screener for 'likely voters' includes recent, past voting behavior, then wouldn't these new registrants be excluded? If they are, as some feel, more likely to be democrats than republicans, then the 'likely voter' sampling frame would underestimate Kerry's votes.

Leora Lawton

---

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 2004 10:18:47 -0400  
Reply-To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>  
Subject: Re: Early voting  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

This is certainly a problem for exit pollsters--maybe Warren will weigh in on how they address early voting and absentee voting. For the polls I direct, if a respondent says they have already voted, by gosh, they are a definite voter and we take them. But this is a good reminder. I should skip them out of the mind made up/could still be persuaded to vote for another candidate question. Thanks! JAS

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

visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)

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

In a message dated 10/18/2004 3:49:47 PM Central Daylight Time, [exp12@PSU.EDU](mailto:exp12@PSU.EDU) writes:  
Colleagues,

Early voting has begun in swing states Florida, Iowa, Nevada, and Colorado -- among others. "Turnout" in Florida today surprised and swamped some county election officials, leading to long lines:  
<http://www.reuters.com/newsArticle.jhtml?type=topNews&storyID=6532854>

I am curious how those doing state polls and national tracking polls are taking this into account. Any estimates on the number of voters who will not be among the population of those eligible for exit polls? If someone says they already voted, does that make them a likely voter no matter what they answer to likely voter screens? Are you finding that those that have voted are less likely to report their vote choice? Is this just a small nuisance this year or could early voting be a major challenge to accurate

polling?

Curious in Pennsylvania,  
Eric

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 2004 13:24:59 -0400  
Reply-To: "Edward P. Freeland" <efreelan@PRINCETON.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Edward P. Freeland" <efreelan@PRINCETON.EDU>  
Subject: Meta-Analysis of State Polls  
Comments: To: AAPORNet <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Anyone interested in a state-level analysis of potential electoral  
college outcomes for the upcoming presidential election should check out  
<http://election.princeton.edu>

The site is updated daily with results from statewide polls.=20

=20

=20

=20

=20

Edward P. Freeland, Ph.D.

Associate Director

Survey Research Center

Princeton University

169 Nassau St

Princeton NJ 08542-7007

Ph 609.258.1854

Fax 609.258.0549

=20

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 2004 13:37:18 -0400  
Reply-To: Catherine Gallagher <cgallag4@GMU.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Catherine Gallagher <cgallag4@GMU.EDU>  
Organization: George Mason University  
Subject: New Graduate Program  
Comments: To: AAPOR <AAPORNET@asu.edu>, Stephen Mastrofski <smastrof@gmu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear AAPOR members,

Please find below information regarding a new graduate program at George Mason University in Justice, Law and Crime Policy.

Two AAPORites are on the faculty (Devon Johnson and Catherine Gallagher), so survey methods and public opinion research are heavily ingrained in the curriculum. Please pass this along to any students who may be interested.

Thanking you in advance,  
Catherine Gallagher

Catherine A Gallagher, PhD  
Justice, Law and Crime Policy Program  
Department of Public and International Affairs  
George Mason University

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Tue, 19 Oct 2004 13:55:18 -0400  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Re: Kudos to Belden  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[0I5T00IH3Z09GD@mta3.srv.hcvlny.cv.net](mailto:0I5T00IH3Z09GD@mta3.srv.hcvlny.cv.net)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Unfortunately, the author of the NY Times article mentioned below uses without explanation the rule of thumb that the criterion for the evaluating the difference between the results for two candidates in a poll is twice the MOE for the survey. I suspect that this failure will make much of his discussion incomprehensible for most of the readers who actually attempt to follow it, and really should have been caught by the editors at the Times.

Furthermore, when I see the expression "statistical tie" I tend to gag and have great difficulty believing anything else the author might say.

Aside from any consideration as to whether the published MOE is valid or not, this kind of statement indicates a profound misconception of what the MOE actually represents, namely an arbitrarily chosen probability (95%) that a given poll result is not merely a chance event.

In a two-way race, the error for the difference lies somewhere between 1.4 (square root of 2) and 2 times the MOE for a single measurement. The Survey Research Methods Section of the American Statistical Association has an excellent series of brochures explaining "What a Survey is" (<http://www.amstat.org/sections/srms/whatsurvey.html>). This includes one

on margins of error that suggests using 1.7 times the MOE as a rule of thumb for evaluating the difference between two candidates in a poll.

But whether you use 1.4, 1.7 or 2 times the MOE to judge the difference, if the spread is less than your chosen criterion, this still only means that the probability of this not being purely a chance occurrence is less than 95%. For anyone interested in the outcome, a 90%, 50% or even 25% probability of one candidate leading is \*NOT\* the same as a tie.

Jan Werner

---

Andrew A Beveridge wrote:

> Dear All:

>

> You should all read the NY Times article by Ruttenberg today, which  
> extensively quotes Ms. Belden.

>

> <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/10/19/politics/campaign/19poll.html>

>

> Here is a sample

>

> But when Newsweek, for instance, looked not at registered voters but at  
> "likely voters," Mr. Bush's lead grew to six points, from just two - still  
> within the poll's margin of error, though a more impressive-sounding lead to  
> the average voter.

>

> Similarly, when the Gallup Organization applied its formula, Mr. Bush's  
> three-point lead among registered voters grew to eight points among "likely  
> voters." With a four-point margin of error on each candidate's result, even  
> this seemingly larger lead was at the edge of the poll's margin of error.

>

> Pollsters say they have to look closely at likely voters because many  
> registered voters do not show up come Election Day. In 2000, for instance,  
> more than 30 percent of registered voters did not vote.

>

> But pollsters acknowledge that the winnowing process calls for more art than  
> science.

>

> "Science is put in place and then the pollster has to exercise judgment  
> about how to define likely voters," said Nancy Belden, president of the  
> American Association for Public Opinion Research. "And every polling  
> organization may define a likely voter slightly differently, or in some  
> cases, more than slightly differently than the next polling organizations."

>

> Ms. Belden added, "Each organization is doing its best to try to define the  
> voters in the way that that organization thinks is closest to the truth."

>

>

> Andrew A. Beveridge  
> Professor of Sociology  
> Queens College and Grad Ctr CUNY

>



>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>  
>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
=====

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 2004 11:19:50 -0700  
Reply-To: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>  
Subject: NY Times: Why Can't the Pollsters Agree?  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Bush Leads. Make That Kerry. Why Can't the Pollsters Agree?

JIM RUTENBERG, New York Times, October 19, 2004

WASHINGTON, Oct. 18-What is going to happen on Election Day? It depends on which pollster you ask.

President Bush leads Senator John Kerry by a margin of eight points among likely voters, according to the most recent poll from Gallup, USA Today and CNN. The margin of sampling error was four points.

But wait: Mr. Bush is up by only three points in the latest tracking poll from ABC News and The Washington Post, although with a margin of error of three percentage points.

Not so fast: The race is actually even, according to the latest New York Times/CBS News Poll. And Time magazine's new poll says much the same thing.

But while the headlines they produce may diverge, the actual findings of these polls may not be so different. The differing conclusions reflect how different pollsters use complex formulas to interpret very similar findings among self-described registered voters and try to come up with a result they think best accounts for who will actually show up at the polls.

The different interpretations have drawn a litany of complaints from partisans on both sides. Some are questioning everything about the surveys, including pollsters' political motives, their methodologies and whether accurate polling can be done in the age of cellular phones that cannot be called and caller ID systems that make screening out unfamiliar numbers easy.

But pollsters, who insist that they have the best intentions, say the differences in their surveys only highlight the difficulties this year in determining who is going to vote, no small task at a time of unusually high voter interest and many new voter registrations. And how pollsters set

about figuring that out, they say, can make all of the difference in how the results are presented on television and in newspapers.

Five polls taken from Oct. 14 to Oct. 17 found similar results among registered voters. Mr. Kerry received support from 45 percent to 46 percent of those surveyed; Mr. Bush received from 45 percent to 49 percent. These polls, all with margins of error of plus or minus three or four points, showed the race as either tied among registered voters or with Mr. Bush ahead by two to three points - in each case a statistical tie.

But when Newsweek, for instance, looked not at registered voters but at "likely voters," Mr. Bush's lead grew to six points, from just two - still within the poll's margin of error, though a more impressive-sounding lead to the average voter.

Similarly, when the Gallup Organization applied its formula, Mr. Bush's three-point lead among registered voters grew to eight points among "likely voters." With a four-point margin of error on each candidate's result, even this seemingly larger lead was at the edge of the poll's margin of error.

Pollsters say they have to look closely at likely voters because many registered voters do not show up come Election Day. In 2000, for instance, more than 30 percent of registered voters did not vote.

But pollsters acknowledge that the winnowing process calls for more art than science.

"Science is put in place and then the pollster has to exercise judgment about how to define likely voters," said Nancy Belden, president of the American Association for Public Opinion Research. "And every polling organization may define a likely voter slightly differently, or in some cases, more than slightly differently than the next polling organizations."

Ms. Belden added, "Each organization is doing its best to try to define the voters in the way that that organization thinks is closest to the truth."

Gallup, for instance, uses a mixture of questions to determine likely voting based on how seriously a respondent is planning to vote and how frequently he has voted in the past. It gauges this with seven questions, including one about whether the respondent knows where the local polling place is. After estimating what the actual turnout will be, Gallup includes the preferences of just that fraction of their respondents.

The New York Times and CBS, on the other hand, include responses from all those determined to be likely voters, but gives some of their votes more weight than others depending on how they fit on a scale rating their likelihood of voting.

Trying to divine likely voters is nothing new. And there are plenty of other factors that can affect the polls, from the way questions are asked to the dates of the poll.

Several pollsters said, for instance, that some polls seemed to give Mr. Bush a bigger edge because they were taken amid news reports about Mr.

Kerry's referring in a debate to Vice President Dick Cheney's daughter's sexual orientation. The comment did not sit well with some people and was denounced by Mr. Cheney and his wife, Lynne.

But this year is presenting new, complicating factors, from the closeness of the race to the influx of new registered voters.

"There are many things about this election that may be different than past elections, and one is this phenomenon of how many people are possibly registered," Ms. Belden said. "That could make an enormous difference."

Hundreds of thousands of new voters have been added to the registration rolls in states like Florida, Pennsylvania and Ohio, by some estimates. Since many of these people have not been regular voters, polls that weigh the likelihood of voting in part based on past behavior may not be taking sufficient account of them.

The same goes for increased voting registrations among younger voters, many of whom seem excited about voting for the first time, according to pollsters. Pollsters have varying opinions about whether or not these people will show up at the polls just because they registered.

Pollsters say voters need to be cautious about putting too much stock in any single poll.

"We're basically trying to get a read on the electorate as of the day that we're polling," said Jeffrey M. Jones, managing editor of the Gallup Poll, "not necessarily trying to predict what's going to happen on Election Day itself."

Pollsters from both parties said the best thing to do was to take all of the public polls and average them together. By that count, it is Bush by a nose. For now.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Tue, 19 Oct 2004 18:22:30 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: A question about cell phones and polling  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I have heard it mentioned many times in news reports that it is illegal for polls to call cell phones - sometimes this is stated as it is illegal to use an autodialer to call a cell phone.

Can someone clarify for me (and presumably others) exactly what if anything is illegal about polling cell phone numbers?

Thanks in advance.

--

Leo G. Simonetta  
Research Director  
Art & Science Group, LLC  
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
Baltimore MD 21209

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
=====

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 2004 19:00:02 -0400  
Reply-To: [bdautch@CMOR.ORG](mailto:bdautch@CMOR.ORG)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Brian Dautch <[bdautch@CMOR.ORG](mailto:bdautch@CMOR.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: A question about cell phones and polling  
Comments: To: [simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[0I5U00MDSRNF6D@chimmx04.algx.net](mailto:0I5U00MDSRNF6D@chimmx04.algx.net)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Leo,

It is in fact legal for survey researchers to call cell phones IF the call is dialed manually.

I don't want to leave that statement sitting completely by itself, however. Although I'm sure this isn't necessary, I just wanted to remind everyone of some previous government action: The FCC in particular has discussed the issue of \*telemarketers\* calling people's cell phones, which is a practice that is forbidden. Obviously, survey researchers are not telemarketers. Still, I'd like to put forth the following FCC reference to telemarketing calls to cell phones, taken from the FCC's July 2003 Final TCPA rule:

"...such calls can be costly and inconvenient. The Commission has long recognized, and the record in this proceeding supports the same conclusion, that wireless customers are charged for incoming calls whether they pay in advance or after the minutes are used. Wireless subscribers who purchase a large "bucket" of minutes at a fixed rate nevertheless are charged for those minutes, and for any minutes that exceed the "bucket" allowance. This "bucket" could be exceeded more quickly if consumers receive numerous unwanted telemarketing calls. Moreover, as several commenters point out, telemarketers have no way to determine how consumers are charged for their wireless service."

Certainly, I know of no survey researcher of any kind who would ever abuse this right the way some telemarketers would (and did). Every survey researcher I can name (that calls cell phones) has implemented a very responsible policy for doing so.

This is a crucial element of our profession's self-regulation...because there are absolutely no rogue survey researchers (to the very best of my knowledge) who make it a point to constantly call people's cell phones, we don't have to worry about a survey researcher using up the respondent's "bucket" of minutes (or, worse yet, a scenario in which the respondent has already used that entire "bucket" from their own phone calls, and is being charged money for the survey research call).

That is one of the reasons I am proud to lobby on behalf of survey researchers; I know I'm representing a group who comply with the letter of the current law, and who understand that they shouldn't do anything that might potentially bring about more restrictive legislation in the future.

Brian

Brian Dautch  
Director of Government Affairs  
The Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR)  
6931 Arlington Rd., Suite 308  
Bethesda, MD 20814  
301-654-6601 (phone)  
bdautch@cmor.org

> I have heard it mentioned many times in news reports that it is illegal  
> for polls to call cell phones - sometimes this is stated as it is  
> illegal to use an autodialer to call a cell phone.

>  
> Can someone clarify for me (and presumably others) exactly what if  
> anything is illegal about polling cell phone numbers?

>  
> Thanks in advance.

> --  
> Leo G. Simonetta  
> Research Director  
> Art & Science Group, LLC  
> 6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
> Baltimore MD 21209

>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 2004 21:04:38 -0400  
Reply-To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>  
Subject: Poll Shows Tie; Concerns Cited on Both Rivals  
Comments: To: Media-PublicOpinion-Polls-l@usc.edu, AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/mixed; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-309E7E52;  
boundary="Boundary\_(ID\_KCkqFBJ+3+rITnMZPPxy7g)"

--Boundary\_(ID\_KCkqFBJ+3+rITnMZPPxy7g)

Content-type: text/plain; x-avg-checked=avg-ok-309E7E52; charset=us-ascii;  
format=flowed

Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

NY Times, October 19, 2004

## SURVEYS

Poll Shows Tie; Concerns Cited on Both Rivals

By ADAM NAGOURNEY and JANET ELDER

1c75649.jpg

wo weeks before Election Day, voters hold a sharply critical view of  
<[http://www.nytimes.com/top/news/washington/campaign2004/candidates/georgewbus  
h/index.html?inline=nyt-per-pol](http://www.nytimes.com/top/news/washington/campaign2004/candidates/georgewbus<br/>h/index.html?inline=nyt-per-pol)>President

Bush's record in office, but they have strong reservations about

<[http://www.nytimes.com/top/news/washington/campaign2004/candidates/johnfkerry  
/index.html?inline=nyt-per-pol](http://www.nytimes.com/top/news/washington/campaign2004/candidates/johnfkerry<br/>/index.html?inline=nyt-per-pol)>Senator

John Kerry, leaving the race in a tie, according to the latest New York  
Times/CBS News Poll.

Mr. Bush's job approval rating is at 44 percent, a dangerously low number  
for an incumbent president, and one of the lowest of his tenure. A majority  
of voters said that they disapproved of the way Mr. Bush had managed the  
economy and the war in Iraq, and - echoing a refrain of Mr. Kerry's - that  
his tax cuts had favored the wealthy. Voters said that Mr. Kerry would do a  
better job of preserving Social Security, creating jobs and ending the war  
in Iraq.

But a majority of Americans continue to see Mr. Kerry as an untrustworthy  
politician who will say what he thinks people want to hear. More than half  
of respondents said they considered him liberal, reflecting a dominant line  
of attack by Mr. Bush this fall.

The poll found the two candidates each drawing 46 percent of all registered  
voters in a head-to-head race. Among likely voters in a two-way race, Mr.  
Bush has 47 percent, with 46 percent for Mr. Kerry.

The Times/CBS poll was conducted over the four days after Mr. Bush and Mr.  
Kerry concluded the last of their three debates. Some other polls taken  
during that time have shown Mr. Bush in a slightly stronger position among  
what they described as likely voters. The variations reflect the difficulty  
of determining who is going to vote, particularly in a campaign in which  
both sides have invested so many resources in registering new voters.

Whatever problems Mr. Bush might be experiencing as he comes to the end of

his first term, his position continues to be bolstered by concern about terrorism. Sixty-eight percent of respondents said they had a lot or some confidence that Mr. Bush would make the right decisions to prevent another terrorist attack - compared with 62 percent who said they felt that way about Mr. Kerry.

Mr. Bush, in a speech in New Jersey on Monday, assailed Mr. Kerry's credentials for fighting terrorism, and released a new television advertisement hitting the same theme. The poll findings were highly unusual in that many measures used by pollsters to determine the strength of an incumbent - from job approval to the percentage of Americans who believe the country is heading in the wrong direction (59 percent) - would normally signal trouble for an incumbent.

In addition, voters seem to be listening to many of Mr. Kerry's arguments; 59 percent, for example, said they thought that Mr. Bush's policies favored corporate interests.

Mr. Kerry is in better shape than he was when the debates began, when the Times/CBS News poll found him trailing Mr. Bush, 42 percent to 50 percent. But this poll and others suggest that he is having difficulty turning strong discontent with the state of the country into support for his candidacy.

Mr. Bush's aides said that the poll findings demonstrated that Americans were not prepared to turn out Mr. Bush for a candidate about whom, they said, voters clearly had strong reservations.

"There is a distrust and a reluctance for the public to accept him as being president," Matthew Dowd, a senior Bush adviser, said. "I don't think they like his policies. The public through the course of this campaign - it's not like they haven't gotten to know him."

Mr. Kerry's aides said they were heartened by the poll findings, and said the discontent with Mr. Bush meant that undecided voters were on the verge of flocking to Mr. Kerry.

"I don't think voters have reservations anymore," said Joe Lockhart, a senior Kerry adviser. "These voters are going to make up their own mind. The poll gives every indication that when they do make up their mind, they are going to Kerry."

The Times/CBS News poll also suggested an area of vulnerability for Republicans in Congress. Only 38 percent of the poll's respondents said they approved of the way Congress was doing its job; 46 percent of respondents said they planned to vote for the Democratic Congressional candidate, compared with 38 percent who said they would vote Republican.

And as of now, voters have a warmer view of the Democratic Party than of the Republican Party: 52 percent said they had a favorable view of the Democrats, compared with 47 for Republicans.

The Times/CBS News poll was taken nationwide of 1,048 Americans, including 931 registered voters. It has a margin of sampling error of plus or minus

three percentage points for the entire sample and for registered voters.

In a three-way race including

<http://www.nytimes.com/top/news/washington/campaign2004/candidates/ralphnader/index.html?inline=nyt-per-pol>>Ralph

Nader, Mr. Bush and Mr. Kerry have 45 percent each among registered voters, with Mr. Nader drawing 2 percent. Among likely voters, Mr. Bush has 47 percent to Mr. Kerry's 45 percent, with Mr. Nader drawing 2 percent.

National figures on Mr. Nader are not particularly illuminating because his real impact, if any, will be in individual states where the race is very close.

The race is also ideologically polarized; 56 percent say they consider Mr. Kerry to be a liberal, while 66 percent say they think that Mr. Bush is a conservative.

Mr. Bush is now perceived less favorably than he was earlier this month, which is probably a reflection of the fact that he has fiercely attacked Mr. Kerry recently, erasing an advantage he had had over Mr. Kerry. Typically, candidates who go on the attack pay a price in seeing their own negative ratings rise.

Mr. Bush is now viewed unfavorably by 45 percent of respondents, compared with 43 percent who view him favorably. Mr. Kerry is now viewed unfavorably by 44 percent of the respondents, compared with 39 percent who view him favorably.

The poll underlined the extent to which Mr. Bush has succeeded in raising doubts about Mr. Kerry. In addition to the perception of Mr. Kerry as a liberal, 60 percent said that he told people what he thought they wanted to hear, rather than what he believed. By contrast, 59 percent said Mr. Bush said what he believed, one of the biggest differences Mr. Bush has sought to draw with his opponent.

"I don't trust Kerry a bit," said Robert Brorein, 74, a Republican who said he did not like Mr. Bush but could not bring himself to vote for Mr. Kerry. "I don't trust the way he talks. He doesn't give straight answers. He comes across as being slick. He's good with words, but I just don't believe him."

The poll and follow-up interviews signaled the extent to which Mr. Bush's candidacy rested on his terrorism record, even though Mr. Kerry has improved his credentials on the issue.

Mr. Bush's job approval rating of 44 percent is slightly higher than the 37 percent job approval rating his father had before losing in 1992 to Bill Clinton. Mr. Dowd said he was not concerned by the figure, disputing the finding and pointing to a poll by the Gallup Organization.

"If it were true, it would be a problem," he said. "Gallup has our job approval at 51. They're the ones I pay attention to."

The Times/CBS News poll found indications that voters were listening to Democratic attacks against Mr. Bush, even if they had not embraced the



candidate making them. Nearly half said that Mr. Bush's policies had increased the cost of the prescription drugs for the elderly, while 60 percent said that his policies had benefited the rich, compared with 8 percent who said they benefited the middle class.

In addition, nearly half said that Mr. Bush's policies were cutting the number of jobs in the United States. Sixty-five percent said that Mr. Kerry's policies favored "ordinary Americans" rather than large corporations; 59 percent said Mr. Bush's policies would protect corporations.

One-quarter of respondents said that Mr. Bush's policies had resulted in their taxes going down, while 28 percent said that they had resulted in their taxes going up. And 61 percent said Social Security benefits would be available if Mr. Kerry won; 43 percent said that about Mr. Bush.

On Iraq, Americans no longer see the war as Mr. Bush does. A majority now say the war is either a minor part of the war on terrorism or no part at all. Only 37 percent say the war in Iraq is a major part of the war on terrorism.

In addition, Mr. Kerry has established himself as the candidate who would make health care more affordable, and as the candidate who better understands the needs and problems of average voters.

"The economy is a disaster and I don't think George Bush even realizes it," said Sally Sullivan, 61, a retired legal secretary and an independent voter from New Hampshire. "Middle class jobs are just flowing out of this country and the jobs that are being created are being created in the service industry for 15, 16, and 17 thousand dollars a year. I just think George Bush has lost touch with reality completely as far as the economy goes."

Fred Backus contributed reporting for this article.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

--Boundary\_(ID\_KCkqFBJ+3+rITnMZPPxy7g)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-avg=cert;  
x-avg-checked=avg-ok-309E7E52  
Content-disposition: inline

---  
Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.  
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).  
Version: 6.0.752 / Virus Database: 503 - Release Date: 9/3/2004

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

--Boundary\_(ID\_KCkqFBJ+3+rITnMZPPxy7g)--

---

Date: Tue, 19 Oct 2004 19:09:56 -0700  
Reply-To: phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Phillip J. Trounstine" <phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU>  
Subject: Re: A question about cell phones and polling  
Comments: To: bdautch@CMOR.ORG  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

This doesn't make sense since this language is from CMOR's own website:

What, exactly, is prohibited?

There are several elements involved in this provision. The TCPA prohibits: =

1. ALL calls made to a cellular phone, without the prior consent of the=20 person called
2. IF the call is made using an automatic telephone dialing system=20 (defined as equipment which has the capacity to store or produce telephone =

numbers to be called using a random or sequential number generator and to=20 dial such numbers) or an artificial or prerecorded voice

3. AND IF the party is charged for the call

Therefore, the TCPA does not seek to ban all autodialer/recorded message=20 calls to cell phones, but only those where the party is charged for the=20 call and there is no consent of the called party. However, the difficulty=20 in complying with this law/regulation is in the ability to determine if=20 you are placing a call to a cell phone, and furthermore, whether the=20 called party is being charged for the call.

...Since virtually everyone pays for their incoming calls (or at least, we =

have no way of knowing) how then can it be legal?=20

Phil Trounstine  
Survey and Policy Research Institute  
at San Jose State University  
408-924-6993  
phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu

Brian Dautch <bdautch@CMOR.ORG>  
Sent by: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
10/19/2004 04:00 PM  
Please respond to bdautch

=20

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
cc:=20  
Subject: Re: A question about cell phones and polling

Leo,

It is in fact legal for survey researchers to call cell phones IF the call is dialed manually.

I don't want to leave that statement sitting completely by itself, however. Although I'm sure this isn't necessary, I just wanted to remind everyone of some previous government action: The FCC in particular has discussed the issue of \*telemarketers\* calling people's cell phones, which is a practice that is forbidden. Obviously, survey researchers are not telemarketers. Still, I'd like to put forth the following FCC reference to telemarketing calls to cell phones, taken from the FCC's July 2003 Final TCPA rule:

"...such calls can be costly and inconvenient. The Commission has long recognized, and the record in this proceeding supports the same conclusion, that wireless customers are charged for incoming calls whether they pay in advance or after the minutes are used. Wireless subscribers who purchase a large "bucket" of minutes at a fixed rate nevertheless are charged for those minutes, and for any minutes that exceed the "bucket" allowance. This "bucket" could be exceeded more quickly if consumers receive numerous unwanted telemarketing calls. Moreover, as several commenters point out, telemarketers have no way to determine how consumers are charged for their wireless service."

Certainly, I know of no survey researcher of any kind who would ever abuse this right the way some telemarketers would (and did). Every survey researcher I can name (that calls cell phones) has implemented a very responsible policy for doing so.

This is a crucial element of our profession's self-regulation...because there are absolutely no rogue survey researchers (to the very best of my knowledge) who make it a point to constantly call people's cell phones, we don't have to worry about a survey researcher using up the respondent's "bucket" of minutes (or, worse yet, a scenario in which the respondent has already used that entire "bucket" from their own phone calls, and is being charged money for the survey research call).

That is one of the reasons I am proud to lobby on behalf of survey researchers; I know I'm representing a group who comply with the letter of the current law, and who understand that they shouldn't do anything that might potentially bring about more restrictive legislation in the future.

Brian

Brian Dautch  
Director of Government Affairs  
The Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR)  
6931 Arlington Rd., Suite 308

Bethesda, MD 20814  
301-654-6601 (phone)  
bdautch@cmor.org

> I have heard it mentioned many times in news reports that it is illegal  
> for polls to call cell phones - sometimes this is stated as it is  
> illegal to use an autodialer to call a cell phone.  
>  
> Can someone clarify for me (and presumably others) exactly what if  
> anything is illegal about polling cell phone numbers?  
>  
> Thanks in advance.  
> --  
> Leo G. Simonetta  
> Research Director  
> Art & Science Group, LLC  
> 6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
> Baltimore MD 21209  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 2004 09:22:14 -0400  
Reply-To: Yasamin Miller <[yd17@CORNELL.EDU](mailto:yd17@CORNELL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Yasamin Miller <[yd17@CORNELL.EDU](mailto:yd17@CORNELL.EDU)>  
Subject: surveys on perceptions of universities  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Is anyone familiar with any survey work that looks at how the community members of a higher education institution perceives itself and how it is perceived by the outside?

Many thanks,

Yasamin

Yasamin Miller, Director

Survey Research Institute - SRI  
168 Ives Hall  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, NY 14853  
\* yd17@cornell.edu  
( 607-255-0148  
fax: 607-255-7118

---

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

---

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 2004 09:53:01 -0400  
Reply-To: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@casro.org](mailto:dbowers@casro.org)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@CASRO.ORG](mailto:dbowers@CASRO.ORG)>  
Organization: CASRO  
Subject: Re: A question about cell phones and polling  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

The FCC cell phone autodialer rule has nothing to do with telemarketers. This rule should be interpreted (since this issue has been specifically clarified by the FCC via conversation with CASRO) as prohibiting any call to a cell phone using any kind of autodialer regardless of whether the called party is charged for the call. Cell numbers can be placed on the do not call registry, which means that telemarketers can't call cell numbers that are on the DNC.

Survey researchers may not use an autodialer to make a call to a cell phone, since the law addresses ANY calls to cell phones (not just telemarketing calls). This is why the issue of portability is so important--researchers should be sure that the numbers they are autodialing have not been "ported" from wireline to wireless. See the following info for more details.

One further point, CASRO does not support or endorse any "hierarchy" of self-regulation with respect to telephone research, in which landlines wouldn't get as much protection from abuse as cell phones. Diane Bowers, CASRO

The Federal Government: The Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA)

## I. Intent of the Laws

The TCPA, the TSR, and the National Do Not Call (DNC) Registry were written

with the intention of regulating telemarketers who make unsolicited commercial or sales-related calls to consumers. These laws were enacted and enforced by the FCC and the FTC in response to abuses of the public's privacy and because of misleading and fraudulent telemarketing cases. (Appendix A: CASRO Press Release & FTC Letter--NOT COVERED vs. EXEMPT)

In prohibiting telemarketers' abusive and deceptive practices and regulating the volume of telemarketing calls to consumers, these laws protect the public and provide the public with a legal complaint mechanism. These laws also provide support to CASRO and survey researchers in their efforts to address misuses and abuses of survey research ("sugging" and "frugging"). The enforcement divisions of the FCC ([www.fcc.gov](http://www.fcc.gov)) and the FTC ([www.ftc.gov](http://www.ftc.gov)) provide complaint filing procedures regarding the TCPA, the TSR, and the National DNC Registry. (Appendix B: FTC Complaint Form)

## A. TCPA Provisions

### 1. Telemarketing Solicitations; "commercial speech"

a. Do Not Call List: The TCPA requires telemarketers to offer consumers the option of being placed on a do not call (DNC) list; it restricts telemarketers from calling individuals whose names and numbers have been placed on a DNC list.

(see National Do Not Call Registry below)

b. Time of Day: The TCPA restricts telemarketers' calls from between 8:00 AM and 9:00 PM.

c. Caller ID: Further, the TCPA requires telemarketers to allow their telephone number to be identified by caller ID systems-telemarketers may not block ID of their telephone numbers.

d. Fax Numbers: The TCPA prohibits calls to fax numbers for the purpose of sending an unsolicited advertisement.

### 2. All Unsolicited Calls

The TCPA addresses all unsolicited calls in its provisions on the use of autodialers and calls to cell phones.

a. Autodialers: The TCPA prohibits the use of autodialers (with or without recorded message players) to call cell phones, emergency numbers, an individual in a healthcare institution for a commercial or sales purpose without the prior consent of the called party.

b. Cell Phones: The TCPA prohibits any calls to cell phones using an autodialer.

## B. TCPA and Survey Research

1. The general benefit of the TCPA for researchers is that it definitively differentiates telemarketing and advertising from research calls. Survey research calls by definition, rules, language and intent are NOT INCLUDED in the laws that apply to telemarketers. Survey research is not "commercial speech;" survey research is not advertising, sales, or fundraising.

### 2. Telephone Solicitations; "commercial speech"

Legitimate survey research calls are not covered-i.e., they are "NOT INCLUDED," rather than "EXEMPTED"-from the TCPA provisions that specifically address telephone solicitations. In fact, during the rulemaking phase of writing this bill, the FCC wrote that the law does not apply to "calls conducting research, marketing surveys, political polling or similar activities which do not involve solicitation as defined by our rules." (emphasis my own)

### 3. All Unsolicited Calls

However, the TCPA provisions that address all unsolicited calls, by definition, include survey research calls, unless there are specific exemptions for non-commercial calls.

a. Cell Phone Calls: The TCPA prohibits autodialer calls. This prohibition applies to all calls, including those made for research. Penalties for willful or knowing violations can be as high as \$1,500 per violation. It is important to note that manual (non-autodialer) non-telemarketing calls to cell phones are permitted, even if the person is

charged.

b. Autodialer and automatic telephone dialing system are defined as "equipment which has the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be called using a random or sequential number generator and to dial such numbers." The language is problematic for research businesses. The word "capacity" may indicate a reluctance on the FCC's part to distinguish between autodialers which (1) are used as an efficiency, (2) are a means of eliminating human dialing error, and (3) are controlled by human intervention; and autodialing systems which are completely automatic with no human intervention. Further clarification is needed here.

c. Portability: With the advent of portability between wireless and landline numbers, the FCC has consistently stated that database solutions to ensure compliance with the autodialer regulation is the responsibility of industry. Consequently, databases that identify cell numbers have been established by the telecom industry (NeuStar, the entity that serves the telecommunications industry as administrator of NPAC) and within specific service industries (such as sampling agencies for research companies). While portability is in a nascent stage, it is expected that ported numbers will substantially increase, as the cell phone becomes a primary residential phone number.

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

From: "Phillip J. Trounstine" <phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2004 10:09 PM

Subject: Re: A question about cell phones and polling

This doesn't make sense since this language is from CMOR's own website:

What, exactly, is prohibited?

There are several elements involved in this provision. The TCPA prohibits:

1. ALL calls made to a cellular phone, without the prior consent of the person called
2. IF the call is made using an automatic telephone dialing system (defined as equipment which has the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be called using a random or sequential number generator and to dial such numbers) or an artificial or prerecorded voice
3. AND IF the party is charged for the call

Therefore, the TCPA does not seek to ban all autodialer/recorded message calls to cell phones, but only those where the party is charged for the call and there is no consent of the called party. However, the difficulty in complying with this law/regulation is in the ability to determine if you are placing a call to a cell phone, and furthermore, whether the called party is being charged for the call.



..Since virtually everyone pays for their incoming calls (or at least, we have no way of knowing) how then can it be legal?

Phil Trounstone  
Survey and Policy Research Institute  
at San Jose State University  
408-924-6993  
phil.trounstone@sjsu.edu

Brian Dautch <bdautch@CMOR.ORG>  
Sent by: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
10/19/2004 04:00 PM  
Please respond to bdautch

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
cc:  
Subject: Re: A question about cell phones and polling

Leo,

It is in fact legal for survey researchers to call cell phones IF the call is dialed manually.

I don't want to leave that statement sitting completely by itself, however. Although I'm sure this isn't necessary, I just wanted to remind everyone of some previous government action: The FCC in particular has discussed the issue of \*telemarketers\* calling people's cell phones, which is a practice that is forbidden. Obviously, survey researchers are not telemarketers. Still, I'd like to put forth the following FCC reference to telemarketing calls to cell phones, taken from the FCC's July 2003 Final TCPA rule:

"...such calls can be costly and inconvenient. The Commission has long recognized, and the record in this proceeding supports the same conclusion, that wireless customers are charged for incoming calls whether they pay in advance or after the minutes are used. Wireless subscribers who purchase a large "bucket" of minutes at a fixed rate nevertheless are charged for those minutes, and for any minutes that exceed the "bucket" allowance. This "bucket" could be exceeded more quickly if consumers receive numerous unwanted telemarketing calls. Moreover, as several commenters point out, telemarketers have no way to determine how consumers are charged for their wireless service."

Certainly, I know of no survey researcher of any kind who would ever abuse this right the way some telemarketers would (and did). Every survey researcher I can name (that calls cell phones) has implemented a very responsible policy for doing so.

This is a crucial element of our profession's self-regulation...because there are absolutely no rogue survey researchers (to the very best of my knowledge) who make it a point to constantly call people's cell phones, we don't have to worry about a survey researcher using up the respondent's "bucket" of minutes (or, worse yet, a scenario in which the respondent has already used that entire "bucket" from their own phone calls, and is being charged money for the survey research call).

That is one of the reasons I am proud to lobby on behalf of survey researchers; I know I'm representing a group who comply with the letter of the current law, and who understand that they shouldn't do anything that might potentially bring about more restrictive legislation in the future.

Brian

Brian Dautch  
Director of Government Affairs  
The Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR)  
6931 Arlington Rd., Suite 308  
Bethesda, MD 20814  
301-654-6601 (phone)  
bdautch@cmor.org

> I have heard it mentioned many times in news reports that it is illegal  
> for polls to call cell phones - sometimes this is stated as it is  
> illegal to use an autodialer to call a cell phone.

>  
> Can someone clarify for me (and presumably others) exactly what if  
> anything is illegal about polling cell phone numbers?

>  
> Thanks in advance.

> --  
> Leo G. Simonetta  
> Research Director  
> Art & Science Group, LLC  
> 6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
> Baltimore MD 21209

> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 2004 10:10:20 -0400  
Reply-To: martin plissner <[plissner@VERIZON.NET](mailto:plissner@VERIZON.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: martin plissner <[plissner@VERIZON.NET](mailto:plissner@VERIZON.NET)>  
Subject: Emailing: nop-Politics  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

This survey, done by Research America of Philadelphia for the Joint =  
Center  
for Political and Economic Studies, reports a doubling of the support =  
among  
African-Americans for George Bush from that shown in a similar survey =  
four  
years ago (which, in that case, was not too far from that year's exit =  
poll  
findings). It differs from most public opinion surveys in having been  
conducted over a period of nearly four weeks and in its reflecting more =  
than  
eight hundred interviews with African-Americans. Some people, I for =  
one,  
might find the center's findings surprising. Does anyone have data from  
from their own surveys which might bear on this matter? =20  
=20  
Marty Plissner

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

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 2004 10:17:36 -0400  
Reply-To: [JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM](mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <[JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM](mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: A poll on polls  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="UTF-8"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

This made me laugh out loud; may it brighten your day as well. This is from=  
=20  
[www.andyborowitz.com](http://www.andyborowitz.com), recently featured on NPR. JAS

POLL: AMERICANS EVENLY DIVIDED OVER WHICH POLL THEY BELIEVE=20  
Gallup, Zogby in Statistical Dead Heat=20

Americans are evenly divided over which presidential election poll they believe, with the Gallup poll and the Zogby poll drawing roughly the same number of likely voters, a new poll of likely voters reveals.

In the poll, taken by the University of Minnesota's Institute for Public Opinion, 48% said they believed the Gallup poll and 47% trusted Zogby, a statistical dead heat, says Dr. Davis Bevins, who supervised the survey for the Institute.

With just two weeks to go until the election, neither Gallup nor Zogby has broken out, Dr. Bevins says. It is really too close to call.

Perhaps in response to the ever-tightening race between the rival polling companies, the competition between Gallup and Zogby has grown increasingly nasty in recent days, with both companies airing expensive negative television ads attacking each other.

In one particularly vicious attack ad, Gallup accused Zogby of flip-flopping on whether Sen. John Kerry or President Bush was ahead in the race.

But Zogby soon retaliated with an attack ad of its own, accusing Gallup of having a lesbian daughter.

For his part, Dr. Bevins warns that the accuracy of his own poll may be suspect since the voters in the survey were contacted exclusively by phone. We find that a lot of people are unwilling to answer the phone these days because they're afraid it might be Bill O'Reilly.

Elsewhere, election officials in Florida said that they have encountered a new problem with their electronic voting machines and that the time-code will not stop blinking on and off.

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

visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)

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

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

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 2004 10:24:53 -0400  
Reply-To: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@casro.org](mailto:dbowers@casro.org)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@CASRO.ORG](mailto:dbowers@CASRO.ORG)>  
Organization: CASRO  
Subject: Re: A question about cell phones and polling  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Nancy: No, it is not illegal. Survey Researchers can call cell phones, but must do so manually. (And the other FCC/FTC rules re DNC, etc. relate to telemarketers only.)

One of our concerns is the broad definition of autodialer used by the FCC. We hope, at the very least, to get the FCC to understand that "autodialers" used for efficiency and quality control purposes--such as speed dialing--should be separated from telemarketers' uses of predictive dialers that allow abandonment, dead air time, and recorded message players. This is a tough one. Diane

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

From: "Nancy Belden" <[nancybelden@brspoll.com](mailto:nancybelden@brspoll.com)>  
To: "'Diane Bowers'" <[dbowers@casro.org](mailto:dbowers@casro.org)>  
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2004 10:07 AM  
Subject: RE: A question about cell phones and polling

> But is it illegal to call a cell phone to do an interview if it is hand  
> dialed?

>  
> Nancy Belden  
> Partner, Belden Russonello & Stewart  
> President, American Association for Public Opinion Research  
>  
> 1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700  
> Washington, DC 20036  
> 202.822.6090  
>

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

> From: AAPORNET [[mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)] On Behalf Of Diane Bowers  
> Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2004 9:53 AM  
> To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
> Subject: Re: A question about cell phones and polling  
>

> The FCC cell phone autodialer rule has nothing to do with telemarketers.  
> This rule should be interpreted (since this issue has been specifically  
> clarified by the FCC via conversation with CASRO) as prohibiting any call  
to

- > a cell phone using any kind of autodialer regardless of whether the called
- > party is charged for the call. Cell numbers can be placed on the do not
- > call registry, which means that telemarketers can't call cell numbers that
- > are on the DNC.
- > Survey researchers may not use an autodialer to make a call to a cell
- > phone, since the law addresses ANY calls to cell phones (not just
- > telemarketing calls). This is why the issue of portability is so
- > important--researchers should be sure that the numbers they are
- autodialing
- > have not been "ported" from wireline to wireless. See the following info
- > for more details.
- > One further point, CASRO does not support or endorse any "hierarchy"
- of
- > self-regulation with respect to telephone research, in which landlines
- > wouldn't get as much protection from abuse as cell phones. Diane Bowers,
- > CASRO
- >
- > The Federal Government: The Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA)
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- > I. Intent of the Laws
- >
- > The TCPA, the TSR, and the National Do Not Call (DNC) Registry were
- written
- > with the intention of regulating telemarketers who make unsolicited
- > commercial or sales-related calls to consumers. These laws were enacted
- and
- > enforced by the FCC and the FTC in response to abuses of the public's
- > privacy and because of misleading and fraudulent telemarketing cases.
- > (Appendix A: CASRO Press Release & FTC Letter--NOT COVERED vs. EXEMPT)
- >
- >
- >
- > In prohibiting telemarketers' abusive and deceptive practices and
- regulating
- > the volume of telemarketing calls to consumers, these laws protect the
- > public and provide the public with a legal complaint mechanism. These
- laws
- > also provide support to CASRO and survey researchers in their efforts to
- > address misuses and abuses of survey research ("sugging" and "frugging").
- > The enforcement divisions of the FCC ([www.fcc.gov](http://www.fcc.gov)) and the FTC
- ([www.ftc.gov](http://www.ftc.gov))
- > provide complaint filing procedures regarding the TCPA, the TSR, and the
- > National DNC Registry. (Appendix B: FTC Complaint Form)
- >
- >
- >
- > A. TCPA Provisions
- >
- > 1. Telemarketing Solicitations; "commercial speech"
- >

>  
>  
> a. Do Not Call List: The TCPA requires telemarketers to offer consumers  
the  
> option of being placed on a do not call (DNC) list; it restricts  
> telemarketers from calling individuals whose names and numbers have been  
> placed on a DNC list.

>  
> (see National Do Not Call Registry below)

>  
>  
> b. Time of Day: The TCPA restricts telemarketers' calls from between 8:00  
> AM and 9:00 PM.

>  
>  
> c. Caller ID: Further, the TCPA requires telemarketers to allow their  
> telephone number to be identified by caller ID systems-telemarketers may  
not  
> block ID of their telephone numbers.

>  
>  
> d. Fax Numbers: The TCPA prohibits calls to fax numbers for the purpose  
of  
> sending an unsolicited advertisement.

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> 2. All Unsolicited Calls

>  
> The TCPA addresses all unsolicited calls in its provisions on the use of  
> autodialers and calls to cell phones.

>  
>  
> a. Autodialers: The TCPA prohibits the use of autodialers (with or  
without  
> recorded message players) to call cell phones, emergency numbers, an  
> individual in a healthcare institution for a commercial or sales purpose  
> without the prior consent of the called party.

>  
>  
> b. Cell Phones: The TCPA prohibits any calls to cell phones using an  
> autodialer.

>

> B. TCPA and Survey Research

>

> 1. The general benefit of the TCPA for researchers is that it definitively

> differentiates telemarketing and advertising from research calls. Survey research calls by definition, rules, language and intent are NOT INCLUDED in

> the laws that apply to telemarketers. Survey research is not "commercial speech;" survey research is not advertising, sales, or fundraising.

>

>

>

> 2. Telephone Solicitations; "commercial speech"

>

> Legitimate survey research calls are not covered-i.e., they are "NOT INCLUDED," rather than "EXEMPTED"-from the TCPA provisions that specifically

> address telephone solicitations. In fact, during the rulemaking phase of

> writing this bill, the FCC wrote that the law does not apply to "calls

> conducting research, marketing surveys, political polling or similar

> activities which do not involve solicitation as defined by our rules."

> (emphasis my own)

>

>

>

> 3. All Unsolicited Calls

>

> However, the TCPA provisions that address all unsolicited calls, by

> definition, include survey research calls, unless there are specific

> exemptions for non-commercial calls.

>

>

>

> a. Cell Phone Calls: The TCPA prohibits autodialer calls. This

> prohibition applies to all calls, including those made for research.

> Penalties for willful or knowing violations can be as high as \$1,500 per

> violation. It is important to note that manual (non-autodialer)

> non-telemarketing calls to cell phones are permitted, even if the person

is

> charged.

>

>

>

> b. Autodialer and automatic telephone dialing system are

> defined as "equipment which has the capacity to store or produce telephone

> numbers to be called using a random or sequential number generator and to

> dial such numbers." The language is problematic for research businesses.

> The word "capacity" may indicate a reluctance on the FCC's part to

> distinguish between autodialers which (1) are used as an efficiency, (2)

are

> a means of eliminating human dialing error, and (3) are controlled by

human

> intervention; and autodialing systems which are completely automatic with

no



> human intervention. Further clarification is needed here.

>

>

>

> c. Portability: With the advent of portability between  
> wireless and landline numbers, the FCC has consistently stated that  
> database

> solutions to ensure compliance with the autodialer regulation is the  
> responsibility of industry. Consequently, databases that identify cell  
> numbers have been established by the telecom industry (NeuStar, the entity  
> that serves the telecommunications industry as administrator of NPAC) and  
> within specific service industries (such as sampling agencies for research  
> companies). While portability is in a nascent stage, it is expected that  
> ported numbers will substantially increase, as the cell phone becomes a  
> primary residential phone number.

>

>

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

> From: "Phillip J. Trounstine" <phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU>

> To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

> Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2004 10:09 PM

> Subject: Re: A question about cell phones and polling

>

>

> This doesn't make sense since this language is from CMOR's own website:

>

>

> What, exactly, is prohibited?

> There are several elements involved in this provision. The TCPA prohibits:

>

> 1. ALL calls made to a cellular phone, without the prior consent of the  
> person called

> 2. IF the call is made using an automatic telephone dialing system  
> (defined as equipment which has the capacity to store or produce telephone  
> numbers to be called using a random or sequential number generator and to  
> dial such numbers) or an artificial or prerecorded voice

> 3. AND IF the party is charged for the call

> Therefore, the TCPA does not seek to ban all autodialer/recorded message  
> calls to cell phones, but only those where the party is charged for the  
> call and there is no consent of the called party. However, the difficulty  
> in complying with this law/regulation is in the ability to determine if  
> you are placing a call to a cell phone, and furthermore, whether the  
> called party is being charged for the call.

>

> .Since virtually everyone pays for their incoming calls (or at least, we  
> have no way of knowing) how then can it be legal?

>

> Phil Trounstine

> Survey and Policy Research Institute

> at San Jose State University

> 408-924-6993

> phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu

>

>

>  
>  
>  
> Brian Dautch <bdautch@CMOR.ORG>  
> Sent by: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
> 10/19/2004 04:00 PM  
> Please respond to bdautch

>  
>  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> cc:  
> Subject: Re: A question about cell phones and polling

> Leo,

> It is in fact legal for survey researchers to call cell phones IF the call  
> is dialed manually.

> I don't want to leave that statement sitting completely by itself,  
> however. Although I'm sure this isn't necessary, I just wanted to remind  
> everyone of some previous government action: The FCC in particular has  
> discussed the issue of \*telemarketers\* calling people's cell phones, which  
> is a practice that is forbidden. Obviously, survey researchers are not  
> telemarketers. Still, I'd like to put forth the following FCC reference  
> to telemarketing calls to cell phones, taken from the FCC's July 2003  
> Final TCPA rule:

> "...such calls can be costly and inconvenient. The Commission has long  
> recognized, and the record in this proceeding supports the same  
> conclusion, that wireless customers are charged for incoming calls whether  
> they pay in advance or after the minutes are  
> used. Wireless subscribers who purchase a large "bucket" of minutes at  
> a fixed rate nevertheless are charged for those minutes, and for any  
> minutes that exceed the "bucket" allowance. This "bucket" could be  
> exceeded more quickly if consumers receive numerous unwanted telemarketing  
> calls. Moreover, as several commenters point out, telemarketers have no  
> way to determine how consumers are charged for their wireless service."

> Certainly, I know of no survey researcher of any kind who would ever abuse  
> this right the way some telemarketers would (and did). Every survey  
> researcher I can name (that calls cell phones) has implemented a very  
> responsible policy for doing so.

> This is a crucial element of our profession's self-regulation...because  
> there are absolutely no rogue survey researchers (to the very best of my  
> knowledge) who make it a point to constantly call people's cell phones, we  
> don't have to worry about a survey researcher using up the respondent's  
> "bucket" of minutes (or, worse yet, a scenario in which the respondent has  
> already used that entire "bucket" from their own phone calls, and is being  
> charged money for the survey research call).

> That is one of the reasons I am proud to lobby on behalf of survey  
> researchers; I know I'm representing a group who comply with the letter of

> the current law, and who understand that they shouldn't do anything that  
> might potentially bring about more restrictive legislation in the future.

>  
> Brian

>  
> Brian Dautch  
> Director of Government Affairs  
> The Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR)  
> 6931 Arlington Rd., Suite 308  
> Bethesda, MD 20814  
> 301-654-6601 (phone)  
> bdautch@cmor.org

>> I have heard it mentioned many times in news reports that it is illegal  
>> for polls to call cell phones - sometimes this is stated as it is  
>> illegal to use an autodialer to call a cell phone.

>> Can someone clarify for me (and presumably others) exactly what if  
>> anything is illegal about polling cell phone numbers?

>> Thanks in advance.

>> --  
>> Leo G. Simonetta  
>> Research Director  
>> Art & Science Group, LLC  
>> 6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
>> Baltimore MD 21209

>> -----  
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 2004 10:32:55 -0400  
Reply-To: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Mark Schulman <M.SCHULMAN@SRBI.COM>  
Subject: Re: surveys on perceptions of universities  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu, yd17@CORNELL.EDU  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-disposition: inline

Yasamin, SRBI has conducted several such studies. Our study for Rutgers =  
was released just yesterday. Here's the Rutgers web address:

<http://ur.rutgers.edu/medrel/viewArticle.html?ArticleID=3D4190>

Best wishes,  
Mark Schulman

Mark A. Schulman, Ph.D.  
Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas, Inc.  
145 E. 32nd Street, Suite 500  
New York, NY 10016

e-mail: m.schulman@srbi.com  
voice: 212-779-7700  
fax: 212-779-7785

---

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to  
which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged  
material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or  
taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or  
entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you=  
received this in error, please contact the sender,=  
m.schulman@srbi.com, and delete the material from=  
any computer. =

>>> Yasamin Miller <yd17@CORNELL.EDU> 10/20 9:22 AM >>>  
Is anyone familiar with any survey work that looks at how the community  
members of a higher education institution perceives  
itself and how it is perceived by the outside?

Many thanks,

Yasamin

Yasamin Miller, Director  
Survey Research Institute - SRI

168 Ives Hall  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, NY 14853  
\* yd17@cornell.edu=20  
( 607-255-0148  
fax: 607-255-7118

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>=20  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

---

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

---

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 2004 10:49:06 -0400  
Reply-To: Brian Dautch <[bdautch@CMOR.ORG](mailto:bdautch@CMOR.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Brian Dautch <[bdautch@CMOR.ORG](mailto:bdautch@CMOR.ORG)>  
Subject: Re: A question about cell phones and polling  
Comments: To: Diane Bowers <[dbowers@CASRO.ORG](mailto:dbowers@CASRO.ORG)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[00af01c4b6b0\\$91469d80\\$6401a8c0@DIANE](mailto:00af01c4b6b0$91469d80$6401a8c0@DIANE)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Nancy,

As I indicated in my first post:

>It is in fact legal for survey researchers to call cell phones IF the call  
> is dialed manually.

The rest of my concerns merely centered around the idea that IF survey researchers were to manually dial cell phones with great regularity, thereby imposing lots of costs on consumers, it's *\*possible\** that we could come under regulation for doing so. However, because survey researchers don't abuse the ability to manually dial cell phones, I don't think the government would feel any need to regulate us.

Brian

Brian Dautch  
Director of Government Affairs

CMOR  
Promoting and Advocating Survey Research  
7475 Wisconsin Ave., Suite 300  
Bethesda, MD 20814

ph: (301) 654-6601  
fax: (208) 693-0564  
bdautch@cmor.org <mailto:bdautch@cmor.org>

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Diane Bowers  
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2004 10:25 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: A question about cell phones and polling

Nancy: No, it is not illegal. Survey Researchers can call cell phones, but must do so manually. (And the other FCC/FTC rules re DNC, etc. relate to telemarketers only.)

One of our concerns is the broad definition of autodialer used by the FCC. We hope, at the very least, to get the FCC to understand that "autodialers" used for efficiency and quality control purposes--such as speed dialing--should be separated from telemarketers' uses of predictive dialers that allow abandonment, dead air time, and recorded message players. This is a tough one. Diane

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

From: "Nancy Belden" <nancybelden@brspoll.com>  
To: "'Diane Bowers'" <dbowers@casro.org>  
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2004 10:07 AM  
Subject: RE: A question about cell phones and polling

> But is it illegal to call a cell phone to do an interview if it is hand  
> dialed?

>  
> Nancy Belden  
> Partner, Belden Russonello & Stewart  
> President, American Association for Public Opinion Research  
>  
> 1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700  
> Washington, DC 20036  
> 202.822.6090

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Diane Bowers  
> Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2004 9:53 AM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: A question about cell phones and polling

>  
> The FCC cell phone autodialer rule has nothing to do with telemarketers.  
> This rule should be interpreted (since this issue has been specifically  
> clarified by the FCC via conversation with CASRO) as prohibiting any call  
> to  
> a cell phone using any kind of autodialer regardless of whether the called  
> party is charged for the call. Cell numbers can be placed on the do not  
> call registry, which means that telemarketers can't call cell numbers that  
> are on the DNC.  
> Survey researchers may not use an autodialer to make a call to a cell

- > phone, since the law addresses ANY calls to cell phones (not just
- > telemarketing calls). This is why the issue of portability is so
- > important--researchers should be sure that the numbers they are
- autodialing
- > have not been "ported" from wireline to wireless. See the following info
- > for more details.
- > One further point, CASRO does not support or endorse any "hierarchy"
- of
- > self-regulation with respect to telephone research, in which landlines
- > wouldn't get as much protection from abuse as cell phones. Diane Bowers,
- > CASRO
- >
- > The Federal Government: The Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA)
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- > I. Intent of the Laws
- >
- > The TCPA, the TSR, and the National Do Not Call (DNC) Registry were
- written
- > with the intention of regulating telemarketers who make unsolicited
- > commercial or sales-related calls to consumers. These laws were enacted
- and
- > enforced by the FCC and the FTC in response to abuses of the public's
- > privacy and because of misleading and fraudulent telemarketing cases.
- > (Appendix A: CASRO Press Release & FTC Letter--NOT COVERED vs. EXEMPT)
- >
- >
- >
- > In prohibiting telemarketers' abusive and deceptive practices and
- regulating
- > the volume of telemarketing calls to consumers, these laws protect the
- > public and provide the public with a legal complaint mechanism. These
- laws
- > also provide support to CASRO and survey researchers in their efforts to
- > address misuses and abuses of survey research ("sugging" and "frugging").
- > The enforcement divisions of the FCC ([www.fcc.gov](http://www.fcc.gov)) and the FTC
- ([www.ftc.gov](http://www.ftc.gov))
- > provide complaint filing procedures regarding the TCPA, the TSR, and the
- > National DNC Registry. (Appendix B: FTC Complaint Form)
- >
- >
- >
- > A. TCPA Provisions
- >
- > 1. Telemarketing Solicitations; "commercial speech"
- >
- >
- >
- > a. Do Not Call List: The TCPA requires telemarketers to offer consumers
- the
- > option of being placed on a do not call (DNC) list; it restricts

> telemarketers from calling individuals whose names and numbers have been  
> placed on a DNC list.

> (see National Do Not Call Registry below)

> b. Time of Day: The TCPA restricts telemarketers' calls from between 8:00  
> AM and 9:00 PM.

> c. Caller ID: Further, the TCPA requires telemarketers to allow their  
> telephone number to be identified by caller ID systems-telemarketers may  
not  
> block ID of their telephone numbers.

> d. Fax Numbers: The TCPA prohibits calls to fax numbers for the purpose  
of  
> sending an unsolicited advertisement.

## > 2. All Unsolicited Calls

> The TCPA addresses all unsolicited calls in its provisions on the use of  
> autodialers and calls to cell phones.

> a. Autodialers: The TCPA prohibits the use of autodialers (with or  
without  
> recorded message players) to call cell phones, emergency numbers, an  
> individual in a healthcare institution for a commercial or sales purpose  
> without the prior consent of the called party.

> b. Cell Phones: The TCPA prohibits any calls to cell phones using an  
> autodialer.

## > B. TCPA and Survey Research

> 1. The general benefit of the TCPA for researchers is that it  
definitively  
> differentiates telemarketing and advertising from research calls. Survey



> research calls by definition, rules, language and intent are NOT INCLUDED  
in  
> the laws that apply to telemarketers. Survey research is not "commercial  
> speech;" survey research is not advertising, sales, or fundraising.  
>  
>  
>  
> 2. Telephone Solicitations; "commercial speech"  
>  
> Legitimate survey research calls are not covered-i.e., they are "NOT  
> INCLUDED," rather than "EXEMPTED"-from the TCPA provisions that  
specifically  
> address telephone solicitations. In fact, during the rulemaking phase of  
> writing this bill, the FCC wrote that the law does not apply to "calls  
> conducting research, marketing surveys, political polling or similar  
> activities which do not involve solicitation as defined by our rules."  
> (emphasis my own)  
>  
>  
>  
> 3. All Unsolicited Calls  
>  
> However, the TCPA provisions that address all unsolicited calls, by  
> definition, include survey research calls, unless there are specific  
> exemptions for non-commercial calls.  
>  
>  
>  
> a. Cell Phone Calls: The TCPA prohibits autodialer calls. This  
> prohibition applies to all calls, including those made for research.  
> Penalties for willful or knowing violations can be as high as \$1,500 per  
> violation. It is important to note that manual (non-autodialer)  
> non-telemarketing calls to cell phones are permitted, even if the person  
is  
> charged.  
>  
>  
>  
> b. Autodialer and automatic telephone dialing system are  
> defined as "equipment which has the capacity to store or produce telephone  
> numbers to be called using a random or sequential number generator and to  
> dial such numbers." The language is problematic for research businesses.  
> The word "capacity" may indicate a reluctance on the FCC's part to  
> distinguish between autodialers which (1) are used as an efficiency, (2)  
are  
> a means of eliminating human dialing error, and (3) are controlled by  
human  
> intervention; and autodialing systems which are completely automatic with  
no  
> human intervention. Further clarification is needed here.  
>  
>  
>  
> c. Portability: With the advent of portability between

> wireless and landline numbers, the FCC has consistently stated that  
> database  
> solutions to ensure compliance with the autodialer regulation is the  
> responsibility of industry. Consequently, databases that identify cell  
> numbers have been established by the telecom industry (NeuStar, the entity  
> that serves the telecommunications industry as administrator of NPAC) and  
> within specific service industries (such as sampling agencies for research  
> companies). While portability is in a nascent stage, it is expected that  
> ported numbers will substantially increase, as the cell phone becomes a  
> primary residential phone number.

>  
>

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

> From: "Phillip J. Trounstine" <phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU>

> To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

> Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2004 10:09 PM

> Subject: Re: A question about cell phones and polling

>  
>

> This doesn't make sense since this language is from CMOR's own website:

>  
>

> What, exactly, is prohibited?

> There are several elements involved in this provision. The TCPA prohibits:

>

> 1. ALL calls made to a cellular phone, without the prior consent of the  
> person called

> 2. IF the call is made using an automatic telephone dialing system

> (defined as equipment which has the capacity to store or produce telephone  
> numbers to be called using a random or sequential number generator and to  
> dial such numbers) or an artificial or prerecorded voice

> 3. AND IF the party is charged for the call

> Therefore, the TCPA does not seek to ban all autodialer/recorded message  
> calls to cell phones, but only those where the party is charged for the  
> call and there is no consent of the called party. However, the difficulty  
> in complying with this law/regulation is in the ability to determine if  
> you are placing a call to a cell phone, and furthermore, whether the  
> called party is being charged for the call.

>

> .Since virtually everyone pays for their incoming calls (or at least, we  
> have no way of knowing) how then can it be legal?

>

> Phil Trounstine

> Survey and Policy Research Institute

> at San Jose State University

> 408-924-6993

> phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu

>  
>

>  
>

>

>

>

> Brian Dautch <bdautch@CMOR.ORG>

> Sent by: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

> 10/19/2004 04:00 PM

> Please respond to bdautch

>

>

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> cc:

> Subject: Re: A question about cell phones and polling

>

>

> Leo,

>

> It is in fact legal for survey researchers to call cell phones IF the call  
> is dialed manually.

>

> I don't want to leave that statement sitting completely by itself,  
> however. Although I'm sure this isn't necessary, I just wanted to remind  
> everyone of some previous government action: The FCC in particular has  
> discussed the issue of \*telemarketers\* calling people's cell phones, which  
> is a practice that is forbidden. Obviously, survey researchers are not  
> telemarketers. Still, I'd like to put forth the following FCC reference  
> to telemarketing calls to cell phones, taken from the FCC's July 2003  
> Final TCPA rule:

>

> "...such calls can be costly and inconvenient. The Commission has long  
> recognized, and the record in this proceeding supports the same  
> conclusion, that wireless customers are charged for incoming calls whether  
> they pay in advance or after the minutes are  
> used. Wireless subscribers who purchase a large "bucket" of minutes at  
> a fixed rate nevertheless are charged for those minutes, and for any  
> minutes that exceed the "bucket" allowance. This "bucket" could be  
> exceeded more quickly if consumers receive numerous unwanted telemarketing  
> calls. Moreover, as several commenters point out, telemarketers have no  
> way to determine how consumers are charged for their wireless service."

>

> Certainly, I know of no survey researcher of any kind who would ever abuse  
> this right the way some telemarketers would (and did). Every survey  
> researcher I can name (that calls cell phones) has implemented a very  
> responsible policy for doing so.

>

> This is a crucial element of our profession's self-regulation...because  
> there are absolutely no rogue survey researchers (to the very best of my  
> knowledge) who make it a point to constantly call people's cell phones, we  
> don't have to worry about a survey researcher using up the respondent's  
> "bucket" of minutes (or, worse yet, a scenario in which the respondent has  
> already used that entire "bucket" from their own phone calls, and is being  
> charged money for the survey research call).

>

> That is one of the reasons I am proud to lobby on behalf of survey  
> researchers; I know I'm representing a group who comply with the letter of  
> the current law, and who understand that they shouldn't do anything that  
> might potentially bring about more restrictive legislation in the future.

>

> Brian

>

> Brian Dautch  
> Director of Government Affairs  
> The Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR)  
> 6931 Arlington Rd., Suite 308  
> Bethesda, MD 20814  
> 301-654-6601 (phone)  
> bdautch@cmor.org

>  
>  
>> I have heard it mentioned many times in news reports that it is illegal  
>> for polls to call cell phones - sometimes this is stated as it is  
>> illegal to use an autodialer to call a cell phone.

>>  
>> Can someone clarify for me (and presumably others) exactly what if  
>> anything is illegal about polling cell phone numbers?

>>  
>> Thanks in advance.

>> --  
>> Leo G. Simonetta  
>> Research Director  
>> Art & Science Group, LLC  
>> 6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
>> Baltimore MD 21209

>>  
>> -----  
>> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>  
>  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 2004 10:58:36 -0400  
Reply-To: pkmurray@rci.rutgers.edu  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Patrick Murray <pkmurray@RCI.RUTGERS.EDU>  
Organization: Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling  
Subject: Re: surveys on perceptions of universities  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <s1763ee7.097@srbi.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

For anyone else who is interested, here is a link for the full report -  
which I must say is a very comprehensive approach to constituency =  
research  
for a higher ed institution:

=20

[http://www.president.rutgers.edu/constituency\\_research.pdf](http://www.president.rutgers.edu/constituency_research.pdf)

=20

=20

=20

Patrick Murray

Acting Director

Star-Ledger/Eagleton-Rutgers Poll

<<http://slerp.rutgers.edu>> <http://slerp.rutgers.edu>

Center for Public Interest Polling

<<http://eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu>> <http://eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu>

Eagleton Institute of Politics

Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey

185 Ryders Lane, New Brunswick, NJ 08901

732-932-9384 x-243; 732-932-1551 (fax)

=20

=20

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

|From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Mark Schulman

|Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2004 9:33 AM

|To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

|Subject: Re: surveys on perceptions of universities

|  
|Yasamin, SRBI has conducted several such studies. Our study for Rutgers =  
|was

|released just yesterday. Here's the Rutgers web address:

|  
|<http://ur.rutgers.edu/medrel/viewArticle.html?ArticleID=3D4190>

|Best wishes,

|Mark Schulman

|  
|Mark A. Schulman, Ph.D.

|Schulman, Ronca & Bucuvalas, Inc.

|145 E. 32nd Street, Suite 500

|New York, NY 10016

|  
|e-mail: [m.schulman@srbi.com](mailto:m.schulman@srbi.com)

|voice: 212-779-7700

|fax: 212-779-7785

|-----  
|The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity =  
|to

|which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged

|material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, =

or

|taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or  
|entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you  
|received this in error, please contact the sender,  
|m.schulman@srbi.com, and delete the material from  
|any computer.

|>>> Yasamin Miller <yd17@CORNELL.EDU> 10/20 9:22 AM >>>

|Is anyone familiar with any survey work that looks at how the community  
|members of a higher education institution perceives  
|itself and how it is perceived by the outside?

|Many thanks,

|Yasamin

|Yasamin Miller, Director

|Survey Research Institute - SRI

|168 Ives Hall

|Cornell University

|Ithaca, NY 14853

| \* yd17@cornell.edu

| ( 607-255-0148

| fax: 607-255-7118

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

|Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

|Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 20 Oct 2004 11:08:41 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Phone polls have lost ring of truth  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Bowling night??

Phone polls have lost ring of truth  
Cellphone users don't get the call  
Response rates concern pollsters  
[http://www.thestar.com/NASApp/cs/ContentServer?pagename=thestar/Layout/Article\\_Type1&c=Article&cid=1098222610710&call\\_pageid=968332188854&col=96835006](http://www.thestar.com/NASApp/cs/ContentServer?pagename=thestar/Layout/Article_Type1&c=Article&cid=1098222610710&call_pageid=968332188854&col=96835006)  
0724



Toronto Star  
TIM HARPER  
WASHINGTON BUREAU

WASHINGTON - The last weeks of the U.S. election campaign may have doomed telephone polling, which became common three decades ago late in the Jimmy Carter-Gerald Ford contest.

The reason? Cellphones.

The traditional method of polling via random phone calls to American homes may be missing a significant and active part of the electorate, and an increasing number of analysts are suggesting a surprise may be in store  
Nov. 2.

SNIP

The effect these CPOs (cellphones only) may have as voters in this campaign is unknown - for the simple reason that no one has asked them.

American pollsters do not call cellphone users, who must pay for minutes used on incoming calls.

But it's not just cellphones.

Call display, U.S. "Do Not Call" legislation and an electorate which doesn't have time to answer a series of questions have all radically reduced response rates for pollsters.

SNIP

"I think telephone polling will be a thing of the past, certainly 10 years from now," says Karlyn Bowman of the American Enterprise Institute, who has studied U.S. public opinion research for more than two decades.

She says many early polls should be viewed with suspicion and predicts the era of internet polling is coming quickly.

"The polling industry in general, and Gallup in particular, is concerned about anything that could affect our data," says Frank Newport, editor-in-chief of Gallup in the United States.

"It is an issue like call waiting and call display that we are watching, but so far we have no evidence that our data is being compromised."

SNIP

Conventional wisdom suggests CPOs are young and urban, more likely Kerry supporters - while those who are answering land lines are older and possibly rural, more likely Bush supporters. More than six in 10 voters over 65 use land lines exclusively.

Minorities in the U.S. are also less likely to respond to pollsters and

they are also more likely Democrats.

The bottom line - Kerry's support may be being under-reported and Bush's support over-reported.

But Newport says he has no data to suggest that.

While he says younger voters do tilt toward the Democrats they do not do so in such overwhelming numbers as to skew polls.

He and other pollsters say they ensure their samples include 18-to-29 year-olds, expected to vote in possibly record numbers this year.

SNIP

Gallup and other major pollsters display their names rather than unknown numbers so they can get past call display, but Pew Research has found that in a typical five-day survey period, they receive responses from 27 per cent of households, down from 36 per cent as recently as 1997.

"The decline results from increased reluctance to participate in surveys and not from an inability by survey organizations to contact someone in a household," Pew said in its April study.

"The growing use of answering machines, voice mail, caller ID, and call blocking is not preventing survey organizations from reaching an adult in most of the households sampled."

Gallup has come in for particular criticism during this campaign from Democrats and their surrogates, and was the target of a full-page ad in The New York Times by MoveOn.org criticizing its methodology after it reported a 14-point lead for Bush.

"We're used to that, it's normal politics," Newport said. "We believe we are giving an accurate picture."

Still, he says internet polling is probably on the way and Gallup may begin polling cellphone users.

SNIP

Beware of weekend polling, they say, because Fridays and Saturdays are particularly poor days for reaching anyone.

Wednesdays and Fridays are also bad because they can be bowling nights and Democrats are out. And Sunday morning polling is suspect because more Republicans are at church.

Sunday afternoon polling gets a disproportionate number of female responses during the football season.

Polling done the night before the election is useless, as is anything attempted the night before Halloween, most say.

--

Leo G. Simonetta  
Research Director  
Art & Science Group, LLC  
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
Baltimore MD 21209

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

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 2004 10:28:19 -0500  
Reply-To: Robert Godfrey <[rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU](mailto:rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Robert Godfrey <[rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU](mailto:rgodfrey@FACSTAFF.WISC.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: odd statement by Ed Rendell  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[s173d98b.031@ngwgate1.startribune.com](mailto:s173d98b.031@ngwgate1.startribune.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

What do folks make of this? Is Ruy Teixeira "spinning himself" or is Gallup overlooking something here in their likely voter methodology?

<http://www.emergingdemocraticmajorityweblog.com/donkeyrising/archives/000808.php>  
[excerpt]

Here's a basic sketch of how Gallup's methodology works:  
Gallup asks each [RV] respondent seven LV screening questions, and gives each person an LV score of 0 to 7. [Assuming a turnout of 55 percent], the top 55% are classified as likely voters. In practice that typically means all of the "7"s--given full weight--plus some proportion of those with lower scores (usually the "6"s), who are weighted down so that the size of the likely voter sample matches the projected turnout for the year (apparently 55 percent this year). All other voters are discarded from the sample.

Note that the demographics of Gallup's LV sample are not adjusted in any way (as their overall samples are) and are simply allowed to fall where they may.

also from:

[http://www.talkingpointsmemo.com/archives/week\\_2004\\_10\\_17.php#003730](http://www.talkingpointsmemo.com/archives/week_2004_10_17.php#003730)  
"One might say that minority or young voters vote less consistently than affluent whites. But Ruy shows pretty clearly that Gallup's numbers presume rates of participation that defy history and common sense.

For instance, minority representation among voters in 1996 was 17% and in 2000 it was 19.4%. Yet Gallup says it'll be 14.5% this year. That's hard to figure since, as Ruy notes, minorities are growing as

a percentage of the population.

With blacks, it was 10.1% in 1996 and 9.7% in 2000. But Gallup says that it'll fall this year to 7.5%.

On young voters (18-29 year olds), it's a similar story. Young voters made up 17% of the electorate in 1996 and 2000. This year, says Gallup, they'll account for only 11%."

Robert Godfrey

At 2:55 PM -0500 10/18/04, Rob Daves wrote:

>Sorry about posting an incomplete message earlier: I didn't get quite  
>finished before my thick, too-fast fingers hit the send key. This is my  
>more complete response to Leora's question:

>

>If researchers use past vote behavior or current registration status in  
>their "hard screen," that is, one that results in interviews with only  
>the resulting "likely voters," then it could underestimate  
>newly-registered voters of any party. However, not everyone uses such a  
>hard screen, even though they include those two questions in their  
>likely voter modeling. There are many other methods that use those  
>variables that also could include them. For example...

>

>1. Gallup's index cutoff method uses a series of questions, including  
>those two. The new voter might potentially score high enough on the  
>index to be included as a likely voter, even though he or she didn't  
>vote in 2000 or is not included on registration rolls yet.

>

>2. A method that uses past vote and registration status as only part  
>of a hard screen. For example, one public polling firm uses those two  
>as hard screens unless the respondent is young enough not to have voted,  
>then uses a 10-point scale on self-professed probability of voting to  
>decide whether to keep the younger potential respondent in as a likely  
>voter or not.

>

>3. The weighting method, which uses a scale created from a number of  
>variables, including perhaps past vote and registration status, to  
>create case weights for each respondent: Those who score high on likely  
>voter measures (high interest, definitely will vote, registered, and  
>voted in 2000) get the highest weights, and those who report less  
>positively correlated voting behavior or attitudes get smaller weights.

>

>Hard screens may be more useful when a more exact definition about the  
>likely electorate is known, such as in primary elections, or in states  
>where secretaries of state keep good, up-to-date records (how many of  
>those are there?), or very close to Election Day. But there are places  
>where hard screens are more suspect. For example, in the battleground  
>state of Minnesota, people can register to vote at the polls on Election  
>Day; a hard screen containing those two questions might contribute to  
>coverage error in polls conducted in states with Election Day  
>registration.

>

>As others have pointed out, there's no single industry standard for

>modeling a likely electorate.

>

>Again, sorry about posting an incomplete message earlier.

>

>Rob Daves, director

>The Minnesota Poll

>

>>>> Leora Lawton <lawton@TECHSOCIETY.COM> 10/18/04 02:08PM >>>

>I was wondering about the upsurge in registration: if the screener

>for

>'likely voters' includes recent, past voting behavior, then wouldn't

>these

>new registrants be excluded? If they are, as some feel, more likely to

>be

>democrats than republicans, then the 'likely voter' sampling frame

>would

>underestimate Kerry's votes.

>

>Leora Lawton

>

>-----

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>

>-----

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 2004 11:16:38 -0400

Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>

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

From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>

Subject: Harris poll & likely voters

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

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Bush Leads by Eight Points - or Two - Depending on Definition of Likely Voters

[http://biz.yahoo.com/prnews/041020/sfw094\\_1.html](http://biz.yahoo.com/prnews/041020/sfw094_1.html)

This Harris poll press release for a telephone poll uses 2 definitions of likely voters.

--

Leo G. Simonetta

Research Director

Art & Science Group, LLC

As always opinions expressed are solely those of the author.

---

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

---

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 2004 14:33:53 -0400  
Reply-To: Colleen Porter <[cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU](mailto:cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Colleen Porter <[cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU](mailto:cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU)>  
Subject: Followup on dentist survey, West Wing  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

Well, it looks like we finally got the last return on one of our dentist surveys....about 2 years after the last wave of mailing:) That's a career record for me. It's nice to know the peel-and-stick envelopes still work after all that time.

Also, I am looking forward to tonight's episode of West Wing, and remembered that the last episode in May aired the Wednesday of the AAPOR conference, and I watched it in Phoenix. That brought back warm memories.

Colleen

Colleen K. Porter  
[cporter@phhp.ufl.edu](mailto:cporter@phhp.ufl.edu)  
phone: 352\273-6068, fax: 352\273-6075  
University of Florida  
Dept. of Health Services Research, Management and Policy  
Location: 101 Newell Drive, Rm. 4148  
US Mail: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

---

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

---

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 2004 13:46:12 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Subject: new use for pollsters  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

A new use for pollsters: finding "real people" for reporters to talk to. This is from Matt Taibbi's series in New York Press which attempts to determine the worst campaign reporter of all  
<<http://www.nypress.com/17/42/news&columns/taibbi.cfm>>:

>Last week, I called Mark Schulman of SRBI, and asked him if his  
>agency ever provided Time with quotes from respondents in addition  
>to polling data. He said no, although this was possible ("provided  
>we get permission from the respondent"). However, he did note that  
>Time had recently asked his agency's help in recruiting "real  
>people" for its reporters to talk to.  
>  
> "They said, 'We want to talk to some real people,'" he told me.  
>  
> "They said that?" I asked. "Just like that? 'We want to talk to  
>real people?'"  
>  
>"That's what they said," he replied. "I mean, it makes sense,  
>because there's the number, but the numbers aren't the people, of  
>course."  
>  
>A striking thing for a pollster to say, one would think.  
>  
> "So where do you go looking for real people?" I asked. "That can't be  
>easy."  
>  
>"Um, we just get them off the street," Schulman said. "Although in  
>this case, we just sort of called around, asked people we knew, and  
>they put us in touch with some women they knew in the Philadelphia  
>area."  
>  
>The recruiting Schulman was referring to was actually for a Nancy  
>Gibbs piece ("What Do Women Want?" Oct. 11), to which Tumulty  
>contributed. This sounds like an up-and-coming trend to me: You get  
>the pollster to find "the people," leaving the reporter more time to  
>spend on the plane with the Louis Quatorze crowd. It saves time and  
>money, right?

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

=====  
Date: Wed, 20 Oct 2004 16:26:59 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Exit Polls to Protect the Vote  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

CHECKING UP=20

## Exit Polls to Protect the Vote

By MARTIN PLISSNER

<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/10/17/weekinreview/17plis.html>

WASHINGTON — Since the 1960's, the exit poll, that staple of election-night television, has been used along with other tools to declare winners when the polls close in each state, and its accuracy is noted later when the actual vote count proves it right. A landmark exception, of course, came in 2000, when the networks initially gave the decisive Florida vote to Al Gore.

But now exit polls are being used in some places to monitor the official vote count itself, either to validate the outcome or to mount a challenge to it.

### SNIP

In August, exit polling figured in a bitter fight in Venezuela over what amounted to competing landslides for and against a recall of the sitting president, Hugo Chavez, a socialist with ties to Fidel Castro.

The recall's proponents sponsored an exit poll, supervised by Penn Schoen & Berland, an American firm whose clients have included Bill Clinton and Michael Bloomberg. Sometime before the polls closed on Aug. 15, Penn Schoen reported that 59 percent of Venezuelan voters had said yes to throwing the president out of office.

A few hours later, the official count, by an election commission under Mr. Chavez's control, declared him the winner, with 58 percent of the total.

Both the Organization of American States and the Carter Center, the Atlanta-based human rights organization founded by Jimmy Carter, said that their observers had seen no irregularities at the polls. In response to the exit poll, they called for a random audit at selected polling stations and again found nothing suspicious.

Mr. Schoen acknowledged in an interview that the poll's field workers were recruited by a group that helped organize the recall, but he said the volunteers had been trained to conduct the poll professionally, and that his firm would have no reason to put its reputation at risk by participating in a fraudulent poll. The recall's supporters continue to believe the election was stolen.

### SNIP



Could exit polls also play a role in the American presidential election =  
on  
Nov. 2? The potential is there.

Votewatch, a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization based in San Francisco,  
plans to conduct exit polls in selected states to monitor election  
procedures and record impediments to voting, including voting equipment  
flaws, confusion over ballots and perceived discrimination by polling  
officials.

Steven Hertzberg, a San Francisco systems engineer who founded =  
Votewatch,  
said he planned to use volunteers supplied by civic groups like Common  
Cause, among other recruits, and that they would be trained and =  
supervised  
by polling professionals.=20

From its exit polling, Votewatch hopes to go beyond anecdotal indicators  
and get a measure of how many people encountered which kind of problems,  
Mr. Hertzberg said.

The group has also decided to ask people whom they voted for, or meant =  
to  
vote for, to assess whether one candidate's backers are more affected by  
irregularities. But Fritz Scheuren, president of the American =  
Statistical  
Association and a principal adviser to Votewatch, said it was important =  
to  
note that "we are not competing with the networks, and we don't want to  
appear to be."=20

In any event, its backers say, Votewatch won't be projecting who will =  
win  
or lose in November - only the incidence of voting problems that might  
affect the outcome.=20

Martin Plissner, a former CBS News political director, is the author of  
"The Control Room: How Television Calls the Shots in Presidential  
Elections."

Copyright 2004 The New York Times Company

--=20  
Leo G. Simonetta  
Research Director  
Art & Science Group, LLC  
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
Baltimore MD 21209

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Wed, 20 Oct 2004 14:20:45 -0700

Reply-To: jdrovers@sfsu.edu

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: John Rogers <jdrovers@SFSU.EDU>

Organization: Public Research Institute

Subject: Re: Poll Shows Tie; Concerns Cited on Both Rivals

Comments: To: dick halpern <dhalpern@BELLSOUTH.NET>, AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To: <6.1.2.0.2.20041019210332.03074ec0@mail.atl.bellsouth.net>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Using the simple formula for the standard error of a proportion, I get =  
95%  
confidence intervals of plus or minus 3.03 for a 50% proportion with a  
sample of 1,048; for 931 observations I get plus or minus 3.2. Does =  
this  
mean that there was no weighting for random selection of individuals =  
within  
households, the number of telephones per household, or nonresponse; and =  
that  
there was no adjustment for design effects and weighting? Or perhaps we =  
are  
just dealing with a confidence level of less than 95%? It seems =  
unlikely to  
me that the numbers of 3% and 3% reflect any consideration beyond the =  
basic  
formula.

Can it really be that whatever response rate you get from a 4-day poll  
(given random selection within households) conducted on a weekend would =  
even  
reach double digits if it were calculated properly? And can it be that  
response rate really has no influence on the precision of the poll =  
results?

From the CBS News FAQ on methodology

(<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2001/07/02/opinion/main299401.shtml>):

-----

Do Our Respondents Look Like The American Public?=20

At the end of our surveys, we find sometimes that we have questioned too  
many people from one group or another. Older people, for example, tend =  
to be  
at home to answer the phone more than younger people, so there is often =  
a  
greater percentage of older people in our surveys than exists in the  
American public.=20

When that happens, we take great pains to adjust our data so that I accurately reflects the whole population. That process is called "weighting." We make sure that our final figures match U.S. Census = Bureau breakdowns on age, sex, race, education, and region of the country. We = also "weight" to adjust for the fact that people who share a phone with = others have less chance to be contacted than people who live alone and have = their own phones, and that households with more than one telephone number have more chances to be called than households with only one phone number.=20

So when we add up all the answers to our questions, we know that no = one's opinion counts for more than it should. When you see one of our poll = results on TV or in the newspaper, you know that it does not show the opinions = of only one or two groups of Americans.=20

-----

I will really try not to post excessively on this topic, but I just had = to point out a specific example. I don't mean to single out the = organization conducting the poll, you can find plenty of other examples all too = easily. Given the obvious importance of these polls to the decisions of voters, candidates, and who knows how many other interested parties, shouldn't = we expect the results to be reported with realistic confidence intervals? =20

John Rogers

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of dick halpern  
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2004 5:05 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Poll Shows Tie; Concerns Cited on Both Rivals

NY Times, October 19, 2004

SURVEYS

Poll Shows Tie; Concerns Cited on Both Rivals

By ADAM NAGOURNEY and JANET ELDER

[SNIP]

The poll found the two candidates each drawing 46 percent of all = registered voters in a head-to-head race. Among likely voters in a two-way race, = Mr. Bush has 47 percent, with 46 percent for Mr. Kerry.

The Times/CBS poll was conducted over the four days after Mr. Bush and = Mr. Kerry concluded the last of their three debates. Some other polls taken during that time have shown Mr. Bush in a slightly stronger position = among what they described as likely voters. The variations reflect the = difficulty of determining who is going to vote, particularly in a campaign in which both sides have invested so many resources in registering new voters.

[SNIP]

The Times/CBS News poll was taken nationwide of 1,048 Americans, = including 931 registered voters. It has a margin of sampling error of plus or = minus three percentage points for the entire sample and for registered voters.

[SNIP]

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

=====  
Date: Thu, 21 Oct 2004 00:22:38 -0400  
Reply-To: [plissner@verizon.net](mailto:plissner@verizon.net)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Martin Plissner <[plissner@VERIZON.NET](mailto:plissner@VERIZON.NET)>  
Subject: NYTimes.com Article: A Sham Election in Eastern Europe  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

The article below from NYTimes.com has been sent to you by [plissner@verizon.net](mailto:plissner@verizon.net).

This is one of numerous citations in American papers of an exit poll conducted last weekend in Belarus by "the Gallup organization." Its findings are said to dispute the sitting president's claim of victory for a referendum which would enable him to seek a third term. There is little detail about the poll in these reports, nor is there any reference to it on the Gallup website. Does anyone know how further information might be obtained?

Marty Plissner

plissner@verizon.net

/----- E-mail Sponsored by Fox Searchlight -----\

SIDEWAYS - OPENS IN NEW YORK AND LOS ANGELES OCT. 22

An official selection of the New York Film Festival and the Toronto International Film Festival, SIDEWAYS is the new comedy from Alexander Payne, director of ELECTION and ABOUT SCHMIDT. Starring Paul Giamatti, Thomas Haden Church, Sandra Oh and Virginia Madsen, SIDEWAYS opens in NY & LA October 22 and will expand across North America in November.

Watch the trailer at:

[http://www.foxsearchlight.com/sideways/index\\_nyt.html](http://www.foxsearchlight.com/sideways/index_nyt.html)

\-----/

A Sham Election in Eastern Europe

October 19, 2004

Aleksandr Lukashenko, the despotic president of Belarus and a former collective-farm manager, is not technically a Communist, but he did everything else by the old rules in his country's election on Sunday. Mr. Lukashenko did not even wait for the polls to close before he announced victory and told the West to keep its impending criticism to itself. The voting cleared the way for Mr. Lukashenko to stay on for a third five-year term after his current one expires in 2006. Not a single opposition candidate won a seat in the lower house of Parliament.

The big difference, compared with the bad old Soviet days, was that there were observers around to record how the election went.

An exit poll by the Gallup organization said the turnout had actually been less than the 50 percent required to change the election rules. Opposition deputies showed pictures of ballots with the "yes" ticked off before they were handed to voters.

What the vote did do, overwhelmingly, was to confirm Mr. Lukashenko as a post-Soviet autocrat. Following the new global template, Mr. Lukashenko said his "victory"

reflected his ability to provide security because no Belarussian had fallen victim to a terrorist act since he came to power 10 years ago. That was three years after Belarus declared independence, and Mr. Lukashenko quickly made sure he would stay in power, holding shady elections, violently attacking demonstrators, arresting opponents and closing independent media.

Few of the former Soviet republics have had an easy time, and many have succumbed to the allure of a strong ruler. But even in this company, Mr. Lukashenko has been especially brazen in his Stalinist methods. It is incumbent on the West to encourage the citizens of Belarus to seek better leadership.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/10/19/opinion/19tue3.html?ex=1099332557&ei=1&en=c87a9cadbec5128a>

-----  
Get Home Delivery of The New York Times Newspaper. Imagine reading The New York Times any time & anywhere you like! Leisurely catch up on events & expand your horizons. Enjoy now for 50% off Home Delivery! Click here:

<http://homedelivery.nytimes.com/HDS/SubscriptionT1.do?mode=SubscriptionT1&ExternalMediaCode=W24AF>

## HOW TO ADVERTISE

-----

For information on advertising in e-mail newsletters or other creative advertising opportunities with The New York Times on the Web, please contact [onlinesales@nytimes.com](mailto:onlinesales@nytimes.com) or visit our online media kit at <http://www.nytimes.com/adinfo>

For general information about NYTimes.com, write to [help@nytimes.com](mailto:help@nytimes.com).

Copyright 2004 The New York Times Company

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

---

Date: Thu, 21 Oct 2004 01:47:55 -0700  
Reply-To: [ellis.godard@csun.edu](mailto:ellis.godard@csun.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Ellis Godard <[ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU](mailto:ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU)>  
Subject: Zogby Satires

Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

NPR ran a fake ad today about a sitcom called The Zogbys, in which family members routinely cite poll numbers about every topic of discussion:

<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=4118995#email>

Letterman tonight included a fake ad about [www.zogby.com](http://www.zogby.com), where (it was said) you can learn that Kerry and Bush are neck and neck, and that American's love Zogby because he's "hunky" and other tongue-in-cheek adjectives.

-eg

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 21 Oct 2004 08:50:31 -0500  
Reply-To: Rob Daves <daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Rob Daves <daves@STARTRIBUNE.COM>  
Subject: Re: new use for pollsters  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu, dhenwood@PANIX.COM  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

Doug, and colleagues...

Using a poll to find "real" people is not really all that new.

The Minnesota Poll has for nearly two decades asked at the end of questionnaires if respondents would talk with reporters who sometimes want to interview people who have taken part in the poll, or if they would rather remain anonymous. Between a quarter and a third of respondents give us permission to allow reporters to call them.

This helps reporters be more parsimonious with their on-deadline time. But more importantly, including respondents in stories based on poll findings makes the story be more readable and interesting, and helps demonstrate to readers that the poll is, in fact, based on "real" people.

And we're not alone: Other media polls also use this technique.

We go to great lengths to protect respondents. I lecture reporters about making sure that they are "on the record" when they conduct their follow-up interview, and that they CANNOT use anything that the

respondent has told the interviewer, because we want to ensure respondent-researcher confidentiality. And obviously, before we archive our data with various organizations, we strip all identifying info such as phone number from records to protect respondent privacy.

All best wishes...

Rob Daves, director  
The Minnesota Poll

>>> Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM> 10/20/04 12:46PM >>>

A new use for pollsters: finding "real people" for reporters to talk to. This is from Matt Taibbi's series in New York Press which attempts to determine the worst campaign reporter of all <<http://www.nypress.com/17/42/news&columns/taibbi.cfm>>:

>Last week, I called Mark Schulman of SRBI, and asked him if his >agency ever provided Time with quotes from respondents in addition >to polling data. He said no, although this was possible ("provided >we get permission from the respondent"). However, he did note that >Time had recently asked his agency's help in recruiting "real >people" for its reporters to talk to.

>  
> "They said, 'We want to talk to some real people,'" he told me.

>  
> "They said that?" I asked. "Just like that? 'We want to talk to >real people?'"

>  
>"That's what they said," he replied. "I mean, it makes sense, >because there's the number, but the numbers aren't the people, of >course."

>  
>A striking thing for a pollster to say, one would think.

>  
> "So where do you go looking for real people?" I asked. "That can't be easy."

>  
>"Um, we just get them off the street," Schulman said. "Although in >this case, we just sort of called around, asked people we knew, and >they put us in touch with some women they knew in the Philadelphia >area."

>  
>The recruiting Schulman was referring to was actually for a Nancy >Gibbs piece ("What Do Women Want?" Oct. 11), to which Tumulty >contributed. This sounds like an up-and-coming trend to me: You get >the pollster to find "the people," leaving the reporter more time to >spend on the plane with the Louis Quatorze crowd. It saves time and >money, right?

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



-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
=====

Date: Thu, 21 Oct 2004 09:54:00 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Polls Apart  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Polls Apart  
By ANDREW KOHUT

<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/10/21/opinion/21kohut.html>

OP-ED CONTRIBUTOR

The round of national surveys taken after the third presidential debate indicates that the polls are not going to give us a clear picture of who will win the election until the final days of the campaign, if then. This is not because polling no longer works - it's because voter opinion is highly unstable. While many Americans are strongly committed to re-electing President Bush or getting rid of him, there remains a relatively large bloc of swing voters who are critical of the president but who still cannot comfortably back Senator John Kerry.

This cross-pressure remains the dilemma of millions of uncommitted voters.

After the second debate, the race was pretty much even, with some movement toward Mr. Kerry. This week the picture is much cloudier, even though voters thought Mr. Kerry won the third debate. The race remains tied in the New York Times/CBS News Poll and Pew Research Center surveys, but the president has moved to a significant lead in the Newsweek, Gallup and ABC News/Washington Post polls. Besides conflicting bottom lines, the surveys also provide an array of contradictory conclusions about voter opinions. Some suggest that the debates had no impact on the race, while others say they strengthened support for Mr. Kerry. Some find the president's approval score sinking; others have it stable. Some show a big advantage for Mr. Bush when the samples are narrowed from registered voters to likely voters. Others show a negligible Bush advantage or even a Kerry advantage.

SBIP

Finally, many experts have predicted that neither candidate will win a decisive victory. We might indeed have a razor-thin margin and even a replay of the disputed election of 2000. But the swings in sentiment in the polls have been so wide to suggest the possibility that one candidate could take a decisive lead by Election Day.

Or not.

Andrew Kohut is president of the Pew Research Center.

--

Leo G. Simonetta  
Research Director  
Art & Science Group, LLC  
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
Baltimore MD 21209

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

---

Date: Thu, 21 Oct 2004 16:33:17 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Subject: exit polls  
Comments: To: aapornet <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

What's the deal with exit polls this year, now that VNS is no more?

I'm hearing absolute horror stories about shenanigans in Florida - new registrations "disappearing," party IDs mysteriously shifting from D to R, absentee ballots rejected because sigs don't match those on record from 30 years earlier, etc. It's going to be very interesting to compare exit poll results with official counts in some states.

--

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>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

---

Date: Thu, 21 Oct 2004 14:20:26 -0700  
Reply-To: [stevej@NSDSSURVEY.ORG](mailto:stevej@NSDSSURVEY.ORG)  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Stephen M. Johnson" <stevej@NSDSSURVEY.ORG>  
Subject: Re: Followup on dentist survey, West Wing  
Comments: To: Colleen Porter <cporter@PHHP.UFL.EDU>  
Comments: cc: aapornet@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <s1767759.053@fuji.hp.ufl.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8bit

Colleen,  
The wonder of your story is that you actually got the last return. We once tried to survey dental hygienists and it was almost impossible. However, as far as the record goes. When I worked at Decision Research we had a survey on the danger of comets and other celestial bodies hitting the Earth that was in the journal of the Planetary Society. We were still getting returns more than 5 years later from places like Sri Lanka.  
Steve Johnson, Ph.D.  
President, Northwest Survey & Data Services

> Well, it looks like we finally got the last return on one of our dentist  
> surveys....about 2 years after the last wave of mailing:) That's a  
> career record for me. It's nice to know the peel-and-stick envelopes  
> still work after all that time.  
>  
> Also, I am looking forward to tonight's episode of West Wing, and  
> remembered that the last episode in May aired the Wednesday of the AAPOR  
> conference, and I watched it in Phoenix. That brought back warm  
> memories.  
>  
> Colleen  
>  
>  
>  
> Colleen K. Porter  
> cporter@phhp.ufl.edu  
> phone: 352\273-6068, fax: 352\273-6075  
> University of Florida  
> Dept. of Health Services Research, Management and Policy  
> Location: 101 Newell Drive, Rm. 4148  
> US Mail: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu  
>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
=====

Date: Thu, 21 Oct 2004 14:55:19 -0700  
Reply-To: "Pollack, Lance" <LPollack@PSG.UCSF.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Pollack, Lance" <LPollack@PSG.UCSF.EDU>  
Subject: Train Bombings and the Spanish Election  
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

With the recent release of surveillance video from a security camera at the Madrid train station, I was reminded of something that has bothered me all along. At the time of the election and since then I have heard various statements that the Spanish "caved in to terrorism" or that they voted the government out because of the bombing.

What has bothered me is that my impression all along had been that while the Spanish government backed the US effort in Iraq, the Spanish electorate was solidly against it. Given the first chance for the electorate to make known their opposition, the ruling party was going to be kicked out of office anyway. Did the polls indicate that, or am I wrong and the ruling party was actually leading prior to the bombing? What I question is the bombing leads to ouster assumption. Was there any polling done pre-bombing to answer this question?

Lance M. Pollack, Ph.D.  
Health Survey Research Unit (HSRU)  
University of California, San Francisco  
lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Fri, 22 Oct 2004 10:08:56 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Re: exit polls  
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <p0611040cbd9dcd0994e1@[192.168.0.17]>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Networks to test new exit polling system

By DAVID BAUDER  
Associated Press  
<http://www.sun-sentinel.com/news/local/southflorida/sfl-1013exitpolling,0,5905573.story?coll=sfla-home-headlines>

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

Baltimore MD 21209

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Doug Henwood

> Sent: Thursday, October 21, 2004 4:33 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: exit polls

>

> What's the deal with exit polls this year, now that VNS is no more?

>

> I'm hearing absolute horror stories about shenanigans in

> Florida - new registrations "disappearing," party IDs

> mysteriously shifting from D to R, absentee ballots rejected

> because sigs don't match those on record from 30 years

> earlier, etc. It's going to be very interesting to compare

> exit poll results with official counts in some states.

> --

>

> 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>

> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Fri, 22 Oct 2004 11:44:26 -0400

Reply-To: "Sand Mountain Comm." <sandmtn@MINDSPRING.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Sand Mountain Comm." <sandmtn@MINDSPRING.COM>

Subject: Early voting survey question language

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

My firm will conduct a survey on Sunday night for the upcoming elections.

The survey will be for a single county and we're interested in testing

whether people will "early vote" the week before the election.

We're struggling with the wording of the question and wonder if anyone on

the list has asked this recently and would be willing to share the wording

you used.

Todd Rehm

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Fri, 22 Oct 2004 18:50:39 -0400  
Reply-To: "Meekins, Brian - BLS" <Meekins.Brian@BLS.GOV>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Meekins, Brian - BLS" <Meekins.Brian@BLS.GOV>  
Subject: TSM II monograph abstract update  
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <aapornet@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

Notifications of receipt of the monograph abstracts for the Second Telephone Survey Methodology Conference have been sent out. For those of you who submitted, thank you for your interest. If you submitted an abstract but have not received notification from us, please contact Clyde Tucker immediately at [tucker\\_c@bls.gov](mailto:tucker_c@bls.gov).

Thanks.

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Fri, 22 Oct 2004 16:15:44 -0700  
Reply-To: Wei Yen <weiyen@UCLA.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Wei Yen <weiyen@UCLA.EDU>  
Subject: Job Opening  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Survey Manager, California Health Interview Survey (CHIS)

Job Description:

The Survey Manager is responsible for the development, production and dissemination California Health Interview Survey (CHIS) data files. The Survey Manager is a member of the CHIS senior management team and a research scientist in the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research.

CHIS is one of the nation's largest ongoing biennial health surveys. It is conducted by the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research in collaboration with the California Department of Health Services and the Public Health Institute.

Under general direction of the Director of CHIS, the Survey Manager is

responsible for ensuring that data file production timelines are met, reports are filed, and all contractual obligations relating to the survey data file production deliverables are completed. The Survey Manager is also expected to contribute, as needed, to the CHIS sample re-design and response rate improvement techniques and collaborate with the senior statistician and statistical consultants on issues of statistical design, data analysis, and other data issues.

The Survey Manager works closely with the Principal Investigator, Co-Investigators, Director and representatives from federal agencies, state agencies and private non-profit research organizations on the timelines and courses of action for the research process, the validity of survey results and quality control issues, and any programmatic discussions which could result in changes to the scope of work of the project. The Survey Manager directly supervises research, programming and technical assistance staff. Presentation and participation in professional meetings and publication of articles and reports are strongly encouraged.

#### Qualifications:

Doctoral or masters degree in a social science or other relevant field or equivalent experience is essential.

Candidates require demonstrated experience working with complex surveys and large data sets in survey data file production: variable construction, file management, confidentiality analysis, technical documentation, data cleaning and editing, quality control, weighting of sample data, calculation of response rates, imputation of missing values and data file dissemination. Demonstrated knowledge of statistical methods and data collection techniques related to the administration of survey projects. Excellent computer skills required in statistical programming, data management, spreadsheets, and word processing. Must be highly experienced with SAS.

Previous supervisory experience, including demonstrated ability to develop, plan and direct the work of various levels of support staff, and to provide technical advice and supervision, problem resolution, and review of and feedback on quality of work. Excellent writing and analytic skills; writing examples will be requested. Excellent oral presentation skills. Demonstrated ability to work in a team and take initiative.

#### Compensation:

Salary: \$4,550 to \$8,192 monthly, dependent on experience. Excellent benefits. Equal Opportunity Employer.

#### How to Apply:

Please submit letter of application and resume to Karen Markus, Personnel Manager, UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, 10911 Weyburn Avenue, Suite 300, Los Angeles, CA 90024 (Campus Mail Code 714346). Resumes may be faxed to (310) 794-2686 or emailed to [kmarkus@ucla.edu](mailto:kmarkus@ucla.edu).

-----

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Sat, 23 Oct 2004 14:18:27 -0700  
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>  
Subject: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll  
Comments: To: Warren Gold <WGold@itsa.ucsf.edu>,  
Ariya Sasaki <AriyaLove2004@aol.com>,  
Karen Leonard <karen153@adelphia.net>,  
mickeyhuff@mac.com, Peter Phillips <peter.phillips@sonoma.edu>,  
Suzanne Grady <suziandchuck@yahoo.com>  
Comments: cc: Steven Kull <pipa@his.com>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Date: October 23, 2004

To: Retro Poll supporters and other interested persons

After my brief comment, you will find useful reports (links) on newly released polls by PIPA and Pew Foundation

We are pleased to report that the polls of PIPA (The Program in Policy Alternatives at the University of Maryland) continue to expand on the preliminary work we began in 2002 on the connection between support for the war in Iraq and belief in the Bush Administration's various fabricated pronouncements such as that Saddam had weapons of mass destruction and was connected to Al Qaeda and the 9/11 attack. We only regret that Steven Kull, PIPA's director, chose from the beginning not to credit us for pioneering that work (he knew of our efforts) because, had he done so, Retro Poll might be garnering more attention for its important work. Retro Poll's approach tends to address more fundamental issues, problems, and institutions within media and contemporary culture than does PIPA. PIPA, as David Peterson points out below, tends to view the poles of the playing field as between Republican liars and Democrat truth sayers. Though obviously the most egregious lying has been coming from the White House in these recent years, the problems of U.S. democracy can not be so easily described by such a limited paradigm. The role of culture and media in sculpting information to meet ideological needs must be made transparent if democracy is to survive and thrive in the U.S. Most corporate polls support the work of corporate media and thus tend to do the opposite-i.e. bolster the charade of objectivity. This problem will remain no matter who accedes to the Presidency on November 2. We applaud PIPA and encourage them to continue to expand their good work that earlier showed that people who get their news and information from the major TV networks tend to be particularly ignorant of actual facts, more for Fox viewers but for all the other TV networks as well.

Marc Sapir MD, MPH



Executive Director  
Retro Poll  
www.retropoll.org

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

From: davidepet [mailto:davidepet@comcast.net]  
Sent: Saturday, October 23, 2004 6:47 AM  
To: davidepet@comcast.net  
Subject: RE: A HANDFUL OF ITEMS FOR YOU

Dear Friends:

FYI: Both the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press and the Program on International Policy Attitudes have released new reports on American beliefs and attitudes in the past three days.

Democrats, <<http://people-press.org/reports/pdf/229.pdf>> Blacks Less Confident in Accurate Vote Count. Race Tightens Again, Kerry's Image Improves, Andrew Kohut et al., Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, October 20, 2004 (and the accompanying---and itself lengthy---media release, "Race <<http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?ReportID=229>> Tightens Again, Kerry's Image Improves")

The Separate Realities of Bush and Kerry Supporters <[http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres\\_Election\\_04/Report10\\_21\\_04.pdf](http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres_Election_04/Report10_21_04.pdf)> , Steven Kull et al., Program on International <<http://www.pipa.org/index.html>> Policy Attitudes, October 21, 2004 (and the accompanying Media Release <[http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres\\_Election\\_04/Press10\\_21\\_04.pdf](http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres_Election_04/Press10_21_04.pdf)> )

Also FYI, here's a couple of links to mainstream news media reports on the PIPA findings---relatively rare occasions for PIPA, whose work is generally greeted by silence.

"Divide Seen in Voter Knowledge <[http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2004/10/22/divide\\_seen\\_in\\_voter\\_knowledge/](http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2004/10/22/divide_seen_in_voter_knowledge/)> ," Boston Globe, October 22, 2004

"How Americans view Bush and Kerry on foreign policy <<http://www.csmonitor.com/2004/1022/p03s01-uspo.html>> ," Howard LaFranchi, Christian Science Monitor, October 22, 2004

Last, here's a link to a long article from last Sunday's New York Times Magazine, on some of the fundamentalist strains operating within the American political culture. (The Iranian mullahs have nothing on the Americans.)

"Without a Doubt

<<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/10/17/magazine/17BUSH.html?oref=login>>,"

Ron Suskind, New York Times Magazine, October 17, 2004

All in all, what might one glean from the findings? Consider the following statement from the Pew report:

Supporters of Bush and Kerry offer very different reasons for why they want to see their candidate elected. For Bush voters, positive assessments of the president's character are mentioned nearly as often as his stance on the issues, while for Kerry voters issues are predominant.

PIPA's report focuses on this feature of the political culture, and PIPA's Steven Kull even uses the phrase "resistance to information" to characterize the seemingly unshakable foundations of Bush's base of supporters---no matter what facts enter into circulation regarding its actual conduct during the past four years.

But this grants far too much to Kerry's supporters, I'm afraid. And PIPA's report is misleading to the extent it states or suggests that support for Kerry follows from the Kerry campaign's focus on issues as opposed to images.

My own personal view is that both campaigns have been designed to keep issues off the table. (For those of you still paying attention, this is where the critique of power and ideology ought to take the place of opinion surveys and punditry---and include opinion surveys and punditry right alongside political campaigns under its microscope.)

Still. Overall, the superiority of the PIPA material is pretty obvious. (In my opinion.)

Sincerely Yours,

David Peterson

davidepet@comcast.net

PS. Apologies for any links that may require you to register before accessing them. Should any of the links to the general media fail, feel free to ask me for copies of the articles, all three of which I can easily forward. (Including Ron Suskind's piece dated Oct. 17, which is approx. 8,000 words in all, and a pain in the neck to access via the format used by the NYTimes's archive. Presuming you can even access it.)

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Sat, 23 Oct 2004 19:55:59 -0400

Reply-To: Gary Andres <[Gary.Andres@DUTKOGROUP.COM](mailto:Gary.Andres@DUTKOGROUP.COM)>

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

From: Gary Andres <[Gary.Andres@DUTKOGROUP.COM](mailto:Gary.Andres@DUTKOGROUP.COM)>

Subject: Re: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll



QGNvbWNhc3QubmV0IA0KCVN1YmplY3Q6IFJFOiBBIEhBTkrGVUwgT0YgSVRFTVMgRk9SIFIPVSAN  
Cg0KCURIYXlRnJpZW5kczogDQoNCgkgICAgRllJOiBCb3RoIHRoZSBQZXcgUmVzZWZyY2ggQ2Vu  
dGVyIGZvcilB0aGUgUGVvcGxlIGFuZCB0aGUgUHFJlc3MgYw5kIA0KCXRoZSBQcm9ncmFtIG9uIElu  
dGVybmF0aW9uYwUgUG9saWN5IEF0dG10dWRlcyBoYXZlIHJlbGVhc2VkdG5ldyByZXBvcnRzIA0K  
CW9uIEFtZXJpY2FuIGJlbGllZnMgYW5kIGF0dG10dWRlcyBpbilB0aGUgcGFzdCB0aHJlZSBkYXlz  
LiANCg0KDQoJRGVtb2NyYXRzLCA8aHR0cDovL3Blb3BsZS1wcmVzcy5vcmevcmVwb3J0cy9wZGYv  
MjI5LnBkZj4gIEJ5YWNrcyBMZXNzIA0KCUNvbmZpZGVudCBpbilBbY2N1cmF0ZSBWb3RIENvdW50  
LiAgUmFjZSBUaWdodGVucyBBZ2FpbwgsS2VycnkncyBjBWFnZSANCglJbXByb3ZlcywgQW5kcmV3  
IETvaHV0IGV0IGFsLiwgUGV3IFJlc2VhcmNoIENlbnRlciBmb3IgdGhlIFBib3BsZSBhbmQgDQoJ  
dGhlIFByZXNzLCBPY3RvYmVyIDIwLCAyMDA0IChhbmQgdGhlIGFjY29tcGFueWluZy0tLWFuZCBp  
dHNlbgYgDQoJbGVuZ3RoeS0tLW1lZGllHJlbGVhc2UsICJSYWNlIA0KCTxodHRwOi8vcGVvcGxl  
LXByZXNzLm9yZy9yZXBvcnRzL2Rpc3BsYXkucGhwMz9SZXBvcnRJRd0yMjk+ICBUaWdodGVucyAN  
CglBZ2FpbwgsS2VycnkncyBjBWFnZSBjXByb3ZlcyIpIA0KDQoJVGHlIFNlcGFyYXRlIFJlYXp  
dGlscyBvZiBCdXNoIGFuZCBLZXJyeSBTdXBwb3J0ZXJzIA0KCTxodHRwOi8vd3d3LnBpcGEub3Jn  
L09ubGluZVJlcG9ydHMvUHJlc19FbGVjdGlvlb8wNC9SZXBvcnRzMF8yMV8wNC5wZGY+IA0KCSwg  
U3RldmVuIEt1bGwgZXQgYWwuLW5kcm9ncmFtIG9uIEludGVybmF0aW9uYwUgDQoJPGh0dHA6Ly93  
d3cucGluYS5vcmevaW5kZXguaHRtbD4gIFBvbjEgSBbHRpdHVkZXMsIE9jdG9iZXIgmJEsIDIw  
MDQgDQoJKGFuZCB0aGUgYWNjb21wYW55aW5nIE1lZGllHJlbGVhc2UgDQoJPGh0dHA6Ly93d3cu  
cGluYS5vcmevT25saW5lUmVwb3J0cy9QcmVzX0VsZWN0aW9uXzA0L1ByZXNzMTBfMjFfMDQucGRm  
PiApIA0KDQoNCg0KCSAgICBBbHNvIEZZSSwgaGVyZSdzIGegY29lcGxlIG9mIGxpbmtzIHRvIG1h  
aW5zdHJlYW0gbmV3cyBtZWRpYSBYb3ZXBvcnRzIA0KCVN1YHRoZSBQSVBBIgZpbmRpbmdzLS0tcmVs  
YXRpdmVseSBYXlIG9jY2FzaW9ucyBmb3IgdG9iZD4gYmVudG9yZ29yayBpcyANCglnZW5lcmFs  
bHkgZ3JlZXRlZCBieSBzaWxlbmNlLiANCg0KDQoJlRpdmlkZSBTZWVvUIGluIFZvdGVyIETub3ds  
ZWRnZSANCgk8aHR0cDovL3d3dy5ib3N0b24uY29tL25ld3MvbmF0aW9uL3dhc2hpbmd0b24vYXJ0  
aWNSZXMvMjAwNC8xMC8yMi9kaXZpZGUgDQoJX3NlZW5faW5fdm90ZXJfa25vd2xlZGdlLz4gLCIG  
Qm9zdG9uIEdsb2JlCBPY3RvYmVyIDIwLCAyMDA0IA0KDQoJlkhvdyBBbWVyaWNhbnMgdmllldyBC  
dXNoIGFuZCBLZXJyeSBvbiBmb3JlaWduIHVvbjEgSBbHR0cDovL3d3dy5jc21vbml0b3lu  
Y29tLzIwMDQvMTAyMi9wMDNzMDEtdXNwby5odG1sPiAsIiBib3dhcmQgDQoJTGFGemFuY2hpLCBD  
aHJpc3RyYw4gU2NpZW5jZSBnb25pdG9yLCBPY3RvYmVyIDIwLCAyMDA0IA0KDQoNCgkgICAgTGfz  
dCwgaGVyZSdzIGegBgluayB0byBhIGxvbmcyYXJ0aWNSZSBmcm9tIGxhc3QgU3VuZGF5J3MgTmV3  
IFlvcmsgDQoJVGlZXMgTWFnYXppbmUsIG9uIHVvWUgb2YgdGhlIGZ1bWRhbWVudGFsaXN0IHN0  
cmFpbmMg3BlcmF0aW5nIHdpdGhpbilANCgl0aGUgUgQW1lcmlyYw4gcG9saXRpY2FsIGN1bHR1cmUu  
ICAoVGHlIElyYw5pYw4gbXVsbGFocyBoYXZlIG5vdGhpbmcm9tIG9uZDQoJdGhlIEFtZXJpY2Fucy4p  
IA0KDQoNCgkiV2l0aG91dCBhIERvdWJ0IA0KCTxodHRwOi8vd3d3Lm55dGltZXMuY29tLzIwMDQv  
MTAvMTcvbWFnYXppbmUvMTdCVVNlMh0bWw/b3JlZj1sb2dpcj4gLCIGDQoJU9uIFNlc2tpbmQs  
IE5ldyBZb3JrIFRpbWVzeIE1hZ2F6aW5lLCBPY3RvYmVyIDE3LCAyMDA0IA0KDQoNCgkgICAgQWxs  
IGluIGFsbcwgd2hhdCBtaWdodCBvbmUgZ2xlYW4gZnJvbSB0aGUgZmluZGluZ3M/ICBDb25zaWRl  
ciB0aGUgDQoJZm9sbG93aW5nIHN0YXRlBWVudCBmcm9tIHRoZSBQZXcgcmVwb3J0OiANCg0KCVN1  
cHBvcnRlcnMg2YgQnVzaCBhbmQgS2Vycnkcb2ZmZXIgdMvYySBkaWZmZXJlbnQgemVhc29ucyBm  
b3Igd2h5IHRoZXRkdQoJd2FudCB0byBzZwUgdGhlaXlY2FuZGkYXRlIGVsZWN0ZWQuIEZvcilBC  
dXNoIHZvdGVycywgcG9zaXRpdmUgDQoJYXNzZXNzbWVudHMg2YgdGhlIHByZXNpZGVudCdzIGNo  
YXJhY3RlciBhemUgbWVudGlvbmVklG5lYXJseSBhcyBvZnRlbiANCglhcyBoaXMgc3RhbmlIG9u  
IHRoZSBpc3N1ZXMsIHdoaWxlIGZvcilBLZXJyeSB2b3RlcnMgaXNzdWVzIGFyZSANCglwcmVkb21p  
bmFudC4gDQoNCgkgICAgUElQSSdzIHJlcG9ydCBmb2N1c2VzIG9uIHRoZXNzZmVhdHVyZSBvZiB0  
aGUgcG9saXRpY2FsIGN1bHR1cmUslGFuZCANCglQSVBBj3MgU3RldmVuIEt1bGwgZXZlbiB1c2Vz  
IHRoZSBwaHJhc2UgInJlc2lzdGFuY2UgdG8gaW5mb3JtYXRpb24iIHRvIA0KCVN1YXJhY3Rlcm16  
ZSB0aGUgc2VlbWluZ2x5IHVuc2hha2FibGUgZm91bWRhdGlvbnMg2YgQnVzaCdzIGJhc2Ugb2Yg  
DQoJc3VwcG9ydGVycy0tLW5vIG1hdHRlciB3aGF0IGZhY3RzIGVudGVyIGluZG8gY2lyY3VsYXRp  
b24gcmVnYXJkaW5nIGl0cyANCglhY3R1YWwgY29uZHVjdCBkdXJpbmcm9tIGhIHhbc3QgZm91ciB5  
ZWZyY34gDQoJICAgIEJldCB0aGlZIGdyYW50cyBmYXlGdG9vIG11Y2ggdG8gS2VycnkncyBzdXBw  
b3J0ZXJzLCBJJ20gYwZyYwWkLiAgQW5kIA0KCVBJUEEncyByZXBvcnRzQgaXMGbWlzbGVhZGluZyB0  
byB0aGUgZXh0ZW50IGl0IHN0YXRlcyBvciBzdWdnZXN0cyB0aGF0IA0KCVN1cHBvcnRzQgZm9yIEt1  
cnJlZGZvbGxvd3MgZnJvbSB0aGUgS2VycnkcyY2FtcGFpZ24ncyBmb2N1cyBvbiBpc3N1ZXMGYXMG  
DQoJb3Bwb3NlZCB0byBpbWFnZXMuIA0KCSAgICBNesBvd24gcGVyc29uYwUgdmlldyBpcyB0aGF0

IGJvdGggY2FtcGFpZ25zIGhhdmUgYmVlbiBkZXNpZ25lZCB0byANCglrZWVwIGlzc3VlcyBvZmYg  
dGhlIHRhYmxlLiAgKEZvciB0aG9zZSBvZiB5b3Ugc3RpbGwgcGF5aW5nIGF0dGVudGlvbiwgDQoJ  
dGhpcyBpcyB3aGVyZSB0aGUgY3JpdGlxdWUgb2YgcG93ZXIgaW5kIGlkZW9sb2d5IG91Z2h0IHRv  
IHRha2UgdGhlIHhsYWNlIA0KCW9mIG9waW5pb24gc3VydmV5cyBhbmQgcHVuZG10cnktLS1hbmQg  
aW5jbHVkZSBvcGluaW9uIHN1cnZleXMgYmY5kIA0KCXB1bmRpdHJ5IHJpZ2h0IGFsb25nc2lkZSBw  
b2xpdGljYWwgY2FtcGFpZ25zIHVuzGVyIGl0cyBtaWNYb3Njb3BILikgDQoJICAgIFN0aWxsLiAg  
T3ZlcmFsbCwgdGhlIHN1cGVyaW9yaXR5IG9mIHRoZSBQSVBBIG1hdGVyaWFsIGlzIHByZXR0eSAN  
CglvYnZpb3VzLiAgKEluIG15IG9waW5pb24uKSANCg0KCVNpbmNlcmVseSBZb3VycywgDQoJRGF2  
aWQgUGV0ZXJzb24gDQoJZGF2aWRlcGV0QGNvbWNhc3QubmV0IA0KDQoJUfMuIEFwb2xvZ2llcyBm  
b3IgaW55IGxpbtzIHRoYXQgbWF5IHJlcXVpcmUgeW91IHRvIHJlZ2lzdGVyIGJlZm9yZSANCglh  
Y2Nlc3NpbmcdGhls4gIFNob3VsZCBhbngb2YgdGhlIGxpbtzIHRvIHRoZSBnZW5lcmFsIG1l  
ZGhlIGZhaWwsIGZlZWwgDQoJZnJlZSB0byBhc2sgbWUgZm9yIGNvcGlscyBvZiB0aGUgYXJ0aWNs  
ZXMsIGFsbCB0aHJlZSBvZiB3aGljaCBJIGNhbiANCglYXNpbHkgZm9yd2FyZC4gIChJbmNsdWRp  
bmcgUm9uIFN1c2tpbmQncyBwaWVjZSBkYXRlZCBPY3QuIDE3LCB3aGljaCBpcyANCglhcHB3gu  
IDgsMDAwIHdvcnRzIGluIGFsbCwgcW5kIGEgcGFpbjBpbjB0aGUgUgVjY2Nlc3Mgdmllh  
IHRoZSANCglmb3JtYXQgdXNlZCBieSB0aGUgTlUaW1lcyczIGFyY2hpdmUuICBQcmVzdW1pbmccg  
eW91IGNhbiBlcmVuzGVyY2VzcyANCglpC4pIA0KDQoNCgktLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0t  
LS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0tLS0t  
YXN1LmVkdS9hemNoaXZlcy9hYXBvcmlkC5odG1sIA0KCVBsZWZzZSBhc2sgYXV0aG9ycyBiZWZv  
cmUgcXVvdGluZyBvdXRzaWRlIEFBUE9STkVULiANCglQcm9ibGVtcz8tZG9uJ3QgcmVwbHkgdG8g  
dGhpcyBtZXNzYWdlLCB3cm10ZSB0bzogYWFwb3JuZXQtcmlkZmVzdWVzdEBhc3UuZWR1IA0KDQo=

---

Date: Sat, 23 Oct 2004 19:06:31 -0700  
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>  
Subject: Re: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll  
Comments: To: Gary Andres <Gary.Andres@DUTKOGROUP.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <11122210225B5D47B9AAD73A7320B50001C27D85@dutsrdc002814>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I'd just like to know how many people on the AAPOR list actually believe that this comment by Gary Andres is a more appropriate form of discourse for us than what I just posted. Talk about unprofessional. This country is headed for a meltdown because of people who think they can use intimidation like that. (And for the record and Gary's benefit, I consistently get more positive feedback than negative from members of the list. I am profoundly grateful to have the opportunity to be involved in this dialogue, and I respond to people who disagree with me as well as to those who agree. I plan to continue).

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

-----Original Message-----  
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Gary Andres  
Sent: Saturday, October 23, 2004 3:56 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll

Marc: I think a number of people are fed up with your left wing, political bullshit filling our inboxes. Please reserve the AAPORNET list for serious discussion about issues that real professionals care about, not your politically motivated hate mail that reflect your partisan views.

Thanks.

Gary Andres

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

From: AAPORNET on behalf of Marc Sapir

Sent: Sat 10/23/2004 5:18 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Cc:

Subject: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll

Date: October 23, 2004

To: Retro Poll supporters and other interested persons

After my brief comment, you will find useful reports (links) on newly released polls by PIPA and Pew Foundation

We are pleased to report that the polls of PIPA (The Program in Policy Alternatives at the University of Maryland) continue to expand on the preliminary work we began in 2002 on the connection between support for the war in Iraq and belief in the Bush Administration's various fabricated pronouncements such as that Saddam had weapons of mass

destruction and was connected to Al Qaeda and the 9/11 attack. We only regret that Steven Kull, PIPA's director, chose from the beginning not to credit us for pioneering that work (he knew of our efforts) because, had he done so, Retro Poll might be garnering more attention for its important work. Retro Poll's approach tends to address more fundamental issues, problems, and institutions within media and contemporary culture than does PIPA. PIPA, as David Peterson points out below, tends to view the poles of the playing field as between Republican liars and Democrat

truth sayers. Though obviously the most egregious lying has been coming from the White House in these recent years, the problems of U.S.

democracy can not be so easily described by such a limited paradigm.

The role of culture and media in sculpting information to meet ideological needs must be made transparent if democracy is to survive and thrive in the U.S. Most corporate polls support the work of

corporate media and thus tend to do the opposite-i.e. bolster the

charade of objectivity. This problem will remain no matter who accedes

to the Presidency on November 2. We applaud PIPA and encourage them to

continue to expand their good work that earlier showed that people who

get their news and information from the major TV networks tend to be

particularly ignorant of actual facts, more for Fox viewers but for all

the other TV networks as well.

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

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

From: davidepet [mailto:davidepet@comcast.net]

Sent: Saturday, October 23, 2004 6:47 AM

To: davidepet@comcast.net

Subject: RE: A HANDFUL OF ITEMS FOR YOU

Dear Friends:

FYI: Both the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press and the Program on International Policy Attitudes have released new reports on American beliefs and attitudes in the past three days.

Democrats, <<http://people-press.org/reports/pdf/229.pdf>> Blacks Less

Confident in Accurate Vote Count. Race Tightens Again, Kerry's Image

Improves, Andrew Kohut et al., Pew Research Center for the People and

the Press, October 20, 2004 (and the accompanying---and itself lengthy---media release, "Race

<<http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?ReportID=229>>

Tightens

Again, Kerry's Image Improves")

The Separate Realities of Bush and Kerry Supporters

<[http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres\\_Election\\_04/Report10\\_21\\_04.pdf](http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres_Election_04/Report10_21_04.pdf)>

, Steven Kull et al., Program on International

<<http://www.pipa.org/index.html>> Policy Attitudes, October 21,

2004

(and the accompanying Media Release

<[http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres\\_Election\\_04/Press10\\_21\\_04.pdf](http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres_Election_04/Press10_21_04.pdf)> )

Also FYI, here's a couple of links to mainstream news media reports on the PIPA findings---relatively rare occasions for PIPA, whose work is generally greeted by silence.

"Divide Seen in Voter Knowledge

<<http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2004/10/22/divide>

[\\_seen\\_in\\_voter\\_knowledge/](http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2004/10/22/divide)>," Boston Globe, October 22, 2004

"How Americans view Bush and Kerry on foreign policy

<<http://www.csmonitor.com/2004/1022/p03s01-uspo.html>>," Howard LaFranchi, Christian Science Monitor, October 22, 2004

Last, here's a link to a long article from last Sunday's New York Times Magazine, on some of the fundamentalist strains operating within the American political culture. (The Iranian mullahs have nothing on the Americans.)

"Without a Doubt

<<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/10/17/magazine/17BUSH.html?oref=login>>,"

Ron Suskind, New York Times Magazine, October 17, 2004

All in all, what might one glean from the findings? Consider the following statement from the Pew report:

Supporters of Bush and Kerry offer very different reasons for



why they  
want to see their candidate elected. For Bush voters, positive  
assessments of the president's character are mentioned nearly as  
often  
as his stance on the issues, while for Kerry voters issues are  
predominant.

PIPA's report focuses on this feature of the political  
culture, and  
PIPA's Steven Kull even uses the phrase "resistance to  
information" to  
characterize the seemingly unshakable foundations of Bush's base  
of  
supporters---no matter what facts enter into circulation  
regarding its  
actual conduct during the past four years.

But this grants far too much to Kerry's supporters, I'm  
afraid. And  
PIPA's report is misleading to the extent it states or suggests  
that  
support for Kerry follows from the Kerry campaign's focus on  
issues as  
opposed to images.

My own personal view is that both campaigns have been  
designed to  
keep issues off the table. (For those of you still paying  
attention,  
this is where the critique of power and ideology ought to take  
the place  
of opinion surveys and punditry---and include opinion surveys  
and  
punditry right alongside political campaigns under its  
microscope.)

Still. Overall, the superiority of the PIPA material is  
pretty  
obvious. (In my opinion.)

Sincerely Yours,  
David Peterson  
davidepet@comcast.net

PS. Apologies for any links that may require you to register  
before  
accessing them. Should any of the links to the general media  
fail, feel  
free to ask me for copies of the articles, all three of which I  
can  
easily forward. (Including Ron Suskind's piece dated Oct. 17,  
which is  
approx. 8,000 words in all, and a pain in the neck to access via  
the  
format used by the NYTimes's archive. Presuming you can even  
access  
it.)

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

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

Date: Sun, 24 Oct 2004 00:28:48 -0400  
Reply-To: JP Murphy <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: JP Murphy <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Subject: Re: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll  
Comments: To: Marc Sapir <[marcsapir@COMCAST.NET](mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Marc --

I always read your postings and consider them valuable contributions to =  
AAPORNET. They appear to be offered in a spirit of friendly =  
colleagueship and are well reasoned and often persuasive. It is an =  
embarrassment for me as a member of this list to read Gary's comment. =  
(It's Saturday evening -- maybe he was drunk? A Cardinals fan?)=20

I occasionally criticize arguments and remarks with which I disagree but =  
hope that nothing I write is ever found to be as ugly and belligerent as =  
this. It's inconceivable to me that it represents thinking shared by =  
anyone else on this list. Maybe, as a political lobbyist, it's his job =  
to be this way. Not a job I'd care to have!

JIM MURPHY

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY  
Post Office Box 80484  
Valley Forge, Pennsylvania 19484-0484 USA  
(610) 408-8800  
[www.jpmmurphy.com](http://www.jpmmurphy.com)=20

----- Original Message -----=20  
From: Marc Sapir=20  
To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)=20  
Sent: Saturday, October 23, 2004 10:06 PM  
Subject: Re: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll

I'd just like to know how many people on the AAPOR list actually believe that this comment by Gary Andres is a more appropriate form of discourse for us than what I just posted. Talk about unprofessional. This country is headed for a meltdown because of people who think they can use intimidation like that. (And for the record and Gary's benefit, I consistently get more positive feedback than negative from members of the list. I am profoundly grateful to have the opportunity to be involved in this dialogue, and I respond to people who disagree with me as well as to those who agree. I plan to continue).

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

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Gary Andres  
Sent: Saturday, October 23, 2004 3:56 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll

Marc: I think a number of people are fed up with your left wing, political bullshit filling our inboxes. Please reserve the AAPORNET list for serious discussion about issues that real professionals care about, not your politically motivated hate mail that reflect your partisan views.

Thanks.

Gary Andres

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

From: AAPORNET on behalf of Marc Sapir  
Sent: Sat 10/23/2004 5:18 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Cc:  
Subject: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll

Date: October 23, 2004

To: Retro Poll supporters and other interested persons

After my brief comment, you will find useful reports (links) on newly released polls by PIPA and Pew Foundation

We are pleased to report that the polls of PIPA (The Program in Policy

Alternatives at the University of Maryland) continue to expand on the preliminary work we began in 2002 on the connection between support for the war in Iraq and belief in the Bush Administration's various fabricated pronouncements such as that Saddam had weapons of mass

destruction and was connected to Al Qaeda and the 9/11 attack. We only regret that Steven Kull, PIPA's director, chose from the beginning not to credit us for pioneering that work (he knew of our efforts) because, had he done so, Retro Poll might be garnering more attention for its important work. Retro Poll's approach tends to address more fundamental issues, problems, and institutions within media and contemporary culture than does PIPA. PIPA, as David Peterson points out below, tends to view the poles of the playing field as between Republican liars and Democrat truth sayers. Though obviously the most egregious lying has been coming from the White House in these recent years, the problems of U.S.

democracy can not be so easily described by such a limited paradigm.

The role of culture and media in sculpting information to meet ideological needs must be made transparent if democracy is to survive and thrive in the U.S. Most corporate polls support the work of

corporate media and thus tend to do the opposite-i.e. bolster the charade of objectivity. This problem will remain no matter who accedes to the Presidency on November 2. We applaud PIPA and encourage them to continue to expand their good work that earlier showed that people who get their news and information from the major TV networks tend to be particularly ignorant of actual facts, more for Fox viewers but for all the other TV networks as well.

Marc Sapir MD, MPH  
Executive Director  
Retro Poll  
[www.retropoll.org](http://www.retropoll.org)

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

From: davidepet [mailto:davidepet@comcast.net]  
Sent: Saturday, October 23, 2004 6:47 AM  
To: davidepet@comcast.net  
Subject: RE: A HANDFUL OF ITEMS FOR YOU

Dear Friends:

FYI: Both the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press and the Program on International Policy Attitudes have released new reports on American beliefs and attitudes in the past three days.

Democrats, <<http://people-press.org/reports/pdf/229.pdf>> Blacks Less Confident in Accurate Vote Count. Race Tightens Again, Kerry's Image Improves, Andrew Kohut et al., Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, October 20, 2004 (and the accompanying---and itself lengthy---media release, "Race <<http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?ReportID=3D229>> Tightens Again, Kerry's Image Improves")

The Separate Realities of Bush and Kerry Supporters

<[http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres\\_Election\\_04/Report10\\_21\\_04.pdf](http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres_Election_04/Report10_21_04.pdf)> , Steven Kull et al., Program on International <<http://www.pipa.org/index.html>> Policy Attitudes, October 21, 2004 (and the accompanying Media Release

<[http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres\\_Election\\_04/Press10\\_21\\_04.pdf](http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres_Election_04/Press10_21_04.pdf)> )

Also FYI, here's a couple of links to mainstream news media reports on the PIPA findings---relatively rare occasions for PIPA, whose work is generally greeted by silence.

"Divide Seen in Voter Knowledge

<[http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2004/10/22/divide\\_\\_seen\\_in\\_voter\\_knowledge/](http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2004/10/22/divide__seen_in_voter_knowledge/)> , " Boston Globe, October 22, 2004

"How Americans view Bush and Kerry on foreign policy <<http://www.csmonitor.com/2004/1022/p03s01-uspo.html>> , " Howard

LaFranchi, Christian Science Monitor, October 22, 2004

Last, here's a link to a long article from last Sunday's New York Times Magazine, on some of the fundamentalist strains operating within the American political culture. (The Iranian mullahs have nothing on the Americans.)

"Without a Doubt

<<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/10/17/magazine/17BUSH.html?oref=3Dlogin>> ,"  
Ron Suskind, New York Times Magazine, October 17, 2004

All in all, what might one glean from the findings?  
Consider the following statement from the Pew report:

Supporters of Bush and Kerry offer very different reasons for why they want to see their candidate elected. For Bush voters, positive assessments of the president's character are mentioned nearly as often as his stance on the issues, while for Kerry voters issues are predominant.

PIPA's report focuses on this feature of the political culture, and PIPA's Steven Kull even uses the phrase "resistance to information" to characterize the seemingly unshakable foundations of Bush's base of supporters---no matter what facts enter into circulation regarding its actual conduct during the past four years.

But this grants far too much to Kerry's supporters, I'm afraid. And PIPA's report is misleading to the extent it states or suggests that support for Kerry follows from the Kerry campaign's focus on issues as opposed to images.

My own personal view is that both campaigns have been designed to keep issues off the table. (For those of you still paying attention, this is where the critique of power and ideology ought to take the place of opinion surveys and punditry---and include opinion surveys and

punditry right alongside political campaigns under its microscope.)

Still. Overall, the superiority of the PIPA material is pretty obvious. (In my opinion.)

Sincerely Yours,  
David Peterson  
davidepet@comcast.net

PS. Apologies for any links that may require you to register before accessing them. Should any of the links to the general media fail, feel free to ask me for copies of the articles, all three of which I can easily forward. (Including Ron Suskind's piece dated Oct. 17, which is approx. 8,000 words in all, and a pain in the neck to access via the format used by the NYTimes's archive. Presuming you can even access it.)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:

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

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

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

=====  
Date: Sun, 24 Oct 2004 03:13:48 -0500  
Reply-To: "Norval D. Glenn" <[ndglenn@MAIL.LA.UTEXAS.EDU](mailto:ndglenn@MAIL.LA.UTEXAS.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Norval D. Glenn" <[ndglenn@MAIL.LA.UTEXAS.EDU](mailto:ndglenn@MAIL.LA.UTEXAS.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll  
Comments: To: JP Murphy <[jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com](mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[002001c4b981\\$f5faf180\\$52e4c3d1@default](mailto:002001c4b981$f5faf180$52e4c3d1@default)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I don't always agree with what Marc says, but "hate mail"? Hardly.

Whatever happened to civil discourse, whereby people can disagree with one another without being disagreeable. The view that "you disagree with me; therefore you are evil" is all too common these days. The intolerance comes from both the right and the left. Too bad that it has invaded AAPORNET.

Norval Glenn

On Sun, 24 Oct 2004, JP Murphy wrote:

> Marc --

>

> I always read your postings and consider them valuable contributions to AAPORNET. They appear to be offered in a spirit of friendly collegueship and are well reasoned and often persuasive. It is an embarrassment for me as a member of this list to read Gary's comment. (It's Saturday evening -- maybe he was drunk? A Cardinals fan?)

>

> I occasionally criticize arguments and remarks with which I disagree but hope that nothing I write is ever found to be as ugly and belligerent as this. It's inconceivable to me that it represents thinking shared by anyone else on this list. Maybe, as a political lobbyist, it's his job to be this way. Not a job I'd care to have!

>

> JIM MURPHY

>

> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

> J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY

> Post Office Box 80484

> Valley Forge, Pennsylvania 19484-0484 USA

> (610) 408-8800

> www.jpMurphy.com

>

>

>

>

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

> From: Marc Sapir

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Sent: Saturday, October 23, 2004 10:06 PM

> Subject: Re: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll

>

>

> I'd just like to know how many people on the AAPOR list actually believe  
> that this comment by Gary Andres is a more appropriate form of discourse  
> for us than what I just posted. Talk about unprofessional. This  
> country is headed for a meltdown because of people who think they can  
> use intimidation like that. (And for the record and Gary's benefit, I  
> consistently get more positive feedback than negative from members of  
> the list. I am profoundly grateful to have the opportunity to be  
> involved in this dialogue, and I respond to people who disagree with me  
> as well as to those who agree. I plan to continue).

>

> Marc Sapir MD, MPH



> Executive Director  
> Retro Poll  
> www.retropoll.org

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Gary Andres  
> Sent: Saturday, October 23, 2004 3:56 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll

> Marc: I think a number of people are fed up with your left wing,  
> political bullshit filling our inboxes. Please reserve the AAPORNET  
> list for serious discussion about issues that real professionals care  
> about, not your politically motivated hate mail that reflect your  
> partisan views.

> Thanks.

> Gary Andres

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

> From: AAPORNET on behalf of Marc Sapir  
> Sent: Sat 10/23/2004 5:18 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Cc:  
> Subject: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll

> Date: October 23, 2004

> To: Retro Poll supporters and other interested persons

> After my brief comment, you will find useful reports (links) on  
> newly released polls by PIPA and Pew Foundation

> We are pleased to report that the polls of PIPA (The Program in  
> Policy

> Alternatives at the University of Maryland) continue to expand  
> on the

> preliminary work we began in 2002 on the connection between  
> support for

> the war in Iraq and belief in the Bush Administration's various  
> fabricated pronouncements such as that Saddam had weapons of

> mass

> destruction and was connected to Al Qaeda and the 9/11 attack

> We only

> regret that Steven Kull, PIPA's director, chose from the

> beginning not

> to credit us for pioneering that work (he knew of our efforts)

> because,

> had he done so, Retro Poll might be garnering more attention for  
> its  
> important work. Retro Poll's approach tends to address more  
> fundamental  
> issues, problems, and institutions within media and contemporary  
> culture  
> than does PIPA. PIPA, as David Peterson points out below, tends  
> to view  
> the poles of the playing field as between Republican liars and  
> Democrat  
> truth sayers. Though obviously the most egregious lying has  
> been coming  
> from the White House in these recent years, the problems of U.S.  
>  
> democracy can not be so easily described by such a limited  
> paradigm.  
> The role of culture and media in sculpting information to meet  
> ideological needs must be made transparent if democracy is to  
> survive  
> and thrive in the U.S. Most corporate polls support the work of  
>  
> corporate media and thus tend to do the opposite-i.e. bolster  
> the  
> charade of objectivity. This problem will remain no matter who  
> accedes  
> to the Presidency on November 2. We applaud PIPA and encourage  
> them to  
> continue to expand their good work that earlier showed that  
> people who  
> get their news and information from the major TV networks tend  
> to be  
> particularly ignorant of actual facts, more for Fox viewers but  
> for all  
> the other TV networks as well.

>  
> Marc Sapir MD, MPH  
> Executive Director  
> Retro Poll  
> [www.retropoll.org](http://www.retropoll.org)

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

> From: [davidepet \[mailto:davidepet@comcast.net\]](mailto:davidepet@comcast.net)  
> Sent: Saturday, October 23, 2004 6:47 AM  
> To: [davidepet@comcast.net](mailto:davidepet@comcast.net)  
> Subject: RE: A HANDFUL OF ITEMS FOR YOU

> Dear Friends:

>  
> FYI: Both the Pew Research Center for the People and the  
> Press and  
> the Program on International Policy Attitudes have released new  
> reports  
> on American beliefs and attitudes in the past three days.

>  
> Democrats, <<http://people-press.org/reports/pdf/229.pdf>> Blacks  
> Less  
> Confident in Accurate Vote Count. Race Tightens Again, Kerry's  
> Image  
> Improves, Andrew Kohut et al., Pew Research Center for the  
> People and  
> the Press, October 20, 2004 (and the accompanying---and itself  
> lengthy---media release, "Race  
> <<http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?ReportID=229>>  
> Tightens  
> Again, Kerry's Image Improves")  
>  
> The Separate Realities of Bush and Kerry Supporters  
>  
> <[http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres\\_Election\\_04/Report10\\_21\\_04.pdf](http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres_Election_04/Report10_21_04.pdf)>  
> , Steven Kull et al., Program on International  
> <<http://www.pipa.org/index.html>> Policy Attitudes, October 21,  
> 2004  
> (and the accompanying Media Release  
>  
> <[http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres\\_Election\\_04/Press10\\_21\\_04.pdf](http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres_Election_04/Press10_21_04.pdf)> )  
>  
>  
>

> Also FYI, here's a couple of links to mainstream news media  
> reports  
> on the PIPA findings---relatively rare occasions for PIPA, whose  
> work is  
> generally greeted by silence.  
>  
>

> "Divide Seen in Voter Knowledge  
>  
> <[http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2004/10/22/divide  
> \\_seen\\_in\\_voter\\_knowledge/](http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2004/10/22/divide<br/>> _seen_in_voter_knowledge/)> ," Boston Globe, October 22, 2004  
>  
> "How Americans view Bush and Kerry on foreign policy  
> <<http://www.csmonitor.com/2004/1022/p03s01-uspo.html>> ," Howard  
> LaFranchi, Christian Science Monitor, October 22, 2004  
>  
>

> Last, here's a link to a long article from last Sunday's New  
> York  
> Times Magazine, on some of the fundamentalist strains operating  
> within  
> the American political culture. (The Iranian mullahs have  
> nothing on  
> the Americans.)  
>  
>

> "Without a Doubt

>  
> <<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/10/17/magazine/17BUSH.html?oref=login>> ,"  
> Ron Suskind, New York Times Magazine, October 17, 2004  
>  
>  
> All in all, what might one glean from the findings?  
> Consider the  
> following statement from the Pew report:  
>  
> Supporters of Bush and Kerry offer very different reasons for  
> why they  
> want to see their candidate elected. For Bush voters, positive  
> assessments of the president's character are mentioned nearly as  
> often  
> as his stance on the issues, while for Kerry voters issues are  
> predominant.  
>  
> PIPA's report focuses on this feature of the political  
> culture, and  
> PIPA's Steven Kull even uses the phrase "resistance to  
> information" to  
> characterize the seemingly unshakable foundations of Bush's base  
> of  
> supporters---no matter what facts enter into circulation  
> regarding its  
> actual conduct during the past four years.  
> But this grants far too much to Kerry's supporters, I'm  
> afraid. And  
> PIPA's report is misleading to the extent it states or suggests  
> that  
> support for Kerry follows from the Kerry campaign's focus on  
> issues as  
> opposed to images.  
> My own personal view is that both campaigns have been  
> designed to  
> keep issues off the table. (For those of you still paying  
> attention,  
> this is where the critique of power and ideology ought to take  
> the place  
> of opinion surveys and punditry---and include opinion surveys  
> and  
> punditry right alongside political campaigns under its  
> microscope.)  
> Still. Overall, the superiority of the PIPA material is  
> pretty  
> obvious. (In my opinion.)  
>  
> Sincerely Yours,  
> David Peterson  
> [davidepet@comcast.net](mailto:davidepet@comcast.net)  
>  
> PS. Apologies for any links that may require you to register  
> before  
> accessing them. Should any of the links to the general media

> fail, feel  
> free to ask me for copies of the articles, all three of which I  
> can  
> easily forward. (Including Ron Suskind's piece dated Oct. 17,  
> which is  
> approx. 8,000 words in all, and a pain in the neck to access via  
> the  
> format used by the NYTimes's archive. Presuming you can even  
> access  
> it.)

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

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

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Sun, 24 Oct 2004 07:33:48 -0400  
Reply-To: Gary Andres <[Gary.Andres@DUTKOGROUP.COM](mailto:Gary.Andres@DUTKOGROUP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Gary Andres <[Gary.Andres@DUTKOGROUP.COM](mailto:Gary.Andres@DUTKOGROUP.COM)>  
Subject: Re: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll  
Comments: To: Marc Sapir <[marcsapir@comcast.net](mailto:marcsapir@comcast.net)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=utf-8  
Content-transfer-encoding: base64

TWFyY2ogIEluIHJldHJvc3BIY3QgSSBtYWRIHR3byBtaXN0YWtscyB3aXRoIG15IGNvbW1lbnRz  
LiAgRmlyc3QsIEkgeC2hvdWxkIGhhdmUgY2hvc2VuIG15IHdvcnRzIGRpZmZlcmVudGx5IGFuZCBm  
b3IgdGhhdCBJIGFwb2xvZ2l6ZSB0byB5b3UgcGVyc29uYWxseS4gIFNIY29uZCwgSSBzaG91bGQg  
aGF2ZSBkaXJlY3RlZCBteSBjb21tZW50cyAod2l0aCBsZXNzIGNhdXN0aWMgd29yZHMpIHRvIHlv  
dSBkaXJlY3RseSwgbm90IHRoZSBsaXN0LiBTbyBmb3IgdGhvc2Ugd2hvIHdlemUgb2ZmZW5kZWQg  
YnkgeXkgY29tWVudHMslIEkgd2FudCB0byBzYXkgc29ycnkgeG8geW91IGFzIHdlibGwuICBpbiBy  
ZWZsZWNoaW9uIEkgd2FzIGd1aWx0eSBvZiB0aGUgc2FtZSAiZmlsbGluZyIgeW91ciBpbmJveGVz  
IHdpdGggcGFydGlyYW5zaGlwIChtaW5lKSBhcyBJICBjaGFyZ2VkIE1hcmMgd2l0aCBkb2luZy4g  
IA0KIA0KSW4gdGhlIGZ1dHVyZSBJIHdpbGwga2VlcCBteSBjb21tZW50cyB0byB0aGUgYnJvYWRl  
ciBncm91cCBmb2N1c2VklG9uIGlzc3VlcYBvZiBwcm9mZXNzaW9uYWwgY29uY2VybiBhbmQgZGly  
ZWN0IG15IHBlcnNvbmlzIHZpZXdzIHRvIHRoZSB3cm10ZXIuIA0KIA0KR2FyeSBbbmRyZXMNCg0K









ZWFzZSBhc2sgYXV0aG9ycyBiZWZvcmlUgcXVvdGluZyBvdXRzaWRlIEFBUE9STkVULiANCgkglCAgICAgIFByb2JsZW1zPy1kb24ndCBYzXBseSB0byB0aGlzIG1lc3NhZ2UsIHdyaXRlIHRvOiANCgllhYXBvcmlkC1yZXF1ZXN0QGFzdS5lZHUgDQoNCg0KDQo=

---

Date: Sun, 24 Oct 2004 07:45:04 -0400  
Reply-To: info surveysampler <info@SURVEYSAMPLER.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: info surveysampler <info@SURVEYSAMPLER.COM>  
Organization: Echantillonneur ASDE Survey Sampler  
Subject: Re: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll  
Comments: To: Gary Andres <Gary.Andres@DUTKOGROUP.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <11122210225B5D47B9AAD73A7320B50001C27D86@dutsrdc002814>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear Mr Andres,

We don't know each other but as one of the recipients of a copy of your red hot missive to Mr Sapir I had a rather low opinion of your manners. But now I want to congratulate you wholeheartedly. WOW! A real apology without any reservations without people or circumstances to blame. Wonderful. Thank you for restoring my faith in civility.

Michel Rochon

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Gary Andres  
Sent: 24-oct.-04 07:34  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll

Marc: In retrospect I made two mistakes with my comments. First, I should have chosen my words differently and for that I apologize to you personally. Second, I should have directed my comments (with less caustic words) to you directly, not the list. So for those who were offended by my comments, I want to say sorry to you as well. On reflection I was guilty of the same "filling" your inboxes with partisanship (mine) as I charged Marc with doing.

In the future I will keep my comments to the broader group focused on issues of professional concern and direct my personal views to the writer.

Gary Andres

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

From: Marc Sapir [mailto:marcsapir@comcast.net]  
Sent: Sat 10/23/2004 10:06 PM  
To: Gary Andres; AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Cc:  
Subject: RE: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll

I'd just like to know how many people on the AAPOR list actually believe that this comment by Gary Andres is a more appropriate form of discourse for us than what I just posted. Talk about unprofessional. This country is headed for a meltdown because of people who think they can use intimidation like that. (And for the record and Gary's benefit, I consistently get more positive feedback than negative from members of the list. I am profoundly grateful to have the opportunity to be involved in this dialogue, and I respond to people who disagree with me as well as to those who agree. I plan to continue).

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

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Gary Andres  
Sent: Saturday, October 23, 2004 3:56 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll

Marc: I think a number of people are fed up with your left wing, political bullshit filling our inboxes. Please reserve the AAPORNET list for serious discussion about issues that real professionals care about, not your politically motivated hate mail that reflect your partisan views.

Thanks.

Gary Andres

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

From: AAPORNET on behalf of Marc Sapir  
Sent: Sat 10/23/2004 5:18 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Cc:  
Subject: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll

Date: October 23, 2004

To: Retro Poll supporters and other interested persons

After my brief comment, you will find useful reports  
(links) on  
newly  
released polls by PIPA and Pew Foundation

We are pleased to report that the polls of PIPA (The  
Program in  
Policy  
Alternatives at the University of Maryland) continue to  
expand  
on the  
preliminary work we began in 2002 on the connection  
between  
support for  
the war in Iraq and belief in the Bush Administration's  
various  
fabricated pronouncements such as that Saddam had  
weapons of  
mass  
destruction and was connected to Al Qaeda and the 9/11  
attack

We only  
regret that Steven Kull, PIPA's director, chose from the  
beginning not  
to credit us for pioneering that work (he knew of our  
efforts)  
because,  
had he done so, Retro Poll might be garnering more  
attention for  
its  
important work. Retro Poll's approach tends to address  
more  
fundamental  
issues, problems, and institutions within media and  
contemporary  
culture  
than does PIPA. PIPA, as David Peterson points out  
below, tends  
to view  
the poles of the playing field as between Republican  
liars and  
Democrat  
truth sayers. Though obviously the most egregious lying  
has  
been coming  
from the White House in these recent years, the problems  
of U.S.

democracy can not be so easily described by such a limited paradigm. The role of culture and media in sculpting information to meet ideological needs must be made transparent if democracy is to survive and thrive in the U.S. Most corporate polls support the work of corporate media and thus tend to do the opposite-i.e. bolster the charade of objectivity. This problem will remain no matter who accedes to the Presidency on November 2. We applaud PIPA and encourage them to continue to expand their good work that earlier showed that people who get their news and information from the major TV networks tend to be particularly ignorant of actual facts, more for Fox viewers but for all the other TV networks as well.

Marc Sapir MD, MPH  
Executive Director  
Retro Poll  
[www.retropoll.org](http://www.retropoll.org)

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

From: [davidepet \[mailto:davidepet@comcast.net\]](mailto:davidepet@comcast.net)  
Sent: Saturday, October 23, 2004 6:47 AM  
To: [davidepet@comcast.net](mailto:davidepet@comcast.net)  
Subject: RE: A HANDFUL OF ITEMS FOR YOU

Dear Friends:

FYI: Both the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press and the Program on International Policy Attitudes have released new reports on American beliefs and attitudes in the past three days.

Blacks  
Less  
Confident in Accurate Vote Count. Race Tightens Again,  
Kerry's  
Image  
Improves, Andrew Kohut et al., Pew Research Center for  
the  
People and  
the Press, October 20, 2004 (and the accompanying---and  
itself  
lengthy---media release, "Race

<<http://people-press.org/reports/pdf/229.pdf>>  
Tightens  
Again, Kerry's Image Improves")

The Separate Realities of Bush and Kerry Supporters

<[http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres\\_Election\\_04/Report10\\_21\\_04.pdf](http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres_Election_04/Report10_21_04.pdf)>  
, Steven Kull et al., Program on International  
<<http://www.pipa.org/index.html>> Policy Attitudes,  
October 21,  
2004  
(and the accompanying Media Release

<[http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres\\_Election\\_04/Press10\\_21\\_04.pdf](http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres_Election_04/Press10_21_04.pdf)> )

Also FYI, here's a couple of links to mainstream  
news media  
reports  
on the PIPA findings---relatively rare occasions for  
PIPA, whose  
work is  
generally greeted by silence.

"Divide Seen in Voter Knowledge

<<http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2004/10/22/divide>

[\\_seen\\_in\\_voter\\_knowledge/>](http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2004/10/22/divide)," Boston Globe, October 22,  
2004

"How Americans view Bush and Kerry on foreign policy

<<http://www.csmonitor.com/2004/1022/p03s01-uspo.html>> ,"

Howard

LaFranchi, Christian Science Monitor, October 22, 2004

Last, here's a link to a long article from last  
Sunday's New  
York  
Times Magazine, on some of the fundamentalist strains  
operating  
within  
the American political culture. (The Iranian mullahs  
have  
nothing on  
the Americans.)

"Without a Doubt

<<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/10/17/magazine/17BUSH.html?oref=login>> ,"

Ron Suskind, New York Times Magazine, October 17, 2004

All in all, what might one glean from the findings?  
Consider the  
following statement from the Pew report:  
  
Supporters of Bush and Kerry offer very different  
reasons for  
why they  
want to see their candidate elected. For Bush voters,  
positive  
assessments of the president's character are mentioned  
nearly as  
often  
as his stance on the issues, while for Kerry voters  
issues are  
predominant.

PIPA's report focuses on this feature of the  
political  
culture, and  
PIPA's Steven Kull even uses the phrase "resistance to  
information" to  
characterize the seemingly unshakable foundations of  
Bush's base  
of  
supporters---no matter what facts enter into circulation  
regarding its  
actual conduct during the past four years.

But this grants far too much to Kerry's supporters,

I'm

afraid. And  
PIPA's report is misleading to the extent it states or  
suggests  
that  
support for Kerry follows from the Kerry campaign's  
focus on  
issues as  
opposed to images.

My own personal view is that both campaigns have  
been  
designed to  
keep issues off the table. (For those of you still  
paying  
attention,  
this is where the critique of power and ideology ought  
to take  
the place  
of opinion surveys and punditry---and include opinion  
surveys  
and  
punditry right alongside political campaigns under its  
microscope.)  
Still. Overall, the superiority of the PIPA  
material is  
pretty  
obvious. (In my opinion.)

Sincerely Yours,  
David Peterson  
davidepet@comcast.net

PS. Apologies for any links that may require you to  
register  
before  
accessing them. Should any of the links to the general  
media  
fail, feel  
free to ask me for copies of the articles, all three of  
which I  
can  
easily forward. (Including Ron Suskind's piece dated  
Oct. 17,  
which is  
approx. 8,000 words in all, and a pain in the neck to  
access via  
the  
format used by the NYTimes's archive. Presuming you can  
even  
access  
it.)

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
aapornet-request@asu.edu

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Sun, 24 Oct 2004 10:15:11 -0400  
Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Andrew A Beveridge <andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU>  
Organization: Queens College CUNY  
Subject: Re: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll  
Comments: To: "Norval D. Glenn" <ndglenn@MAIL.LA.UTEXAS.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.4.33.0410240304200.16255-100000@kipper.la.utexas.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear All:

I think that if Gary has that big an issue with Marc he should have contacted him directly and not subject the list to a flame war. We are 9 days from an election, and partisanship often rears its head. You should my college class list serve (Yale Class of 1967 right between Kerry and Bush, and many knew both of them) if you want partisanship.

Furthermore, we don't want to detract from the fascinating findings of the PIPA poll.

Andy Beveridge

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Norval D. Glenn  
Sent: Sunday, October 24, 2004 4:14 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll

I don't always agree with what Marc says, but "hate mail"? Hardly. Whatever happened to civil discourse, whereby people can disagree with one another without being disagreeable. The view that "you disagree with me; therefore you are evil" is all too common these days. The intolerance comes from both the right and the left. Too bad that it has invaded AAPORNET.

Norval Glenn

On Sun, 24 Oct 2004, JP Murphy wrote:

> Marc --  
>  
> I always read your postings and consider them valuable contributions  
> to AAPORNET. They appear to be offered in a spirit of friendly  
> collegueship and are well reasoned and often persuasive. It is an



> embarrassment for me as a member of this list to read Gary's comment.  
> (It's Saturday evening -- maybe he was drunk? A Cardinals fan?)  
>  
> I occasionally criticize arguments and remarks with which I disagree but  
hope that nothing I write is ever found to be as ugly and belligerent as  
this. It's inconceivable to me that it represents thinking shared by anyone  
else on this list. Maybe, as a political lobbyist, it's his job to be this  
way. Not a job I'd care to have!

>  
> JIM MURPHY

>  
> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
> J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY  
> Post Office Box 80484  
> Valley Forge, Pennsylvania 19484-0484 USA  
> (610) 408-8800  
> www.jpmmurphy.com

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

> From: Marc Sapir  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Sent: Saturday, October 23, 2004 10:06 PM  
> Subject: Re: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll

>  
>  
> I'd just like to know how many people on the AAPOR list actually  
> believe that this comment by Gary Andres is a more appropriate form of  
> discourse for us than what I just posted. Talk about unprofessional.  
> This country is headed for a meltdown because of people who think they  
> can use intimidation like that. (And for the record and Gary's  
> benefit, I consistently get more positive feedback than negative from  
> members of the list. I am profoundly grateful to have the opportunity  
> to be involved in this dialogue, and I respond to people who disagree  
> with me as well as to those who agree. I plan to continue).

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

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

> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Gary Andres  
> Sent: Saturday, October 23, 2004 3:56 PM  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Re: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll

>  
> Marc: I think a number of people are fed up with your left wing,  
> political bullshit filling our inboxes. Please reserve the AAPORNET  
> list for serious discussion about issues that real professionals care  
> about, not your politically motivated hate mail that reflect your

> partisan views.

>

> Thanks.

>

> Gary Andres

>

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

> From: AAPORNET on behalf of Marc Sapir

> Sent: Sat 10/23/2004 5:18 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Cc:

> Subject: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll

>

>

>

> Date: October 23, 2004

>

>

> To: Retro Poll supporters and other interested persons

>

> After my brief comment, you will find useful reports (links)

> on newly

> released polls by PIPA and Pew Foundation

>

> We are pleased to report that the polls of PIPA (The Program

> in Policy

> Alternatives at the University of Maryland) continue to expand

> on the

> preliminary work we began in 2002 on the connection between

> support for

> the war in Iraq and belief in the Bush Administration's various

> fabricated pronouncements such as that Saddam had weapons of

> mass

> destruction and was connected to Al Qaeda and the 9/11 attack

> We only

> regret that Steven Kull, PIPA's director, chose from the

> beginning not

> to credit us for pioneering that work (he knew of our efforts)

> because,

> had he done so, Retro Poll might be garnering more attention

> for its

> important work. Retro Poll's approach tends to address more

> fundamental

> issues, problems, and institutions within media and

> contemporary culture

> than does PIPA. PIPA, as David Peterson points out below,

> tends to view

> the poles of the playing field as between Republican liars and

> Democrat

> truth sayers. Though obviously the most egregious lying has

> been coming

> from the White House in these recent years, the problems of U.S.

>

> democracy can not be so easily described by such a limited

> paradigm.  
> The role of culture and media in sculpting information to meet  
> ideological needs must be made transparent if democracy is to  
> survive  
> and thrive in the U.S. Most corporate polls support the work  
> of  
>  
> corporate media and thus tend to do the opposite-i.e. bolster  
> the  
> charade of objectivity. This problem will remain no matter  
> who accedes  
> to the Presidency on November 2. We applaud PIPA and  
> encourage them to  
> continue to expand their good work that earlier showed that  
> people who  
> get their news and information from the major TV networks tend  
> to be  
> particularly ignorant of actual facts, more for Fox viewers  
> but for all  
> the other TV networks as well.

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

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

> From: davidepet [mailto:davidepet@comcast.net]  
> Sent: Saturday, October 23, 2004 6:47 AM  
> To: davidepet@comcast.net  
> Subject: RE: A HANDFUL OF ITEMS FOR YOU

> Dear Friends:

>  
> FYI: Both the Pew Research Center for the People and the  
> Press and  
> the Program on International Policy Attitudes have released  
> new reports  
> on American beliefs and attitudes in the past three days.

>  
> Democrats, <<http://people-press.org/reports/pdf/229.pdf>>  
> Blacks Less  
> Confident in Accurate Vote Count. Race Tightens Again,  
> Kerry's Image  
> Improves, Andrew Kohut et al., Pew Research Center for the  
> People and  
> the Press, October 20, 2004 (and the accompanying---and itself  
> lengthy---media release, "Race  
> <<http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?ReportID=229>>  
> Tightens  
> Again, Kerry's Image Improves")

> The Separate Realities of Bush and Kerry Supporters

>  
> <[http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres\\_Election\\_04/Report10\\_21\\_04.pdf](http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres_Election_04/Report10_21_04.pdf)>  
> , Steven Kull et al., Program on International  
> <<http://www.pipa.org/index.html>> Policy Attitudes, October  
> 21,  
> 2004  
> (and the accompanying Media Release

>  
> <[http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres\\_Election\\_04/Press10\\_21\\_04.pdf](http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/Pres_Election_04/Press10_21_04.pdf)>  
> )

>  
> Also FYI, here's a couple of links to mainstream news  
> media reports  
> on the PIPA findings---relatively rare occasions for PIPA,  
> whose work is  
> generally greeted by silence.

>  
> "Divide Seen in Voter Knowledge

> <<http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2004/10/22/divi>  
> de

> \_seen\_in\_voter\_knowledge/> , " Boston Globe, October 22, 2004

>  
> "How Americans view Bush and Kerry on foreign policy  
> <<http://www.csmonitor.com/2004/1022/p03s01-uspo.html>> , " Howard  
> LaFranchi, Christian Science Monitor, October 22, 2004

>  
> Last, here's a link to a long article from last Sunday's  
> New York  
> Times Magazine, on some of the fundamentalist strains  
> operating within  
> the American political culture. (The Iranian mullahs have  
> nothing on  
> the Americans.)

>  
> "Without a Doubt

> <<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/10/17/magazine/17BUSH.html?oref=login>> , "  
> Ron Suskind, New York Times Magazine, October 17, 2004

>  
> All in all, what might one glean from the findings?  
> Consider the  
> following statement from the Pew report:

>  
> Supporters of Bush and Kerry offer very different reasons for  
> why they

> want to see their candidate elected. For Bush voters, positive  
> assessments of the president's character are mentioned nearly  
> as often  
> as his stance on the issues, while for Kerry voters issues are  
> predominant.

>  
> PIPA's report focuses on this feature of the political  
> culture, and  
> PIPA's Steven Kull even uses the phrase "resistance to  
> information" to  
> characterize the seemingly unshakable foundations of Bush's  
> base of  
> supporters---no matter what facts enter into circulation  
> regarding its  
> actual conduct during the past four years.

> But this grants far too much to Kerry's supporters, I'm  
> afraid. And  
> PIPA's report is misleading to the extent it states or  
> suggests that  
> support for Kerry follows from the Kerry campaign's focus on  
> issues as  
> opposed to images.

> My own personal view is that both campaigns have been  
> designed to  
> keep issues off the table. (For those of you still paying  
> attention,  
> this is where the critique of power and ideology ought to take  
> the place  
> of opinion surveys and punditry---and include opinion surveys  
> and  
> punditry right alongside political campaigns under its  
> microscope.)

> Still. Overall, the superiority of the PIPA material is  
> pretty  
> obvious. (In my opinion.)

>  
> Sincerely Yours,  
> David Peterson  
> [davidepet@comcast.net](mailto:davidepet@comcast.net)

>  
> PS. Apologies for any links that may require you to register  
> before  
> accessing them. Should any of the links to the general media  
> fail, feel  
> free to ask me for copies of the articles, all three of which  
> I can  
> easily forward. (Including Ron Suskind's piece dated Oct. 17,  
> which is  
> approx. 8,000 words in all, and a pain in the neck to access  
> via the  
> format used by the NYTimes's archive. Presuming you can even  
> access  
> it.)

>

>  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> aapornet-request@asu.edu

>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
> Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to:  
> aapornet-request@asu.edu

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Sun, 24 Oct 2004 12:49:02 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Subject: Re: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <0I6300HBSE5F9L@mta2.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Andrew A Beveridge wrote:

>You should my  
>college class list serve (Yale Class of 1967 right between Kerry and Bush,  
>and many knew both of them) if you want partisanship.

My Yale class of '75 listserv shows almost no partisanship at all - it's almost entirely pro-Kerry, and often strongly so. I've often wondered about what that meant. My guess is that a class of 1950 or 1960 listserv would be predominantly Republican, though that's based more on stereotype than evidence. But the Republican party has moved away from that old Northeastern Ivy model towards a more southern and western one, as the differences between 41 and 43 show. So what's happening? Has elite opinion, at least this branch of the elite, become more liberal? Is my class stamped more by the experience of the 60s than one just eight years older? Are younger Yalies more

conservative? Does anyone study elite opinion?

--

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>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Sun, 24 Oct 2004 15:19:59 -0400  
Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU>  
Subject: Re: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll  
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Let me make the obvious comment: people who post on a list serve [like = this one] are a self-selected sample and should not be used to draw any conclusions about any such larger population as Republicans or = Democrats.

And what do you mean, Northeastern Ivy Model? As if Harvard and Yale = were in the same class!!

Nat Ehrlich, [AB Harvard 1961; PhD Michigan 1964]  
Research Specialist  
Michigan State University=20  
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research  
Office=A0for Social Research  
321 Berkey Hall  
East Lansing, MI 48824  
517-355-6672

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

From: Doug Henwood [mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM]=20  
Sent: Sunday, October 24, 2004 12:49 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: PIPA Poll relationship to Retro Poll

Andrew A Beveridge wrote:

>You should my  
>college class list serve (Yale Class of 1967 right between Kerry and =  
Bush,  
>and many knew both of them) if you want partisanship.

My Yale class of '75 listserv shows almost no partisanship at all -  
it's almost entirely pro-Kerry, and often strongly so. I've often  
wondered about what that meant. My guess is that a class of 1950 or  
1960 listserv would be predominantly Republican, though that's based  
more on stereotype than evidence. But the Republican party has moved  
away from that old Northeastern Ivy model towards a more southern and  
western one, as the differences between 41 and 43 show. So what's  
happening? Has elite opinion, at least this branch of the elite,  
become more liberal? Is my class stamped more by the experience of  
the 60s than one just eight years older? Are younger Yalies more  
conservative? Does anyone study elite opinion?

--

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>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Mon, 25 Oct 2004 10:34:58 -0400  
Reply-To: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Claire Durand <Claire.Durand@UMONTREAL.CA>  
Subject: Re: Train Bombings and the Spanish Election  
Comments: To: "Pollack, Lance" <LPollack@PSG.UCSF.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <416EB4C5227AD411B2460090274CEA1601EBC4CB@central16.psg.net>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Polls were favorable to the government before the bombings and the ruling=20  
party was considered a rather easy winner before the bombings. However,=20  
the general perception is that public opinion changed not because of the=20  
bombings, but because the government falsely attributed the bombing to ETA=  
=20  
separatists at first instead of attributing them to Al Qaeda. It was=20  
considered an attempt to use the bombings for the government's own=20



political interests and it was not appreciated at all by the media and the  
=20  
population.

Best,

At 14:55 2004-10-21 -0700, Pollack, Lance wrote:

>With the recent release of surveillance video from a security camera at the  
>Madrid train station, I was reminded of something that has bothered me all  
>along. At the time of the election and since then I have heard various  
>statements that the Spanish "caved in to terrorism" or that they voted the  
>government out because of the bombing.  
>  
>What has bothered me is that my impression all along had been that while=  
the  
>Spanish government backed the US effort in Iraq, the Spanish electorate was  
>solidly against it. Given the first chance for the electorate to make known  
>their opposition, the ruling party was going to be kicked out of office  
>anyway. Did the polls indicate that, or am I wrong and the ruling party was  
>actually leading prior to the bombing? What I question is the bombing leads  
>to ouster assumption. Was there any polling done pre-bombing to answer this  
>question?

>  
>Lance M. Pollack, Ph.D.  
>Health Survey Research Unit (HSRU)  
>University of California, San Francisco  
>lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu

>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Claire Durand  
Claire.Durand@umontreal.ca  
<http://www.mapageweb.umontreal.ca/durandc>  
Professeur,  
Responsable des cycles sup=E9rieurs,  
d=E9partement de sociologie,  
Universit=E9 de Montr=E9al  
C.P. 6128, succ. Centre-ville,  
Montr=E9al, Qu=E9bec, H3C 3J7

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Mon, 25 Oct 2004 13:49:14 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>  
Subject: Results of exit polls lie in hands of 12 experts  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

From the Philly Inquirer

Results of exit polls lie in hands of 12 experts

By Jonathan Storm

INQUIRER TV CRITIC

The accuracy of TV voting results on Election Night rests primarily in the brains and computers of two distinguished survey researchers and a panel of 10 number-crunchers.

But don't discount the importance of cheesecake.

Between them, Joe Lenski and Warren Mitofsky have more than 50 years of experience in analyzing data - predicting the outcome of elections, certainly, but also helping lawyers decide how to try their cases, and giving rockers advice on which album tracks to release as singles.

The two head the National Election Pool, which replaced the Voter News Service after the reporting disaster in 2000.

Mitofsky, 70, will be working his 10th presidential election. His firm, Mitofsky International, has performed exit polls in countries from Russia to the Philippines. Perhaps his most famous legal research helped spur a change of venue in the case of four New York City police officers in the shooting of Amadou Diallo.

Lenski, 39, went to work for CBS in 1988, right out of Princeton University, as a statistical analyst. He cofounded Edison Media Research in 1994. Besides doing research to advise musicians, the company has worked for a host of commercial clients.

The National Election Pool's analysis headquarters, above a former Woolworth's in downtown Somerville, N.J., about an hour southwest of New York, will be action central on Election Night.

Ten high-powered numbers mavens - university professors, statisticians, political researchers - will analyze figures, along with Lenski and Mitofsky, who will decide when winners should be called in each state, and relay their calls to the networks. Each news organization retains control of when and what to announce.

The experts in Somerville will survey exit-poll data generated by the National Election Pool and voting results collected by the Associated Press, a cooperative owned and operated by more than 1,500 U.S. daily newspapers. The AP plans to station employees at every county vote-tabulating location in the nation, funneling numbers to the counting house.

Here's the difference this time, according to Lenski:

"Since 2000, we have a better realization of the limitations of the actual vote. There are certain votes that aren't counted on Election Day, and there has been an increase in the percentage of people voting before Election Day."

The National Election Pool, whose efforts reportedly cost \$10 million, has boosted the number of early and absentee-ballot polls it will conduct more than fourfold, to 13, from the three that Voter News Service performed in 2000.

The AP has installed new quality controls to test numbers before they get into the system, and the National Election Pool has developed new computer models, based primarily on voting patterns, to flag seeming discrepancies.

The new system performed well in 23 presidential primaries. And, unlike in the past, all the data is available for everybody at the networks to see.

"At any time, any member of the pool can look at any report about precincts and counties," Lenski said.

The research eggheads have been gathering over snacks and desserts on Thursdays since the beginning of July, subjecting their hotshot software and equipment to upward of five hours a week of a mock 50-state election, without significant problems.

"The big winner so far," Lenski said, "is the sandwich shop down the street, and the bakery that makes their cheesecake."

Workers at La Delizia, delivering to what they think is some sort of weekly party, say the cake, made by Villabate Bakery in Brooklyn, is a big seller for them.

For Election Night, they'd better bring two.

--

Leo "Apprentice Number Maven" Simonetta  
Research Director  
Art & Science Group, LLC  
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
Baltimore MD 21209

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

---

Date: Mon, 25 Oct 2004 15:29:15 -0700  
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>  
Subject: Re: Retro Poll Findings--no horserace here  
Comments: To: Scott Althaus <salthaus@UIUC.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Comments: cc: Warren Gold <WGold@itsa.ucsf.edu>,

Ariya Sasaki <AriyaLove2004@aol.com>,  
James True <jtrue@mindspring.com>,  
Karen Leonard <karen153@adelphia.net>,  
mickeyhuff@mac.com, Peter Phillips <peter.phillips@sonoma.edu>,  
Suzanne Grady <suziandchuck@yahoo.com>,  
Sut Jhally <sutj@comm.umass.edu>,  
Anuradha Mittal <amittal@foodfirst.org>,  
Charles Stein <Stein@stat.stanford.edu>,  
David Himmelstein <himmelhandler@attbi.com>,  
Helen Finkelstein <hfinkels@sfsu.edu>,  
Justin Lewis <LewisJ2@Cardiff.ac.uk>,  
Kris Welch <Welchi@PacBell.net>, Mike Davis <MikeD@uci.edu>,  
Paul Ekman <paul@paulekman.net>,  
Robert McChesney <Bob@freepress.net>,  
Robert Newcomer <rjn@itsa.ucsf.edu>,  
Susan Janson <Susan.Janson@nursing.ucsf.edu>

In-Reply-To: <5.1.1.5.2.20041008093927.01cc02f0@express.cites.uiuc.edu>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear Scott,

Scott,

Two weeks have passed, but I have now taken the time to read your article (with Devon Largio, PSOnline [www.apsanet.org](http://www.apsanet.org) <<http://www.apsanet.org/>> ) When Osama Became Saddam: Origins and Consequences of the Change in America's Public Enemy #1. I must say it's an interesting article. However, I have problems with your conclusions. You are absolutely right that the public had been guided toward the idea of Saddam being a much bigger threat than he actually was starting way before Bush's ascendancy. You must be aware that in 1998 (if my memory is correct) both the Congress and the President (Clinton) made regime change in Iraq (explicitly the removal of Saddam) public U.S. policy. Given that Iraq had been totally degraded militarily, financially and culturally by that time, it was a level of arrogance that only the U.S. as sole superpower could get away with. The Bush regime simply decided to act upon that rhetoric by exaggerating the earlier claims and beliefs that had been spread widely by the media and by doing the bait and switch on 9/11.

When you say that Retro Poll errs in its conclusions on this issue, however, I think that you have not read through our various press releases and articles carefully. Retro Poll's assertions and conclusions pertain principally to critiquing the role of the corporate media (and many polls) in furthering the ideological interests and practical needs of those in power, not infrequently to the denial of fact and truth. We do link Bush to the public belief that Saddam was involved with Al Qaeda but not to the exclusion of prior efforts by prior administrations to elevate Saddam to the level of a major world threat.

Our poll question wording of relevance to your article has been consistent over a two and a half year period. Though our findings are

not directly comparable those of PIPA, our trend results are similar. We show a slow but continuing decline in belief that Saddam worked with Al Qaeda from over 41% two years ago, to 29% in the current poll, October, 2004.

But there are, I think, important methodological complications in your work and analysis. I agree that your comparing the open ended question approach to the closed is of qualitative interest to the research community and I applaud your pointing out that problem. But these two methods can not both be "valid" as measures of public opinion in this case due to the huge data discrepancies. Except to show how inexact public opinion research is and how question wording and context impact results, writing about them together doesn't get anywhere. Without standardization of some kind it's just apples and oranges and so the article isn't talking about a data set that can be accepted as really representative of public views. I see the reason you did that in your argument that the early NYT/CBS poll, being open ended and getting all the publicity, skewed perception by analysts unaware of the other work. Well, that's a useful argument but then the question you don't answer is what the huge discrepancy between 2-8% and 80% really represents. Is it methodological or substantive. You do intimate that it has to do with that background bugaboo against Saddam coming out of the earlier years, and people being ready to jump to agree with Saddam as terrorist when given forced alternatives, and I think you are probably right. But I think the reason you can only intimate this rather than conclude it is because it's in the realm of total conjecture. It's little more than a plausible hypothesis even though you and I may agree on it.

The other bone I want to pick is that in looking at the frequency with which the media and Bush mentioned Saddam and Osama you have fallen into the fatal trap of believing that numbers are qualitative rather than just quantitative. As an example: a key point in a State of the Union Address or before the U.N. or in a crisis oriented Press Conference might be worth 20 or 100 times the public relations impact value of a comment mentioned in an interview or a speech before some organization, covered as a brief news item. But even more importantly, Saddam did not have to be mentioned for some of us to realize on 9/12-15 that U.S. leaders were going to push to invade Iraq. People heard about the comments of Rumsfeld and Wolfowitz etc. As a result, we do not know how many people, among the public, also got that message, which was, in essence, a subliminal linking message. So, your suggesting that the public has become more aware of the truth despite the increased effort by the administration to push the connection after April 2002, can be challenged on that basis as well.

Nevertheless, I do agree with your general conclusion on the trends and growing public awareness of the truth, which I find hopeful. That is also Retro Poll's conclusion. However, we believe that this is due to still other complex factors at play which I will not further detail here, but which you do not take into consideration in your analysis.

Marc Sapir MD, MPH  
Executive Director  
Retro Poll

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Scott Althaus

Sent: Friday, October 08, 2004 6:53 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Retro Poll Findings--no horserace here

The Retro Poll findings are very interesting, but I want to take issue with the interpretation of those findings that was presented in the press release: that the mistaken beliefs about the Saddam-9/11 link were a product of media coverage or of the Bush administration's information campaign in preparation for war against Iraq. This interpretation of these and related findings has also been made by other members of this list and is quite widely held among pundits. However, it does not square with the available evidence.

I and my co-author Devon Largio have just published a study in the October issue of PS: Political Science and Politics (available as an Adobe Acrobat file at <http://www.apsanet.org/PS/oct04/althaus.pdf>) that suggests this misperception was already in place immediately after the 9/11 attacks, and did not result from either media coverage of the Bush administration's efforts to convince the public of its case for going to war. To the contrary, popular levels of misperception on the Saddam-9/11 linkage have been declining steadily ever since 9/11. Moreover, and more importantly for this list, the apparent levels of public misperception were exaggerated by the wording of survey questions and by the universal switch away from open-ended to forced-choice response formats after September 2001.

Here is the concluding section of the paper, which sums up the main points of our argument:  
The shift from Osama to Saddam occurred in media coverage during August of 2002, but began four months earlier in the public statements of President George Bush. As Osama bin Laden faded in news coverage and all but disappeared in President Bush's public statements, clear efforts were made by the Bush administration to replace Osama bin Laden as America's foremost enemy by linking Saddam Hussein to the War on Terror.

Yet the American public needed little convincing on the possibility that

Hussein was involved in 9/11. In polls taken in the days immediately following the 9/11 attacks, open-ended questions showed that Americans were not spontaneously blaming Iraq for the attacks. But forced-choice questions showed that as many as 8 in 10 Americans thought that Hussein was probably behind them. When explicitly presented with the possibility in the immediate aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, Americans by wide margins were already prepared to believe that Saddam was to blame long before the administration began building popular support for the war.

The American public's apparently widespread belief that Saddam Hussein was responsible for the 9/11 terror attacks was no feat of misdirection by the Bush administration. Instead, the Bush administration inherited and played into a favorable climate of public opinion, which may have greatly facilitated its task of building public support for war against Iraq. The mistaken belief that Saddam Hussein was responsible for the 9/11 attacks was already widespread among Americans long before President Bush began publicly linking Saddam Hussein with the War on Terrorism. Indeed, nearly seven months before the 9/11 attacks, an Opinion Dynamics poll in late February of 2001 found that 73% of Americans said it was very or somewhat likely that "Saddam Hussein will organize terrorist attacks on United States [sic] targets to retaliate for the air strikes" that had recently been conducted in Iraq by American and British air forces.

Our analysis of surveys about the mistaken belief that Hussein was responsible for 9/11 also suggests that the degree of misperception was overstated in many polls. This was partly due to the universal switch to forced-choice survey questions after September, 2001, which exaggerated the degree to which Americans saw a connection between Hussein and the 9/11 attacks. The other reason was that most questions only permitted respondents to assess the likelihood that Hussein was involved in 9/11, rather than allowing them to choose from a range of alternative options featuring different degrees of involvement. The only survey to have done this, conducted by the Program on International Policy Attitudes and Knowledge Networks, found that fewer than a quarter of Americans saw a direct tie between Hussein and the terror attacks in New York and Washington D.C.

News coverage and presidential rhetoric may have replaced Osama with Saddam over time, but Saddam was on the short list of most likely suspects from the beginning for most Americans. Rather than showing a gullible public blindly accepting the rationales offered by an administration bent on war, our analysis reveals a self-correcting public that has grown ever more

doubtful of Hussein's culpability since the 9/11 attacks.

---

Scott L. Althaus  
Associate Professor, Dept. of Speech Communication  
Associate Professor, Dept. of Political Science  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Department of Speech Communication  
702 S. Wright St., Rm. 244  
Urbana, IL 61801 USA

Office 217.333.8968  
Fax 217.244.1598  
Email [salthaus@uiuc.edu](mailto:salthaus@uiuc.edu)  
Web [www.uiuc.edu/~salthaus](http://www.uiuc.edu/~salthaus)

---

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

---

Date: Mon, 25 Oct 2004 19:47:07 -0700  
Reply-To: [oneil@oneilresearch.com](mailto:oneil@oneilresearch.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Mike O'Neil <[mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU](mailto:mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU)>  
Subject: Welfare and wording  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I need a very quick citation on a decidedly non-academic issue.

The AZ ballot contains a particularly noxious anti-immigrant proposition (Prop 200) that would, among other things, provide proof of citizenship before any government services (undefined) can be rendered by any state or local official (presumably including teachers, public health workers, etc.).

Most of the petitions that were signed contains the word "welfare" in describing such public services. The ballot language, however, does not contain this word.

This is the basis of a legal challenge to the Proposition that will be heard in court on this Wednesday.

I recall seeing specific research that tested the support for "welfare" vs.



"helping the poor" in an experimental test. Not surprisingly, the latter got more public support, indicating that "welfare" is a term laden with negative overtones.

If someone could send me an excerpt from this or similar research, you could be performing a real public service. Given the very short timeframe, an actual attached article or web page containing it would be more helpful than a citation alone.

If you respond during the day, please respond to my office email [oneil@oneilresearch.com](mailto:oneil@oneilresearch.com) since I get that during the day and only get this at night. If I find something usable today (e.g., testing the word "welfare" not just a citation that question wording matters), it might well be instrumental in court.

Many thanks.

Mike O'Neil  
[www.oneilresearch.com](http://www.oneilresearch.com)  
[oneil@oneilresearch.com](mailto:oneil@oneilresearch.com)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Tue, 26 Oct 2004 09:09:52 -0400  
Reply-To: Roger Tourangeau <[rtourangeau@SURVEY.UMD.EDU](mailto:rtourangeau@SURVEY.UMD.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Roger Tourangeau <[rtourangeau@SURVEY.UMD.EDU](mailto:rtourangeau@SURVEY.UMD.EDU)>  
Subject: Reminder: This Year's Hansen Lecture (November 17)  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

This year the Morris Hansen Lecture Series speaker is Dr. Jennifer Madans. This is the Fourteenth Hansen Lecture. The title of her talk will be "Bridging the Gap: Moving to the 1997 Standards for Collecting Data on Race and Ethnicity."

The talk will be held from 3:30 to 5:30 on Wednesday, November 17 in the Jefferson Auditorium, in the South Building of the Department of Agriculture. A reception will immediately follow in the Whitten Building. The discussants will be Clyde Tucker of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and Robert Hill of Westat. Nat Schenker of the National Center for Health Statistics will serve as this year's Chair. The Abstract for the talk is below, along with a brief biographical note on the speaker. The talk is open to the public. It is not necessary to RSVP.

ABSTRACT

Systems for classifying persons by race, ethnic background, and other attributes make it possible to compare population characteristics across data collection programs and over time. However, population changes make it necessary to update such systems periodically. To monitor population trends, bridges need to be developed that allow us to transition between system changes. The Office of Management and Budget's 1997 standards for the collection of data on race and ethnicity presented many challenges, especially because it allowed respondents to choose more than one race. The need for a bridging mechanism was particularly acute at the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). Calculating vital rates, a major NCHS program activity, requires data from the census for the denominators but data from state vital statistics offices for the numerators. Although the 2000 census adopted the 1997 standards, state vital statistics offices generally have not yet adopted them. Thus there is incompatibility between the race classifications used for the vital records and those used to estimate population counts. Bridging this gap required the development of strategies to modify data from one or both of the data sources, based on models for the relationship between race reporting under the new standards and the old ones, so that valid race-specific rates could be calculated. In the course of this project, we analyzed multiple data sets addressing different aspects of multiple-race reporting. This lecture will describe the approach taken by NCHS to build the bridge and the related infrastructure that supported the project. The importance of problem solving such as this to the mission of a statistical agency will also be discussed.

Dr. Madans has been the Associate Director for Science, National Center for Health Statistics, since May, 1996, and is responsible for the overall plan and development of NCHS's data collection and analysis programs. Since Dr. Madans joined the Center, she has concentrated her research efforts on data collection methodology, health services research and chronic disease epidemiology. She has directed two national longitudinal studies (NHANES I Epidemiologic Followup Study and the National Nursing Home Followup Study) as well as the redesign of the National Health Interview Survey questionnaire. She was one of the designers of the DHHS Survey Integration Plan. Dr. Madans is a graduate of Bard College (B.A.) and the University of Michigan (M.A. and Ph.D., Sociology). She completed a Postdoctoral Fellowship in the Department of Epidemiology and Public Health at Yale University. She has served as a lecturer in the Division of Biostatistics and Epidemiology, Department of Community and Family Medicine, Georgetown University School of Medicine and in the Department of Demography at Georgetown. She is a Fellow of the American Statistical Association.

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 26 Oct 2004 10:02:51 -0400

Reply-To: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <[tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu](mailto:tmglp@cms.mail.virginia.edu)>

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

From: "Thomas M. Guterbock" <[tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU](mailto:tmglp@CMS.MAIL.VIRGINIA.EDU)>

Subject: Re: Welfare and wording  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
In-Reply-To: <JMEJIDNHEJPNBFNKNHPDEEOLCAA.mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

Hi Mike:

I'm sending you (but not to the list) a .pdf file of Tom Smith's 1987  
\_POQ\_ article "That which we call welfare by any other name would smell  
sweeter."

A fine article with a most memorable title. No wonder it stuck in your  
mind!

Tom

--On Monday, October 25, 2004 7:47 PM -0700 Mike O'Neil  
<mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU> wrote:

> I need a very quick citation on a decidedly non-academic issue.  
>  
> The AZ ballot contains a particularly noxious anti-immigrant proposition  
> (Prop 200) that would, among other things, provide proof of citizenship  
> before any government services (undefined) can be rendered by any state or  
> local official (presumably including teachers, public health workers,  
> etc.).  
>  
> Most of the petitions that were signed contains the word "welfare" in  
> describing such public services. The ballot language, however, does not  
> contain this word.  
>  
> This is the basis of a legal challenge to the Proposition that will be  
> heard in court on this Wednesday.  
>  
> I recall seeing specific research that tested the support for "welfare"  
> vs. "helping the poor" in an experimental test. Not surprisingly, the  
> latter got more public support, indicating that "welfare" is a term laden  
> with negative overtones.  
>  
> If someone could send me an excerpt from this or similar research, you  
> could be performing a real public service. Given the very short  
> timeframe, an actual attached article or web page containing it would be  
> more helpful than a citation alone.  
>  
> If you respond during the day, please respond to my office email  
> oneil@oneilresearch.com since I get that during the day and only get this  
> at night. If I find something usable today (e.g., testing the word  
> "welfare" not just a citation that question wording matters), it might  
> well be instrumental in court.  
>  
> Many thanks.  
>  
> Mike O'Neil  
> www.oneilresearch.com

> oneil@oneilresearch.com

>

> -----

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

> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Thomas M. Guterbock                      Voice: (434)243-5223  
Director                      CSR Main Number: (434)243-5222  
Center for Survey Research              FAX: (434)243-5233  
University of Virginia      EXPRESS DELIVERY: 2400 Old Ivy Road  
P. O. Box 400767                      Suite 223  
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767      Charlottesville, VA 22903  
e-mail: TomG@virginia.edu

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====

Date: Tue, 26 Oct 2004 14:59:32 -0500

Reply-To: Scott Althaus <[salthaus@UIUC.EDU](mailto:salthaus@UIUC.EDU)>

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

From: Scott Althaus <[salthaus@UIUC.EDU](mailto:salthaus@UIUC.EDU)>

Subject: Re: Retro Poll Findings--no horserace here

Comments: To: [marsapir@comcast.net](mailto:marsapir@comcast.net), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

Comments: cc: Warren Gold <[WGold@itsa.ucsf.edu](mailto:WGold@itsa.ucsf.edu)>,  
Ariya Sasaki <[AriyaLove2004@aol.com](mailto:AriyaLove2004@aol.com)>,  
James True <[jtrue@mindspring.com](mailto:jtrue@mindspring.com)>,  
Karen Leonard <[karen153@adelphia.net](mailto:karen153@adelphia.net)>,  
Marc Sapir <[marsapir@comcast.net](mailto:marsapir@comcast.net)>,  
mickeyhuff@mac.com, Peter Phillips <[peter.phillips@sonoma.edu](mailto:peter.phillips@sonoma.edu)>,  
Suzanne Grady <[suziandchuck@yahoo.com](mailto:suziandchuck@yahoo.com)>,  
Sut Jhally <[sutj@comm.umass.edu](mailto:sutj@comm.umass.edu)>,  
Anuradha Mittal <[amittal@foodfirst.org](mailto:amittal@foodfirst.org)>,  
Charles Stein <[Stein@stat.stanford.edu](mailto:Stein@stat.stanford.edu)>,  
David Himmelstein <[himmelhandler@attbi.com](mailto:himmelhandler@attbi.com)>,  
Helen Finkelstein <[hfinkels@sfsu.edu](mailto:hfinkels@sfsu.edu)>,  
Justin Lewis <[LewisJ2@Cardiff.ac.uk](mailto:LewisJ2@Cardiff.ac.uk)>,  
Kris Welch <[Welchi@PacBell.net](mailto:Welchi@PacBell.net)>, Mike Davis <[MikeD@uci.edu](mailto:MikeD@uci.edu)>,  
Paul Ekman <[paul@paulekman.net](mailto:paul@paulekman.net)>,  
Robert McChesney <[Bob@freepress.net](mailto:Bob@freepress.net)>,  
Robert Newcomer <[rjn@itsa.ucsf.edu](mailto:rjn@itsa.ucsf.edu)>,  
Susan Janson <[Susan.Janson@nursing.ucsf.edu](mailto:Susan.Janson@nursing.ucsf.edu)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Dear Marc,

Thank you for your continuing interest in our study, and for taking the time to write out your comments in such detail.

In my earlier post to the list, I made neither claim nor quarrel regarding the Retro Poll or its findings. My point was narrowly that patterns in the Retro Poll data were being interpreted to suggest a causal relationship between the Bush administration's public relations efforts to convince Americans about the Saddam-9/11 link, and the apparent "discovery" of widespread public misperceptions about Saddam's culpability in the 9/11 attacks. It is quite common today for social scientists and interested observers to conclude that these public misperceptions were the product of a Bush administration spin campaign, but until our study was published (<http://www.apsanet.org/about/media/althaus.pdf>) there had been no hard evidence to support this inference one way or another.

Our study shows merely, and I emphasize merely, that:

(1) public misperceptions of the Saddam-9/11 link were question-dependent, in the sense that open-ended questions revealed low levels of culpability while forced-choice questions showed high levels of apparent misperception, as well as the sense that most questions (all but PIPA) didn't give respondents sufficient opportunities to select from multiple degrees of culpability, which when offered showed much lower levels of misperception.

(2) public misperceptions of the Saddam-9/11 link (in forced-choice questions) appeared to be at their highest levels in the first few days following the 9/11 attacks, and have been gradually declining in magnitude ever since.

(3) the degree of public misperception was somewhat higher \*before\* the Bush administration made a concerted effort to link Saddam with the War on Terror, an effort that began roughly in April of 2002 and continued through September of that year, culminating in the Congressional vote in early October to authorize military force. By September of 2002, the Harris Interactive poll showed lower levels of misperception than in September 2001; all other poll trends (which began in August or September of 2002) were generally declining over the rest of the series, during a period where the Bush administration continued to vigorously assert a Saddam-9/11 link.

So, our main point was (and is) merely that the available evidence does not support the hypothesis that the Bush administration's many efforts to link Saddam to the War on Terrorism paid off in raising aggregate levels of public misperceptions about this supposed link. To the contrary, our evidence suggests that this particular communications effort had no discernable effect in aggregate belief trends.

Regarding your conclusion that large discrepancies between open-ended and forced-choice response patterns are evidence of "how inexact public opinion research is" and how "these two methods can not both be 'valid' as measures of public opinion in this case", I beg to differ. Both of these points are important, and good arguments can be marshalled on both sides of them. However, our paper offers an interpretation of these discrepancies that seems quite plausible: If only 8% of Americans blamed Saddam for the attacks in open-ended questions, and nearly 80% were willing to believe he had something to do with the attacks in forced-choice questions, then this suggests (in light of other evidence presented in the article) that (1) many people found it possible that Saddam \*could\* be involved, but (2)

clearly identified Osama bin Ladin as the main culprit. This strikes us as a fair reading of the available data, but of course only one reading. Only a closer analysis of the individual-level data could shed light on this, and unfortunately we lack access to such data.

The "other bone" mentioned in your post had to do with our interpretation of the content analysis data reported in our article. However, nowhere do we assert that the content of Bush's speeches had any mechanical relationship to public belief trends, other than to observe that the overall belief trends were in decline over a period where the Bush administration put substantial rhetorical resources into suggesting a link between Saddam and the War on Terrorism. Moreover, we do not attempt to estimate statistically any such relationship. Now it is possible, as you suggest, that people somehow just "realized" Bush wanted to invade Iraq in the absence of any clear public statements in the immediate post-9/11 period, and there certainly was a long record of obscure pronouncements on this topic left by people like Feith, Wolfowitz, Rumsfeld and Cheney since the early 1990s about the desire to invade Iraq. However, I find it highly improbable that these things were known to the 80% of Americans who acknowledged the possibility of a Saddam-9/11 link in the first week following the 9/11 attacks.

These are all empirical questions, and they demand empirical answers. My larger point with the initial post, as with the article on which it was based, is simply that we need to be careful about asserting causal relationships about the apparent impact of communication processes on public opinion in the absence of relevant evidence. Many people believe that presidents have amazing powers of persuasion and can use their "bully pulpits" to somehow brainwash the American people on a wide range of things, but I submit that the available evidence in support of this hypothesis as a general statement is quite thin, and that the available evidence bearing on this hypothesis in the case of the Saddam-9/11 link offers no support that I can see. To the contrary, there appears to be no obvious "effect" at all stemming from this particular public relations campaign, but the lack of an effect may also be a consequence of limited data at a high level of aggregation. If the Retro Poll data show evidence of a causal effect along these lines, I certainly would be interested in seeing it.

Scott Althaus

----- Original message -----

>Date: Mon, 25 Oct 2004 15:29:15 -0700  
>From: "Marc Sapir" <marcsapir@comcast.net>  
>Subject: RE: Retro Poll Findings--no horseshoe here  
>To: "Scott Althaus" <salthaus@uiuc.edu>, <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
>Cc: "Warren Gold" <WGold@itsa.ucsf.edu>, "Ariya Sasaki"  
<AriyaLove2004@aol.com>, "James True" <jtrue@mindspring.com>, "Karen Leonard" <karenl53@adelphia.net>, "Marc Sapir" <marcsapir@comcast.net>, <mickeyhuff@mac.com>, "Peter Phillips" <peter.phillips@sonoma.edu>, "Suzanne Grady" <suziandchuck@yahoo.com>, "Sut Jhally" <sutj@comm.umass.edu>, "Anuradha Mittal" <amittal@foodfirst.org>, "Charles Stein" <Stein@stat.stanford.edu>, "David Himmelstein" <himmelhandler@attbi.com>, "Helen Finkelstein" <hfinkels@sfsu.edu>, "Justin

Lewis" <LewisJ2@Cardiff.ac.uk>, "Kris Welch" <Welchi@PacBell.net>, "Mike Davis" <MikeD@uci.edu>, "Paul Ekman" <paul@paulekman.net>, "Robert McChesney" <Bob@freepress.net>, "Robert Newcomer" <rjn@itsa.ucsf.edu>, "Susan Janson" <Susan.Janson@nursing.ucsf.edu>

>

> Link: File-List

>

> Dear Scott,

>

>

>

> Scott,

>

>

>

> Two weeks have passed, but I have now taken the time  
> to read your article (with Devon Largio, PSONline  
> www.apsanet.org) When Osama Became Saddam: Origins  
> and Consequences of the Change in America's Public  
> Enemy #1. I must say it's an interesting article.  
> However, I have problems with your conclusions. You  
> are absolutely right that the public had been guided  
> toward the idea of Saddam being a much bigger threat  
> than he actually was starting way before Bush's  
> ascendancy. You must be aware that in 1998 (if my  
> memory is correct) both the Congress and the  
> President (Clinton) made regime change in Iraq  
> (explicitly the removal of Saddam) public U.S.  
> policy. Given that Iraq had been totally degraded  
> militarily, financially and culturally by that time,  
> it was a level of arrogance that only the U.S. as  
> sole superpower could get away with. The Bush regime  
> simply decided to act upon that rhetoric by  
> exaggerating the earlier claims and beliefs that had  
> been spread widely by the media and by doing the  
> bait and switch on 9/11.

>

>

>

> When you say that Retro Poll errs in its conclusions  
> on this issue, however, I think that you have not  
> read through our various press releases and articles  
> carefully. Retro Poll's assertions and conclusions  
> pertain principally to critiquing the role of the  
> corporate media (and many polls) in furthering the  
> ideological interests and practical needs of those  
> in power, not infrequently to the denial of fact and  
> truth. We do link Bush to the public belief that  
> Saddam was involved with Al Qaeda but not to the  
> exclusion of prior efforts by prior administrations  
> to elevate Saddam to the level of a major world  
> threat.

>

>

>  
> Our poll question wording of relevance to your  
> article has been consistent over a two and a half  
> year period. Though our findings are not directly  
> comparable those of PIPA, our trend results are  
> similar. We show a slow but continuing decline in  
> belief that Saddam worked with Al Qaeda from over  
> 41% two years ago, to 29% in the current poll,  
> October, 2004.

>  
>  
>  
> But there are, I think, important methodological  
> complications in your work and analysis. I agree  
> that your comparing the open ended question approach  
> to the closed is of qualitative interest to the  
> research community and I applaud your pointing out  
> that problem. But these two methods can not both be  
> "valid" as measures of public opinion in this case  
> due to the huge data discrepancies. Except to show  
> how inexact public opinion research is and how  
> question wording and context impact results, writing  
> about them together doesn't get anywhere. Without  
> standardization of some kind it's just apples and  
> oranges and so the article isn't talking about a  
> data set that can be accepted as really  
> representative of public views. I see the reason  
> you did that in your argument that the early NYT/CBS  
> poll, being open ended and getting all the  
> publicity, skewed perception by analysts unaware of  
> the other work. Well, that's a useful argument but  
> then the question you don't answer is what the huge  
> discrepancy between 2-8% and 80% really represents.  
> Is it methodological or substantive. You do intimate  
> that it has to do with that background bugaboo  
> against Saddam coming out of the earlier years, and  
> people being ready to jump to agree with Saddam as  
> terrorist when given forced alternatives, and I  
> think you are probably right. But I think the  
> reason you can only intimate this rather than  
> conclude it is because it's in the realm of total  
> conjecture. It's little more than a plausible  
> hypothesis even though you and I may agree on it.

>  
>  
>  
> The other bone I want to pick is that in looking at  
> the frequency with which the media and Bush  
> mentioned Saddam and Osama you have fallen into the  
> fatal trap of believing that numbers are qualitative  
> rather than just quantitative. As an example: a key  
> point in a State of the Union Address or before the  
> U.N. or in a crisis oriented Press Conference might  
> be worth 20 or 100 times the public relations impact



> value of a comment mentioned in an interview or a  
> speech before some organization, covered as a brief  
> news item. But even more importantly, Saddam did  
> not have to be mentioned for some of us to realize  
> on 9/12-15 that U.S. leaders were going to push to  
> invade Iraq. People heard about the comments of  
> Rumsfeld and Wolfowitz etc. As a result, we do not  
> know how many people, among the public, also got  
> that message, which was, in essence, a subliminal  
> linking message. So, your suggesting that the public  
> has become more aware of the truth despite the  
> increased effort by the administration to push the  
> connection after April 2002, can be challenged on  
> that basis as well.

>  
>  
>  
> Nevertheless, I do agree with your general  
> conclusion on the trends and growing public  
> awareness of the truth, which I find hopeful. That  
> is also Retro Poll's conclusion. However, we believe  
> that this is due to still other complex factors at  
> play which I will not further detail here, but which  
> you do not take into consideration in your analysis.

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

---

Scott L. Althaus  
Associate Professor, Dept. of Speech Communication  
Associate Professor, Dept. of Political Science  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Department of Speech Communication  
702 S. Wright St., Rm. 244  
Urbana, IL 61801 USA

Office 217.333.8968  
Fax 217.244.1598  
Email [salthaus@uiuc.edu](mailto:salthaus@uiuc.edu)  
Web [www.uiuc.edu/~salthaus](http://www.uiuc.edu/~salthaus)

---

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

Date: Tue, 26 Oct 2004 13:56:39 -0700  
Reply-To: [jebeling <jebeling@MAIL.CSUCHICO.EDU>](mailto:jebeling@MAIL.CSUCHICO.EDU)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: [jebeling <jebeling@MAIL.CSUCHICO.EDU>](mailto:jebeling@MAIL.CSUCHICO.EDU)  
Subject: Re: Results of exit polls lie in hands of 12 experts  
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

While reading Mr. Simonetta's note following this comment, the thought struck me. What type of time embargo will there be, if any, on the announcement of possible winners in this election. As many may recall that was a big issue in the Carter Reagan campaigns. Since this is possibly such a close election, I'm concerned that there be some embargo imposed on the broadcasters about the statements regarding victory or loss in the various states on the east coast. I live in California and I feel that, while Oregon is not as close an issue as is Ohio or Iowa, there should be some constraints imposed. If there are constraints imposed, how might they be enforced?

Thanks, if anyone knows some of the answers to these issues.

Jon Ebeling

Leo Simonetta wrote:

>>From the Philly Inquirer  
>  
>  
>Results of exit polls lie in hands of 12 experts  
>  
>By Jonathan Storm  
>  
>INQUIRER TV CRITIC  
>  
>  
>The accuracy of TV voting results on Election Night rests primarily in the  
>brains and computers of two distinguished survey researchers and a panel of  
>10 number-crunchers.  
>  
>But don't discount the importance of cheesecake.  
>  
>Between them, Joe Lenski and Warren Mitofsky have more than 50 years of  
>experience in analyzing data - predicting the outcome of elections,  
>certainly, but also helping lawyers decide how to try their cases, and

>giving rockers advice on which album tracks to release as singles.  
>  
>The two head the National Election Pool, which replaced the Voter News Service after the reporting disaster in 2000.  
>  
>Mitofsky, 70, will be working his 10th presidential election. His firm, Mitofsky International, has performed exit polls in countries from Russia to the Philippines. Perhaps his most famous legal research helped spur a change of venue in the case of four New York City police officers in the shooting of Amadou Diallo.  
>  
>Lenski, 39, went to work for CBS in 1988, right out of Princeton University, as a statistical analyst. He cofounded Edison Media Research in 1994. Besides doing research to advise musicians, the company has worked for a host of commercial clients.  
>  
>The National Election Pool's analysis headquarters, above a former Woolworth's in downtown Somerville, N.J., about an hour southwest of New York, will be action central on Election Night.  
>  
>Ten high-powered numbers mavens - university professors, statisticians, political researchers - will analyze figures, along with Lenski and Mitofsky, who will decide when winners should be called in each state, and relay their calls to the networks. Each news organization retains control of when and what to announce.  
>  
>The experts in Somerville will survey exit-poll data generated by the National Election Pool and voting results collected by the Associated Press, a cooperative owned and operated by more than 1,500 U.S. daily newspapers. The AP plans to station employees at every county vote-tabulating location in the nation, funneling numbers to the counting house.  
>  
>Here's the difference this time, according to Lenski:  
>  
>"Since 2000, we have a better realization of the limitations of the actual vote. There are certain votes that aren't counted on Election Day, and there has been an increase in the percentage of people voting before Election Day."  
>  
>The National Election Pool, whose efforts reportedly cost \$10 million, has boosted the number of early and absentee-ballot polls it will conduct more than fourfold, to 13, from the three that Voter News Service performed in 2000.  
>  
>The AP has installed new quality controls to test numbers before they get into the system, and the National Election Pool has developed new computer models, based primarily on voting patterns, to flag seeming discrepancies.  
>  
>The new system performed well in 23 presidential primaries. And, unlike in the past, all the data is available for everybody at the networks to see.  
>  
>"At any time, any member of the pool can look at any report about precincts and counties," Lenski said.

>  
>The research eggheads have been gathering over snacks and desserts on  
>Thursdays since the beginning of July, subjecting their hotshot software  
>and equipment to upward of five hours a week of a mock 50-state election,  
>without significant problems.

>  
>"The big winner so far," Lenski said, "is the sandwich shop down the  
>street, and the bakery that makes their cheesecake."

>  
>Workers at La Delizia, delivering to what they think is some sort of weekly  
>party, say the cake, made by Villabate Bakery in Brooklyn, is a big seller  
>for them.

>  
>For Election Night, they'd better bring two.

>  
>--  
>Leo "Apprentice Number Maven" Simonetta  
>Research Director  
>Art & Science Group, LLC  
>6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
>Baltimore MD 21209

>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>  
>  
>  
>

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 26 Oct 2004 15:02:27 -0700  
Reply-To: "Voigt, Lynda" <[lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG](mailto:lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Voigt, Lynda" <[lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG](mailto:lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG)>  
Subject: Cell phone sampling summit II  
Comments: To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Was there organizational sponsorship for the cell phone sampling summit that was held in 2003 (i.e., AAPOR, SRMS, etc)? How about the one that will be held in 2005?

thanks,

Lynda Voigt

Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.  
Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center

Seattle, WA  
LVoigt@fhcrc.org  
phone (206) 667-4519  
FAX (206) 667-5948

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

Date: Tue, 26 Oct 2004 15:30:24 -0700  
Reply-To: Hank Zucker <[hank@surveysystem.com](mailto:hank@surveysystem.com)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Hank Zucker <[hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM](mailto:hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Results of exit polls lie in hands of 12 experts  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

As another Californian, I'd like to make the opposite request of those of you in a position to influence policy. I do not want any information proscribed. I'd prefer the results of eastern states be released as soon as those making projections are sufficiently confident in their accuracy to make them.

My understanding is that there is no actual data showing that results from the East suppress votes in the West. I am fairly certain that CA did not have a lower turnout in 1980 when Carter actually conceded before the polls closed here than in other years. Does anyone know of any data supporting (or contradicting) the suppression hypothesis or any other way in which releasing early returns may have influenced elections?

Hank Zucker

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

From: "jebeling" <[jebeling@MAIL.CSUCHICO.EDU](mailto:jebeling@MAIL.CSUCHICO.EDU)>  
To: <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
Sent: Tuesday, October 26, 2004 1:56 PM  
Subject: Re: Results of exit polls lie in hands of 12 experts

> While reading Mr. Simonetta's note following this comment, the thought  
> struck me. What type of time embargo will there be, if any, on the  
> announcement of possible winners in this election. As many may recall  
> that was a big issue in the Carter Reagan campaigns. Since this is  
> possibly such a close election, I'm concerned that there be some embargo  
> imposed on the broadcasters about the statements regarding victory or  
> loss in the various states on the east coast. I live in California and I  
> feel that, while Oregon is not as close an issue as is Ohio or Iowa,  
> there should be some constraints imposed. If there are constraints  
> imposed, how might they be enforced?  
>

> Thanks, if anyone knows some of the answers to these issues.  
>  
> Jon Ebeling  
>  
>  
> Leo Simonetta wrote:  
>  
>>From the Philly Inquirer  
>>  
>>  
>>Results of exit polls lie in hands of 12 experts  
>>  
>>By Jonathan Storm  
>>  
>>INQUIRER TV CRITIC  
>>  
>>  
>>The accuracy of TV voting results on Election Night rests primarily in  
the  
>>brains and computers of two distinguished survey researchers and a panel  
of  
>>10 number-crunchers.  
>>  
>>But don't discount the importance of cheesecake.  
>>  
>>Between them, Joe Lenski and Warren Mitofsky have more than 50 years of  
>>experience in analyzing data - predicting the outcome of elections,  
>>certainly, but also helping lawyers decide how to try their cases, and  
>>giving rockers advice on which album tracks to release as singles.  
>>  
>>The two head the National Election Pool, which replaced the Voter News  
>>Service after the reporting disaster in 2000.  
>>  
>>Mitofsky, 70, will be working his 10th presidential election. His firm,  
>>Mitofsky International, has performed exit polls in countries from Russia  
>>to the Philippines. Perhaps his most famous legal research helped spur a  
>>change of venue in the case of four New York City police officers in the  
>>shooting of Amadou Diallo.  
>>  
>>Lenski, 39, went to work for CBS in 1988, right out of Princeton  
>>University, as a statistical analyst. He cofounded Edison Media Research  
in  
>>1994. Besides doing research to advise musicians, the company has worked  
>>for a host of commercial clients.  
>>  
>>The National Election Pool's analysis headquarters, above a former  
>>Woolworth's in downtown Somerville, N.J., about an hour southwest of New  
>>York, will be action central on Election Night.  
>>  
>>Ten high-powered numbers mavens - university professors, statisticians,  
>>political researchers - will analyze figures, along with Lenski and  
>>Mitofsky, who will decide when winners should be called in each state,  
and  
>>relay their calls to the networks. Each news organization retains control

>>of when and what to announce.  
>>  
>>The experts in Somerville will survey exit-poll data generated by the  
>>National Election Pool and voting results collected by the Associated  
>>Press, a cooperative owned and operated by more than 1,500 U.S. daily  
>>newspapers. The AP plans to station employees at every county  
>>vote-tabulating location in the nation, funneling numbers to the counting  
>>house.  
>>  
>>Here's the difference this time, according to Lenski:  
>>  
>>"Since 2000, we have a better realization of the limitations of the  
actual  
>>vote. There are certain votes that aren't counted on Election Day, and  
>>there has been an increase in the percentage of people voting before  
>>Election Day."  
>>  
>>The National Election Pool, whose efforts reportedly cost \$10 million,  
has  
>>boosted the number of early and absentee-ballot polls it will conduct  
more  
>>than fourfold, to 13, from the three that Voter News Service performed in  
>>2000.  
>>  
>>The AP has installed new quality controls to test numbers before they get  
>>into the system, and the National Election Pool has developed new  
computer  
>>models, based primarily on voting patterns, to flag seeming  
discrepancies.  
>>  
>>The new system performed well in 23 presidential primaries. And, unlike  
in  
>>the past, all the data is available for everybody at the networks to see.  
>>  
>>"At any time, any member of the pool can look at any report about  
precincts  
>>and counties," Lenski said.  
>>  
>>The research eggheads have been gathering over snacks and desserts on  
>>Thursdays since the beginning of July, subjecting their hotshot software  
>>and equipment to upward of five hours a week of a mock 50-state election,  
>>without significant problems.  
>>  
>>"The big winner so far," Lenski said, "is the sandwich shop down the  
>>street, and the bakery that makes their cheesecake."  
>>  
>>Workers at La Delizia, delivering to what they think is some sort of  
weekly  
>>party, say the cake, made by Villabate Bakery in Brooklyn, is a big  
seller  
>>for them.  
>>  
>>For Election Night, they'd better bring two.  
>>

>>--

>>Leo "Apprentice Number Maven" Simonetta

>>Research Director

>>Art & Science Group, LLC

>>6115 Falls Road, Suite 101

>>Baltimore MD 21209

>>

>>-----

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

>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>>

>>

>>

>>

>

>-----

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

> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>

>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 26 Oct 2004 15:43:39 -0700

Reply-To: Marc Sapir <[marcsapir@COMCAST.NET](mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET)>

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

From: Marc Sapir <[marcsapir@COMCAST.NET](mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET)>

Subject: Re: Retro Poll Findings--no horserace here

Comments: To: Scott Althaus <[salthaus@UIUC.EDU](mailto:salthaus@UIUC.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

In-Reply-To: <[5.1.1.5.2.20041026141613.02f08408@express.cites.uiuc.edu](mailto:5.1.1.5.2.20041026141613.02f08408@express.cites.uiuc.edu)>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Scott,

I appreciate your in depth review of your article, findings, and conclusions. I find that I am in substantial agreement with almost everything you have written in your current e-mail. I believe I was responding to a brief note you sent me off the list suggesting that we, as others, had attributed peoples' belief in the Saddam-Al Qaeda linkage to Bush's push on this linkage.

Retro Poll does not claim it has any evidence of a causal relationship. We only claim that there is an association between misunderstanding the facts in Iraq and support for the war and the continuing occupation. An interesting sidebar to your findings that people's opinions were not generally influenced by the Bush campaign to sell Saddam as terrorist connected to Al Qaeda might be this: one might expect from the growing disaffection with the linking assertion, a substantial reaction against



Bush and potentially a significant victory for Kerry in the Presidential race. That would fly in the face of much of the polling we've seen which has usually suggested an extremely close race. But your conclusions seem to me to suggest this other possibility. We shall see.

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

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Scott Althaus  
Sent: Tuesday, October 26, 2004 12:00 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Retro Poll Findings--no horserace here

Dear Marc,

Thank you for your continuing interest in our study, and for taking the time to write out your comments in such detail.

In my earlier post to the list, I made neither claim nor quarrel regarding the Retro Poll or its findings. My point was narrowly that patterns in the Retro Poll data were being interpreted to suggest a causal relationship between the Bush administration's public relations efforts to convince Americans about the Saddam-9/11 link, and the apparent "discovery" of widespread public misperceptions about Saddam's culpability in the 9/11 attacks. It is quite common today for social scientists and interested observers to conclude that these public misperceptions were the product of a Bush administration spin campaign, but until our study was published (<http://www.apsanet.org/about/media/althaus.pdf>) there had been no hard evidence to support this inference one way or another.

Our study shows merely, and I emphasize merely, that:

(1) public misperceptions of the Saddam-9/11 link were question-dependent, in the sense that open-ended questions revealed low levels of culpability while forced-choice questions showed high levels of apparent misperception, as well as the sense that most questions (all but PIPA) didn't give respondents sufficient opportunities to select from multiple degrees of culpability, which when offered showed much lower levels of misperception.

(2) public misperceptions of the Saddam-9/11 link (in forced-choice questions) appeared to be at their highest levels in the first few days following the 9/11 attacks, and have been gradually declining in

magnitude  
ever since.

(3) the degree of public misperception was somewhat higher \*before\* the Bush administration made a concerted effort to link Saddam with the War on Terror, an effort that began roughly in April of 2002 and continued through September of that year, culminating in the Congressional vote in early October to authorize military force. By September of 2002, the Harris Interactive poll showed lower levels of misperception than in September 2001; all other poll trends (which began in August or September of 2002) were generally declining over the rest of the series, during a period where the Bush administration continued to vigorously assert a Saddam-9/11 link.

So, our main point was (and is) merely that the available evidence does not support the hypothesis that the Bush administration's many efforts to link Saddam to the War on Terrorism paid off in raising aggregate levels of public misperceptions about this supposed link. To the contrary, our evidence suggests that this particular communications effort had no discernable effect in aggregate belief trends.

Regarding your conclusion that large discrepancies between open-ended and forced-choice response patterns are evidence of "how inexact public opinion research is" and how "these two methods can not both be 'valid' as measures of public opinion in this case", I beg to differ. Both of these points are important, and good arguments can be marshalled on both sides of them. However, our paper offers an interpretation of these discrepancies that seems quite plausible: If only 8% of Americans blamed Saddam for the attacks in open-ended questions, and nearly 80% were willing to believe he had something to do with the attacks in forced-choice questions, then this suggests (in light of other evidence presented in the article) that (1) many people found it possible that Saddam \*could\* be involved, but (2) clearly identified Osama bin Ladin as the main culprit. This strikes us as a fair reading of the available data, but of course only one reading. Only a closer analysis of the individual-level data could shed light on this, and unfortunately we lack access to such data.

The "other bone" mentioned in your post had to do with our interpretation of the content analysis data reported in our article. However, nowhere do

we assert that the content of Bush's speeches had any mechanical relationship to public belief trends, other than to observe that the overall belief trends were in decline over a period where the Bush administration put substantial rhetorical resources into suggesting a link between Saddam and the War on Terrorism. Moreover, we do not attempt to estimate statistically any such relationship. Now it is possible, as you suggest, that people somehow just "realized" Bush wanted to invade Iraq in the absence of any clear public statements in the immediate post-9/11 period, and there certainly was a long record of obscure pronouncements on this topic left by people like Feith, Wolfowitz, Rumsfeld and Cheney since the early 1990s about the desire to invade Iraq. However, I find it highly improbable that these things were known to the 80% of Americans who acknowledged the possibility of a Saddam-9/11 link in the first week following the 9/11 attacks.

These are all empirical questions, and they demand empirical answers. My larger point with the initial post, as with the article on which it was based, is simply that we need to be careful about asserting causal relationships about the apparent impact of communication processes on public opinion in the absence of relevant evidence. Many people believe that presidents have amazing powers of persuasion and can use their "bully pulpits" to somehow brainwash the American people on a wide range of things, but I submit that the available evidence in support of this hypothesis as a general statement is quite thin, and that the available evidence bearing on this hypothesis in the case of the Saddam-9/11 link offers no support that I can see. To the contrary, there appears to be no obvious "effect" at all stemming from this particular public relations campaign, but the lack of an effect may also be a consequence of limited data at a high level of aggregation. If the Retro Poll data show evidence of a causal effect along these lines, I certainly would be interested in seeing it.

Scott Althaus

----- Original message -----

>Date: Mon, 25 Oct 2004 15:29:15 -0700

>From: "Marc Sapir" <marcsapir@comcast.net>

>Subject: RE: Retro Poll Findings--no horserace here

>To: "Scott Althaus" <salthaus@uiuc.edu>, <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

>Cc: "Warren Gold" <WGold@itsa.ucsf.edu>, "Ariya Sasaki"

<AriyaLove2004@aol.com>, "James True" <jtrue@mindspring.com>, "Karen

Leonard" <karenl53@adelphia.net>, "Marc Sapir" <marcsapir@comcast.net>,

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

"Suzanne Grady" <suziandchuck@yahoo.com>, "Sut Jhally"

<sutj@comm.umass.edu>, "Anuradha Mittal" <amittal@foodfirst.org>,

"Charles

Stein" <Stein@stat.stanford.edu>, "David Himmelstein"  
<himmelhandler@attbi.com>, "Helen Finkelstein" <hfinkels@sfsu.edu>,  
"Justin  
Lewis" <LewisJ2@Cardiff.ac.uk>, "Kris Welch" <Welchi@PacBell.net>, "Mike  
Davis" <MikeD@uci.edu>, "Paul Ekman" <paul@paulekman.net>, "Robert  
McChesney" <Bob@freepress.net>, "Robert Newcomer" <rjn@itsa.ucsf.edu>,  
"Susan Janson" <Susan.Janson@nursing.ucsf.edu>

>

> Link: File-List

>

> Dear Scott,

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

> Two weeks have passed, but I have now taken the time  
> to read your article (with Devon Largio, PSONline  
> www.apsanet.org) When Osama Became Saddam: Origins  
> and Consequences of the Change in America's Public  
> Enemy #1. I must say it's an interesting article.  
> However, I have problems with your conclusions. You  
> are absolutely right that the public had been guided  
> toward the idea of Saddam being a much bigger threat  
> than he actually was starting way before Bush's  
> ascendancy. You must be aware that in 1998 (if my  
> memory is correct) both the Congress and the  
> President (Clinton) made regime change in Iraq  
> (explicitly the removal of Saddam) public U.S.  
> policy. Given that Iraq had been totally degraded  
> militarily, financially and culturally by that time,  
> it was a level of arrogance that only the U.S. as  
> sole superpower could get away with. The Bush regime  
> simply decided to act upon that rhetoric by  
> exaggerating the earlier claims and beliefs that had  
> been spread widely by the media and by doing the  
> bait and switch on 9/11.

>

>

>

> When you say that Retro Poll errs in its conclusions  
> on this issue, however, I think that you have not  
> read through our various press releases and articles  
> carefully. Retro Poll's assertions and conclusions  
> pertain principally to critiquing the role of the  
> corporate media (and many polls) in furthering the  
> ideological interests and practical needs of those  
> in power, not infrequently to the denial of fact and  
> truth. We do link Bush to the public belief that  
> Saddam was involved with Al Qaeda but not to the  
> exclusion of prior efforts by prior administrations  
> to elevate Saddam to the level of a major world

> threat.

>  
>  
>  
>  
> Our poll question wording of relevance to your  
> article has been consistent over a two and a half  
> year period. Though our findings are not directly  
> comparable those of PIPA, our trend results are  
> similar. We show a slow but continuing decline in  
> belief that Saddam worked with Al Qaeda from over  
> 41% two years ago, to 29% in the current poll,  
> October, 2004.

>  
>  
>  
> But there are, I think, important methodological  
> complications in your work and analysis. I agree  
> that your comparing the open ended question approach  
> to the closed is of qualitative interest to the  
> research community and I applaud your pointing out  
> that problem. But these two methods can not both be  
> "valid" as measures of public opinion in this case  
> due to the huge data discrepancies. Except to show  
> how inexact public opinion research is and how  
> question wording and context impact results, writing  
> about them together doesn't get anywhere. Without  
> standardization of some kind it's just apples and  
> oranges and so the article isn't talking about a  
> data set that can be accepted as really  
> representative of public views. I see the reason  
> you did that in your argument that the early NYT/CBS  
> poll, being open ended and getting all the  
> publicity, skewed perception by analysts unaware of  
> the other work. Well, that's a useful argument but  
> then the question you don't answer is what the huge  
> discrepancy between 2-8% and 80% really represents.  
> Is it methodological or substantive. You do intimate  
> that it has to do with that background bugaboo  
> against Saddam coming out of the earlier years, and  
> people being ready to jump to agree with Saddam as  
> terrorist when given forced alternatives, and I  
> think you are probably right. But I think the  
> reason you can only intimate this rather than  
> conclude it is because it's in the realm of total  
> conjecture. It's little more than a plausible  
> hypothesis even though you and I may agree on it.

>  
>  
>  
>  
> The other bone I want to pick is that in looking at  
> the frequency with which the media and Bush  
> mentioned Saddam and Osama you have fallen into the  
> fatal trap of believing that numbers are qualitative  
> rather than just quantitative. As an example: a key

> point in a State of the Union Address or before the  
> U.N. or in a crisis oriented Press Conference might  
> be worth 20 or 100 times the public relations impact  
> value of a comment mentioned in an interview or a  
> speech before some organization, covered as a brief  
> news item. But even more importantly, Saddam did  
> not have to be mentioned for some of us to realize  
> on 9/12-15 that U.S. leaders were going to push to  
> invade Iraq. People heard about the comments of  
> Rumsfeld and Wolfowitz etc. As a result, we do not  
> know how many people, among the public, also got  
> that message, which was, in essence, a subliminal  
> linking message. So, your suggesting that the public  
> has become more aware of the truth despite the  
> increased effort by the administration to push the  
> connection after April 2002, can be challenged on  
> that basis as well.

>  
>  
>  
> Nevertheless, I do agree with your general  
> conclusion on the trends and growing public  
> awareness of the truth, which I find hopeful. That  
> is also Retro Poll's conclusion. However, we believe  
> that this is due to still other complex factors at  
> play which I will not further detail here, but which  
> you do not take into consideration in your analysis.

>  
>  
>  
> Marc Sapir MD, MPH

>  
> Executive Director

>  
> Retro Poll

>  
> [www.retropoll.org](http://www.retropoll.org)

>  
>

---

Scott L. Althaus  
Associate Professor, Dept. of Speech Communication  
Associate Professor, Dept. of Political Science  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Department of Speech Communication  
702 S. Wright St., Rm. 244  
Urbana, IL 61801 USA

Office 217.333.8968  
Fax 217.244.1598

Email [salthaus@uiuc.edu](mailto:salthaus@uiuc.edu)  
Web [www.uiuc.edu/~salthaus](http://www.uiuc.edu/~salthaus)

---

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

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

---

Date: Tue, 26 Oct 2004 20:00:47 -0400  
Reply-To: Philip Meyer <[pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU](mailto:pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Philip Meyer <[pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU](mailto:pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU)>  
Subject: Exit polls  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Can anyone guide me to a web site where leaked exit poll results are likely to turn up on Nov. 2? Suspense, at my age, is unhealthy.

Cheers, P.

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

---

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

---

Date: Tue, 26 Oct 2004 20:53:23 -0400  
Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
Organization: Queens College CUNY  
Subject: Re: Exit polls  
Comments: To: Philip Meyer <[pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU](mailto:pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[Pine.A41.4.44+UNC.0410261959130.59306-100000@login2.isis.unc.edu](mailto:Pine.A41.4.44+UNC.0410261959130.59306-100000@login2.isis.unc.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear Phil:

Drudge and National Review Online seem to get this stuff up faster than anyone, however, Warren and Joe don't like it one bit, and I don't blame them.

Andy

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Philip Meyer  
Sent: Tuesday, October 26, 2004 8:01 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Exit polls

Can anyone guide me to a web site where leaked exit poll results are likely to turn up on Nov. 2? Suspense, at my age, is unhealthy.

Cheers, P.

=====  
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  
=====

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

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

Date: Tue, 26 Oct 2004 20:55:20 -0400  
Reply-To: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>  
Organization: Queens College CUNY  
Subject: FW: Dead Voters plotting October Surprise?  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

An amusing direct e-mail piece.

-----  
From: Aristotle's Politics [mailto:[yourNews@aristotle.com](mailto:yourNews@aristotle.com)]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 26, 2004 8:22 PM  
To: [beveridg@optonline.net](mailto:beveridg@optonline.net)



Subject: Dead Voters plotting October Surprise?

<[http://63.220.227.151/sales/images/aristotle\\_logo\\_small.gif](http://63.220.227.151/sales/images/aristotle_logo_small.gif)>

Did you know that Deadwood - registered voters who have moved or died - tops a staggering 25% of the voter rolls in some counties.

To determine exactly how much deadwood there is in your area, go to [www.voterlistsonline.com](http://www.voterlistsonline.com).

Using lists from the US government and US Postal Service we've identified and removed dead voters and those who have moved.

We also update listed phone numbers for every living voter in your district.

This insures your GOTV calls and walk lists only include voters who are here, and not in the hereafter.

American Express, Visa, Mastercard and Discover are welcome. Accuracy is guaranteed.

Sincerely,

<<http://63.220.227.151/sales/images/jpsig.gif>>

John Phillips  
CEO  
Aristotle

We hope you found this message useful and informative. However, if you would like to unsubscribe, please e-mail me at [remove@aristotle.com](mailto:remove@aristotle.com).

---

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Tue, 26 Oct 2004 21:17:14 -0400

Reply-To: Ken Sherrill <[ken@KENSHERILL.COM](mailto:ken@KENSHERILL.COM)>

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

From: Ken Sherrill <[ken@KENSHERILL.COM](mailto:ken@KENSHERILL.COM)>

Subject: Election 2004:The Gay Vote, Gay Marriage,  
andthe Prospects for Gay Rights Legislation;Williams Project  
Event on Nov. 15, 2004

MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

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

From: Williams Project [mailto:williamsproject@law.ucla.edu]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 26, 2004 10:03 AM  
To: Williams Project  
Cc: Sears, Brad  
Subject: Election 2004: The Gay Vote, Gay Marriage, and the Prospects for  
Gay Rights Legislation; Williams Project Event on Nov. 15, 2004

Please forward widely.

Election 2004:

The Gay Vote, Gay Marriage, and the  
Prospects for Gay Rights Legislation

Monday, November 15, 2004  
6:30 pm -8:30 pm  
UCLA School of Law, Room 1357  
1.5 Units of CLE Credit Available

Reception to Follow

This two-hour panel brings together experts from across the country to analyze how LGBT voters and issues affected the November 2004 election and the prospects for gay rights legislation given the election's results.

Confirmed panelists include:

Professor Chai Feldblum

Professor of Law and Director of Federal Legislation Clinic, Georgetown  
University Law Center

Professor David O. Sears

Professor of Psychology and Political Science and Director of the  
Institute for Social Science Research, UCLA  
Professor Kenneth Sherrill

Professor of Political Science, Hunter College  
Susan Pinkus

Director of Polling, Los Angeles Times  
C. Martin Meekins, Esq.

National Board Member, Log Cabin Republicans

To RSVP for this event, call (310) 794-5192, or email  
williamsproject@law.ucla.edu.

Parking is available on the UCLA campus for \$7.00.

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

=====  
Date: Tue, 26 Oct 2004 21:17:52 -0400  
Reply-To: Joe Lenski <[jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM](mailto:jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Joe Lenski <[jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM](mailto:jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Exit polls  
Comments: To: Andrew A Beveridge <[andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU](mailto:andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU)>, AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Thanks Andy:

It is not just that Warren and I don't like it one bit, it is just bad =  
for the survey research industry on many levels to support the leaking =  
of exit poll data before the polls close.

First, the first wave of exit poll data only represents the morning =  
interviews and absentee voter surveys. I am sure that no one in AAPOR =  
would like the accuracy of their work evaluated based upon one-third of =

the interviews.

Second, there are patterns of voting that differ by demographic groups - =  
i.e. Older people vote at different times than younger people - the same =  
with the time pattern of voting for Blacks and White. The first wave of =  
exit poll results may differ from the final results because of this.

Third, the leaking of exit poll data gives an excuse to local election =  
officials to not cooperate with the conduct of exit polls. We have had =  
to overcome much resistance from local election officials and one of the =  
promises that we make for cooperation is that the results will not be =  
broadcast before the polls in that state have closed. Every time that =  
exit poll data is released prematurely on the web our credibility with =  
these election officials is compromised and it just makes doing the next =  
exit poll harder.

Fourth, much of the early exit poll data that is leaked to the web is =  
being "spun" by the campaigns and political operatives. They take the =  
estimates that they like and leak those and the ones that they don't =  
like they don't leak - this was especially true in the New Hampshire =  
primary in January when several different exit poll estimates made their =  
way onto the web and not all of them were accurate.

I could go on for a long time on this topic but I am a little busy right =  
now.

Joe Lenski  
edison media research

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Andrew A Beveridge  
Sent: Tuesday, October 26, 2004 8:53 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Exit polls

Dear Phil:

Drudge and National Review Online seem to get this stuff up faster than  
anyone, however, Warren and Joe don't like it one bit, and I don't blame  
them.

Andy

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Philip Meyer  
Sent: Tuesday, October 26, 2004 8:01 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Exit polls

Can anyone guide me to a web site where leaked exit poll results are  
likely to turn up on Nov. 2? Suspense, at my age, is unhealthy.



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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Voigt, Lynda

Sent: Tuesday, October 26, 2004 6:02 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Cell phone sampling summit II

Was there organizational sponsorship for the cell phone sampling summit that was held in 2003 (i.e., AAPOR, SRMS, etc)? How about the one that will be held in 2005?

thanks,

Lynda Voigt

Lynda F. Voigt, Ph.D.

Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center

Seattle, WA

LVoigt@fhcrc.org

phone (206) 667-4519

FAX (206) 667-5948

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Wed, 27 Oct 2004 05:47:14 -0700

Reply-To: Anthony Whyde <[anthony.s.whyde@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:anthony.s.whyde@CENSUS.GOV)>

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

From: Anthony Whyde <[anthony.s.whyde@CENSUS.GOV](mailto:anthony.s.whyde@CENSUS.GOV)>

Subject: Warnings and Ratings

I found this interesting.

Study: Terror Warnings Up Approval Ratings

By WILLIAM KATES

Associated Press Writer

SYRACUSE, N.Y. (AP) - When the government issues a terror warning, the president's approval rating increases an average of nearly three points, a Cornell University sociologist says.

"The social theories predict it, and anecdotally we know it to be true. Now we have statistical science to confirm it," said Robb Willer, assistant director of Cornell's Sociology and Small Groups Laboratory.

On average, a terror warning prompted a 2.75 point increase in President

George Bush's approval rating the following week, said Willer, who published his study in Current Research in Social Psychology, a peer-reviewed online journal.

Robert Greene, a professor of history and communication at Cazenovia College, said he did not doubt the correlation, but considered the small increase barely noteworthy.

"And I would think any benefit would be very temporary. Americans like crises to be solved," said Greene.

Willer said he took up his study in the aftermath of the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks after watching Bush's approval rating soar from 51 percent on Sept. 10 to 86 percent five days later.

Willer tracked the 26 times that a federal agency reported an increased threat of terrorist activity \_ not just changes in the alert level \_ between February 2001 and May 2004. He compared that with the 131 Gallup Polls conducted during the same period.

"From the perspective of social identity theory, threats of attacks from foreigners increase solidarity and in-group identification among Americans, including feelings of stronger solidarity with their leadership," he said.

Terror warnings increased presidential approval ratings "consistently," Willer said. However, he said he was unable to measure how long the increase lasted.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Wed, 27 Oct 2004 08:08:09 -0500  
Reply-To: "Peyton, Brianne G" <[bgobrien@IUPUI.EDU](mailto:bgobrien@IUPUI.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Peyton, Brianne G" <[bgobrien@IUPUI.EDU](mailto:bgobrien@IUPUI.EDU)>  
Subject: Field Director  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Does anyone know the dates for the Field Director's section of the conference in 2005?

Brianne (Breezy) Peyton  
Field Director  
Indiana University Public Opinion Laboratory  
Indiana University School of Liberal Arts at IUPUI  
(317) 274-4104 [bgobrien@iupui.edu](mailto:bgobrien@iupui.edu)  
=20  
Check us out on the web @ <http://polecat.iupui.edu>=20

-----

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Wed, 27 Oct 2004 10:42:33 -0400  
Reply-To: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>  
Subject: leaking exit polls  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

AAPOR members:

Thanks go to Joe Lenski for reminding us of the need, shall we say responsibility, we all bear for helping protect the integrity of the exit polls and ultimately the trustworthiness of our industry in the eyes of the public. As you all are well aware, the data derived from exit polls are fabulously useful not only immediately after the polls close but for years to come. They are like no other source.

Nancy Belden  
President  
AAPOR

Belden Russonello & Stewart  
1320 19th Street NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
202.822.6090

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Wed, 27 Oct 2004 10:17:53 -0500  
Reply-To: "Wolf, James G" <jamwolf@IUPUI.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Wolf, James G" <jamwolf@IUPUI.EDU>  
Subject: IRB Guidance  
Comments: To: SOCFAC@LISTSERV.IUPUI.EDU, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

For those who are confused, bemused or otherwise doing battle with IRB classifications (exempt, expedited, informed consent required, etc.) the following note from DHHS Office for Human Research Protection provides a link to a chart that many should find useful:

=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D=  
-=3D-=3D



From: "Niemoeller, Larry" <LNiemoeller@OSOPHS.DHHS.GOV>=20  
To: OHRP-L@LIST.NIH.GOV=20  
Subject: Human Subject Regulations Decision Charts=20  
Date: Wed, 27 Oct 2004 10:22:27 +0000

(October 26, 2004) The Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) has updated the set of Human Subject Regulations Decision Charts available at <http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/decisioncharts.htm> <<http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/decisioncharts.htm>> . The revised decision charts provide graphic aids to assist institutional review boards (IRBs), investigators, and others who decide if an activity is research involving human subjects that must be reviewed by an IRB under the requirements of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) regulations at 45 CFR part 46. The charts address decisions on the following:=20

I. whether an activity is research that must be reviewed by an IRB,

II. whether the review may be performed by expedited procedures,  
and=20

III. whether informed consent or its documentation may be waived.=20

=20

=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D=  
-=3D-=3D

Jim Wolf            jamwolf@iupui.edu

Director, Public Opinion Laboratory

Indiana University School of Liberal Arts at IUPUI

Voice: (317) 278-9230   Fax: (317) 278-2383

=20

=20

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====

Date:        Wed, 27 Oct 2004 12:19:00 -0400  
Reply-To:    Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Sender:      AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From:        Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Subject:     Re: Exit polls  
Comments: To: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <Pine.A41.4.44+UNC.0410261959130.59306-100000@login2.isis.u  
              nc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0

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

Phil,  
Of all people, I thought you would have known better. Leaked numbers are worthless. Now I know why reporters are so easily seduced by leaked numbers, if you are, too.

The sites suggested to you sometimes have wrong data. One of them posted test data we had not cleaned out of the system and then told people there were two exit polls in the race, questioning which of exit poll got it right. There frequently are errors in what is posted. It is usually leaked by people that do not know how to read the statistical information they are viewing. They don't know the best estimator from the pre-election polls or an estimator missing the affect of absentee votes. These are in addition to all the reasons my partner, Joe Lenski, gave last night. I suppose you only watch sporting events through half time and conclude that is the final score.

The cynicism in your message asking for the sites that display leaks is duly noted.  
warren mitofsky

At 08:00 PM 10/26/2004, Philip Meyer wrote:

> Can anyone guide me to a web site where leaked exit poll results are  
>likely to turn up on Nov. 2? Suspense, at my age, is unhealthy.

>  
>Cheers, P.

>  
>=====

>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

>=====

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

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

212 980-3031  
212 980-3107 Fax

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Wed, 27 Oct 2004 09:48:47 -0700  
Reply-To: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>  
Subject: www.votingsystems.us  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

The following message was posted on the Survey Methods Listserv of the American Statistical Association. I thought it might be of interest to AAPOR members.

>Date: Wed, 27 Oct 2004 09:59:04 EDT  
>Sender: Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA  
>From: Scheuren@AOL.COM  
>Subject: Preparing for the Upcoming Election?  
>To: SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU  
>  
>Dear Colleagues:  
>  
>Hope you all are bracing up well for the upcoming election? As citizens we  
>have obligations, of course. But as statisticians maybe some of you want  
>to play a direct role too? This was one of the themes in my August AMSTAT  
>NEWS note on Phantom Voters. Since then I have been urging more  
>statistical involvement in my ASA Chapter talks around the country.  
>  
>To aid those of you who want to become more statistically involved, I am  
>announcing a research site  
><<http://www.votingsystems.us>>[www.votingsystems.us](http://www.votingsystems.us) of recent  
>bibliographical sources containing statistical and related treatments of  
>the US electoral system. It is intended to aid professionals facing  
>statistical data collection and analysis challenges involving the 2004 US  
>election.  
>  
>This nonpartisan site, being mounted by NORC, is still under construction  
>and we would welcome peer reviewed submissions of links or complete texts  
>at -- <<mailto:scheuren-friz@norc.uchicago.edu>>[scheuren-friz@norc.uchicago.edu](mailto:scheuren-friz@norc.uchicago.edu).  
>  
>We have sought permission to publish links to the material here but some  
>of these permissions are still pending. These links will be added when  
>received.  
>  
>Best to you all and to our country, Fritz

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Wed, 27 Oct 2004 09:58:05 -0700  
Reply-To: phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Phillip J. Trounstine" <phil.trounstine@SJSU.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Exit polls  
Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Guys -- I say give Phil a break. He's not proposing to print or broadcast gossipy, leaked, half-baked data. He's just asking where he can find what is already going to be out there IN THE PUBLIC DOMAIN. He's just an old info voyeur -- like a lot of us. You can take the reporter out of the newsroom but you can't take the newsroom out of the reporter.

Phil Trounstine  
Survey and Policy Research Institute  
at San Jose State University  
408-924-6993  
phil.trounstine@sjsu.edu

Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Sent by: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
10/27/2004 09:19 AM  
Please respond to Warren Mitofsky

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
cc:  
Subject: Re: Exit polls

Phil,  
Of all people, I thought you would have known better. Leaked numbers are worthless. Now I know why reporters are so easily seduced by leaked numbers, if you are, too.

The sites suggested to you sometimes have wrong data. One of them posted test data we had not cleaned out of the system and then told people there were two exit polls in the race, questioning which of exit poll got it right. There frequently are errors in what is posted. It is usually leaked by people that do not know how to read the statistical information they are viewing. They don't know the best estimator from the pre-election polls or an estimator missing the affect of absentee votes. These are in addition to all the reasons my partner, Joe Lenski, gave last night. I suppose you only watch sporting events through half time and conclude that is the final score.

The cynicism in your message asking for the sites that display leaks is

duly noted.  
warren mitofsky

At 08:00 PM 10/26/2004, Philip Meyer wrote:

> Can anyone guide me to a web site where leaked exit poll results are  
>likely to turn up on Nov. 2? Suspense, at my age, is unhealthy.

>  
>Cheers, P.

>=====

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

>=====

>  
>-----

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

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

212 980-3031  
212 980-3107 Fax

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

-----

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----

Date: Wed, 27 Oct 2004 13:21:42 -0400  
Reply-To: Philip Meyer <[pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU](mailto:pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Philip Meyer <[pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU](mailto:pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Exit polls  
Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@mindspring.com](mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[6.1.2.0.2.20041027121040.03d64950@mail.mindspring.com](mailto:6.1.2.0.2.20041027121040.03d64950@mail.mindspring.com)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Hey, Warren, lighten up. I would play a crooked roulette wheel, if it were the only wheel in town!

Cheers, P.

---

---

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

---

---

On Wed, 27 Oct 2004, Warren Mitofsky wrote:

> Date: Wed, 27 Oct 2004 12:19:00 -0400  
> From: Warren Mitofsky <[mitofsky@mindspring.com](mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com)>  
> To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
> Subject: Re: Exit polls  
>  
> Phil,  
> Of all people, I thought you would have known better. Leaked numbers are  
> worthless. Now I know why reporters are so easily seduced by leaked  
> numbers, if you are, too.  
>  
> The sites suggested to you sometimes have wrong data. One of them posted  
> test data we had not cleaned out of the system and then told people there  
> were two exit polls in the race, questioning which of exit poll got it  
> right. There frequently are errors in what is posted. It is usually leaked  
> by people that do not know how to read the statistical information they are  
> viewing. They don't know the best estimator from the pre-election polls or  
> an estimator missing the affect of absentee votes. These are in addition to  
> all the reasons my partner, Joe Lenski, gave last night. I suppose you only  
> watch sporting events through half time and conclude that is the final  
> score.  
>  
> The cynicism in your message asking for the sites that display leaks is  
> duly noted.  
> warren mitofsky

>  
>  
> At 08:00 PM 10/26/2004, Philip Meyer wrote:  
>> Can anyone guide me to a web site where leaked exit poll results are  
>>likely to turn up on Nov. 2? Suspense, at my age, is unhealthy.  
>>  
>>Cheers, P.

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

---

---

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

>  
> MITOFSKY INTERNATIONAL  
> 1776 Broadway, Suite 1708  
> New York, NY 10019  
>  
> 212 980-3031  
> 212 980-3107 Fax  
>  
> [www.mitofskyinternational.com](http://www.mitofskyinternational.com)  
> [mitofsky@mindspring.com](mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com)  
>

>-----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Wed, 27 Oct 2004 13:23:47 -0400  
Reply-To: [DivaleBill@AOL.COM](mailto:DivaleBill@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: William Divale <[DivaleBill@AOL.COM](mailto:DivaleBill@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Re: IRB Guidance  
Comments: To: [jamwolf@IUPUI.EDU](mailto:jamwolf@IUPUI.EDU), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Folks:

These IRB charts are terrific. As an IRB co-chair, I know from experience that these charts will be extremely useful in showing that most of our studies are exempt from review. I highly recommend using them in the decision making process.

William Divale, Ph.D.  
Professor of Anthropology  
Survey Research Laboratory, Director  
York College, CUNY  
Jamaica, NY 11451  
[www.york.cuny.edu](http://www.york.cuny.edu)

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Wed, 27 Oct 2004 13:50:23 -0400  
Reply-To: Scheuren@AOL.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Fritz Scheuren <Scheuren@AOL.COM>  
Subject: Re: www.votingsystems.us  
Comments: To: jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear Colleagues:

I had intended to post this on AAPORNET myself but am delighted to be beaten to the punch. For AAPORNET, however, I would have emphasized more the fact that this site is really not about predicting future outcomes but mainly gives references to recent scholarly articles on the collection and statistical analysis of data from US voting systems.

Best to all of you, Fritz

---

In a message dated 10/27/2004 12:52:58 PM Eastern Standard Time, jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU writes:  
The following message was posted on the Survey Methods Listserv of the American Statistical Association. I thought it might be of interest to AAPOR members.

Date: Wed, 27 Oct 2004 09:59:04 EDT  
Sender: Survey Research Methods Section of the ASA  
From: Scheuren@AOL.COM  
Subject: Preparing for the Upcoming Election?  
To: SRMSNET@LISTSERV.UMD.EDU

Dear Colleagues:

Hope you all are bracing up well for the upcoming election? As citizens we have obligations, of course. But as statisticians maybe some of you want to play a direct role too? This was one of the themes in my August AMSTAT NEWS note on Phantom Voters. Since then I have been urging more statistical involvement in my ASA Chapter talks around the country.

To aid those of you who want to become more statistically involved, I am announcing a research site <<http://www.votingsystems.us>> of recent bibliographical sources containing statistical and related treatments of the US electoral system. It is intended to aid professionals facing statistical data collection and analysis challenges involving the 2004 US election.

This nonpartisan site is still under construction and we would welcome peer reviewed submissions of links or complete texts at --  
<scheuren-fritz@norc.uchicago.edu>



We have sought permission to publish links to the material here but some of these permissions are still pending. These links will be added when received.

Best to you all and to our country, Fritz

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Wed, 27 Oct 2004 14:18:42 -0400  
Reply-To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>  
Subject: National Center for Health Statistics and Cell Phones  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Someone posted a summary of a 2003 study of cell-phone only respondents a few weeks ago. Any chance you can re-post? JAS

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

visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)

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

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Wed, 27 Oct 2004 14:39:46 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Subject: Re: Exit polls  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <6.1.2.0.2.20041027121040.03d64950@mail.mindspring.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Warren Mitofsky wrote:

> Leaked numbers are  
>worthless.

I got mid-afternoon results of exit polls from friends who worked at the networks in '92, '96, and '00. They were right in all three cases - though in '00, they said Gore won, which was true in a numerical sense, but the EC and the SC disagreed.

--

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>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Wed, 27 Oct 2004 15:04:48 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Subject: Ruy Teixeira on Gallup's racial problem  
Comments: To: aapornet <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

[This is from Ruy Teixeira's latest  
<<http://tcf.org/4L/4LMain.asp?SubjectID=4&ArticleID=486>>. What is  
going on at Gallup?]

### Gallup Poll Racially Biased

By this I don't mean that Gallup's pollsters are themselves racially biased. Rather I mean that their likely voter (LV) samples-whose results Gallup continues to promote above all others-tend to be racially biased because of the methodology Gallup employs to draw them.

Here's a basic sketch of how Gallup's methodology works:

Gallup asks each [RV] respondent seven LV screening questions, and gives each person an LV score of 0 to 7. [Assuming a turnout of 55 percent], the top 55% are classified as likely voters. In practice that typically means all of the "7"s-given full weight-plus some proportion of those with lower scores (usually the "6"s), who are weighted down so that the size of the likely voter sample matches the projected turnout for the year (apparently 55 percent this year). All other voters are discarded from the sample.

Note that the demographics of Gallup's LV sample are not adjusted in any way (as their overall samples are) and are simply allowed to fall where they may.

What this means is that if, say, minority voters are much less likely to answer the seven questions "right," they will be correspondingly under-represented in the LV sample-perhaps severely under-represented.

That is exactly what turns out to be the case. According to <http://en.groundspring.org/EmailNow/pub.php?module=URLTracker&cmd=track&j=11553660&u=101169>

data obtained by Steve Soto over at the Left Coaster, Gallup's latest LV sample-the one that showed Bush with an eight-point lead-has only 14.5 percent minority representation and only 7.5 percent black representation.

How plausible is this as a representation of the election day electorate? Not remotely plausible. In 1996, minority representation among voters was 17 percent; in 2000, 19.4 percent. In 2004, the minority proportion of voters should be more than this, because minorities are growing, not declining, as a percentage of the U.S. population. So 14.5 percent for nonwhites as a prediction of the 2004 electorate is very, very unlikely. It would defy both recent history and powerful demographic trends.

As for 7.5 percent blacks? Come on. Blacks were 10.1 percent in 1996 and 9.7 percent in 2000. And they're 12 percent of the voting age population. There's just no way in the world blacks will only be 7.5 percent of voters in 2004.

So, in effect, Gallup's likely voter approach is disenfranchising minorities in assessing American voters' inclinations on the coming election. That's wrong and Gallup should stop doing it.

And speaking of disenfranchisement, how about America's young people? This group is also full of voters who are relatively unlikely to answer the seven LV questions right and thus qualify for admission into the exalted realm of the Gallup LV sample.

Sure enough, Gallup informs us that young voters (age eighteen to twenty-nine) only compose 11 percent of likely voters. Well, that would be quite a trick. In 1992, young voters were 21 percent of voters; in 1996, 17 percent of voters; and in 2000, 17 percent again. And we're supposed to believe that young voters are all of a sudden going to drop to 11 percent this year? Please, this doesn't pass the laugh test.

As it happens, minorities-no big surprise-lean very heavily toward Kerry this year. But young voters are also Kerry's best age group this year. Systematically under-representing these groups in Gallup's LV samples will therefore have an obvious, and fairly substantial, effect on their results, tilting them in the direction of Bush and the Republicans.

That's not right. Gallup should know better. And we should all know better than to trust results that are based on effective disenfranchisement of large numbers of minority and young voters.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Wed, 27 Oct 2004 15:35:10 -0400  
Reply-To: Bob Ladner <[rladner@BEHAVIORALSCIENCE.COM](mailto:rladner@BEHAVIORALSCIENCE.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Bob Ladner <[rladner@BEHAVIORALSCIENCE.COM](mailto:rladner@BEHAVIORALSCIENCE.COM)>  
Subject: Electoral College Board Game  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Jeez, we need to lighten up. If you want to understand that our votes = really don't matter anyway (well, not quite, but close), play the = electoral college game from the LA Times.

=20

<http://www.latimes.com//news/politics/election-test-fl,0,1851284.flash>

Yours in the pursuit of better science without losing our perspective,

Dr. Bob Ladner

Behavioral Science Research Corporation

When you absolutely, positively, have to get it right the first time.

305-443-2000

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Wed, 27 Oct 2004 20:08:56 -0400  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Minority voting in battleground states  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Fabrizio McLaughlin, a Republican polling firm, has conducted a poll of 12 battleground states (n=800) which shows Bush Leading Kerry by 0.2% (47.3% to 47.1%). However, when they weight the data to match the minority turnout in the 2000 exit polls, it shows Kerry leading by 3.5% (49.2% to 45.7%) and when they weight to 2004 Census figures, their data shows Kerry leading by 5.2% (49.9% to 44.7%).

A press release on this interesting experiment can be downloaded from:  
<http://www.fabmac.com/FMA-2004-10-27-Battleground-Ballot.pdf>

FMA has issued a second press release regarding the same poll that shows that newly registered voters favor Kerry by a 2 to 1 margin, although the n for this group would only be 55, by my calculation. You can get it at: <http://www.fabmac.com/FMA-2004-10-27-New-Registrants.pdf>

Jan Werner

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Wed, 27 Oct 2004 22:47:44 -0500  
Reply-To: Diane O'Rourke <DOurourke@SRL.UIC.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Diane O'Rourke <DOurourke@SRL.UIC.EDU>  
Subject: Fwd: Sheth Foundation/Sudman Symposium Web site  
Comments: To: AAPORnet@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: multipart/mixed; boundary="Boundary\_(ID\_ImTZz/c6gqgma8yZeE48jw)"

This is a MIME message. If you are reading this text, you may want to consider changing to a mail reader or gateway that understands how to properly handle MIME multipart messages.

--Boundary\_(ID\_ImTZz/c6gqgma8yZeE48jw)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-disposition: inline

fyi re Cross-cultural survey research

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

--Boundary\_(ID\_ImTZz/c6gqgma8yZeE48jw)  
Content-type: message/rfc822

Date: Wed, 27 Oct 2004 13:28:56 -0500  
From: "Kris Hertenstein" <Krish@srl.uic.edu>  
Subject: Sheth Foundation/Sudman Symposium Web site

To: DOrourke@srl.uic.edu,jparsons@srl.uic.edu, lindao@srl.uic.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-disposition: inline

Dear Speakers and Registrants,  
By popular request, the talk slides for nearly all the talks given at the =  
Sheth Foundation/Sudman Symposium on Cross-Cultural Survey Research are =  
now uploaded and available for you to view. Clicking on the links for =  
each talk will take you to the corresponding pdf file of the slides. Thank =  
you to the speakers for providing their presentation files, and to Lisa =  
Kelly-Wilson and Baha Urkmez for Web site management.=20

You can access the talks through the symposium Web pages, either via =  
<http://www.business.uiuc.edu/shethsudman/> or  
<http://www.srl.uic.edu/shethsudman.htm>=20

Please let us know if there is any way we can improve the Web sites or =  
provide additional information. =20

Many thanks for your ongoing interest.

Sharon Shavitt and Kris Hertenstein

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

--Boundary\_(ID\_ImTZz/c6gqgma8yZeE48jw)--

=====  
Date: Thu, 28 Oct 2004 09:13:31 -0400  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: WP's Rich Morin on criticism of polls  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=windows-1252; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Today's Washington Post has a long article by Rich Morin about what he describes as "smash-mouth attacks" on pollsters in this election year.

The article may be read online at:  
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A3735-2004Oct27.html>

For a brief moment this morning, the Washington Post web site featured the headline "Missing Arms Dominate Race" over the lede "Pollsters face an increasingly hostile environment and questions about future. – Richard Morin." Victims of smash-mouth attacks with a sense of humor can email me off-list for a screen capture of that front page image.

Jan Werner

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
=====

Date: Thu, 28 Oct 2004 09:33:51 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>  
Subject: Re: WP's Rich Morin on criticism of polls  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <4180F07B.1030506@jwdp.com>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Jan Werner wrote:

>Today's Washington Post has a long article by Rich Morin about what he  
>describes as "smash-mouth attacks" on pollsters in this election year.  
>  
>The article may be read online at:  
><http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A3735-2004Oct27.html>  
>  
>For a brief moment this morning, the Washington Post web site featured  
>the headline "Missing Arms Dominate Race" over the lede "Pollsters face  
>an increasingly hostile environment and questions about future. -  
>Richard Morin." Victims of smash-mouth attacks with a sense of humor  
>can email me off-list for a screen capture of that front page image.  
>  
>Jan Werner

Actually most of the article is about problems with polling (cell  
phones, lower response rates, etc.), and some of it is even on how  
attention to polls may undermine serious coverage of politics. Why  
this defensive reaction to a serious piece?

--

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>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
=====

Date: Thu, 28 Oct 2004 10:29:26 -0400  
Reply-To: JP Murphy <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: JP Murphy <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>  
Subject: Morin Article on Response Rates  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Adding some thoughts to a valuable contribution --

A worthwhile study of declining response rates would focus on the 1980's =  
and 1990's and track

1. the average number of telephone survey requests per household;
2. the average duration of interviews; and
3. the proportion of requests that turn out to be sugging.

By the time the industry began to address high levels of "breakoffs," =  
the damage had already been done. Generic outbound telemarketing -- its =  
volume and intrusiveness -- was another factor.=20

I believe some of the 3 parameters above are included in CMOR studies, =  
but how can one prove that even their numbers, generated within the =  
system, are free of distortion (in this case, understatement) stemming =  
from the very problem they attempt to examine?

The contributions of answering machines and Caller ID are overstated =  
IMHO. Why did those devices become popular in the first place? To =  
respond to a problem that was already bothering people. OK, answering =  
machines do have other purposes -- but their early positioning =  
emphasized screening your calls, as opposed to what we today call voice =  
mail.=20

Marketers, including marketing researchers, just got too greedy.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY  
Post Office Box 80484  
Valley Forge, Pennsylvania 19484-0484 USA  
(610) 408-8800  
www.jpmurphy.com=20

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 28 Oct 2004 16:53:38 +0200  
Reply-To: Matthias Kretschmer <MKretschmer@GMX.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Matthias Kretschmer <MKretschmer@GMX.NET>





Doug Henwood wrote:

>Actually most of the article is about problems with polling (cell  
>phones, lower response rates, etc.), and some of it is even on how  
>attention to polls may undermine serious coverage of politics. Why  
>this defensive reaction to a serious piece?

Ooops, that should be defensive characterization, not reaction. It's  
odd that a member of the tribe acknowledges some problems with the  
trade, yet the focus is on the "smashmouth" bit.

Doug

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 28 Oct 2004 14:05:21 -0400  
Reply-To: [jwerner@jwdp.com](mailto:jwerner@jwdp.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jan Werner <[jwerner@JWDP.COM](mailto:jwerner@JWDP.COM)>  
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing  
Subject: Slate's Consumer's Guide to the Polls  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The online magazine Slate has published a "Consumer's Guide to the  
Polls" which describes a number of practices used in political polls,  
such as screening, weighting, etc., and how each of a number of major  
polls apply them.

Based on my own experience and what I've learned from people at various  
polling outfits, I suspect that some of the observations may not always  
be completely accurate, but even if it is sometimes a little simplistic,  
the article still provides a useful summary.

You can read it at: <http://slate.msn.com/id/2108778/>

Jan Werner

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 28 Oct 2004 11:21:19 -0700  
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <[marcsapir@COMCAST.NET](mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Marc Sapir <[marcsapir@COMCAST.NET](mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET)>  
Subject: Florida and the value of polls  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I have just seen a synopsis of an article by Greg Palast (BBC) in the November Harpers about the voting situation in Florida and how the Kerry vote is already minimized by certain maneuvers of Jeb Bush. Palast has been labeled a loose canon by some, but the reason he is still at the BBC is because whenever challenged he has always backed up what he said with hard evidence. If Palast is even approximately correct about what is going on throughout Florida even the most accurate polls will be unable to predict the outcome correctly because the election there could well be out of the hands of the voters.

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 28 Oct 2004 12:15:36 -0700  
Reply-To: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Voigt, Lynda" <lvoigt@FHCRC.ORG>  
Subject: number portability  
Comments: To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

I have a question about number portability legislation. If I move to an area that has a different telephone "central office" can I still keep my original telephone number?? How about if I move to a new area code??

thanks,  
Lynda Voigt

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 28 Oct 2004 13:39:36 -0700  
Reply-To: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>  
Organization: CERC

Subject: Rock the Vote Poll of new voters  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <000c01c4bd1a\$ef0a8560\$f6440718@RetroPoll>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Thought I'd pass along the following link to the topline data from the "Rock the Vote" poll conducted recently. Surprising findings related to first-time voters.

[http://appserv.pace.edu/emplibary/pace\\_poll\\_102604\\_topline.pdf](http://appserv.pace.edu/emplibary/pace_poll_102604_topline.pdf)

John E. Nienstedt, Sr.  
john@cerc.net

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 28 Oct 2004 17:45:23 -0400  
Reply-To: jmellis@vcu.edu  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Jim Ellis <jmellis@VCU.EDU>  
Organization: SERL  
Subject: Re: Rock the Vote Poll of new voters  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <000d01c4bd2e\$3dd68230\$1a01a8c0@CERC2.cerc.local>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Somewhat surprising, yes. Not to be ignorant, but -- am I missing = something, or do the July benchmark percentages for Kerry, Bush, Cheney and Edwards = not come close to adding to 100% except for Bush? It looks like they add to = 87, 97, 85 and 68, respectively, and they include DK/REF so it looks like = they should be exhaustive, as the current percentages seem to be.

Jim Ellis  
Virginia Commonwealth University

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of John Nienstedt  
Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2004 4:40 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: Rock the Vote Poll of new voters

Thought I'd pass along the following link to the topline data from the "Rock the Vote" poll conducted recently. Surprising findings related to

first-time voters.

[http://appserv.pace.edu/emplibary/pace\\_poll\\_102604\\_topline.pdf](http://appserv.pace.edu/emplibary/pace_poll_102604_topline.pdf)

John E. Nienstedt, Sr.  
john@cerc.net

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Thu, 28 Oct 2004 14:44:26 -0700  
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>  
Subject: Re: Rock the Vote Poll of new voters  
Comments: To: John Nienstedt <john@CERC.NET>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <000d01c4bd2e\$3dd68230\$1a01a8c0@CERC2.cerc.local>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

John,

These might have been startling poll findings if the sample had been random, but it isn't. Where did they find a random sample that had 38% born again/evangelical Christians and 24% of people sampled in college full or part time. It just doesn't make any sense. You can forget the whole deal based on those numbers.

Marc

Marc Sapir MD, MPH  
Executive Director  
Retro Poll  
[www.retropoll.org](http://www.retropoll.org)

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of John Nienstedt  
Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2004 12:40 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Rock the Vote Poll of new voters

Thought I'd pass along the following link to the topline data from the "Rock the Vote" poll conducted recently. Surprising findings related to first-time voters.

[http://appserv.pace.edu/emplibary/pace\\_poll\\_102604\\_topline.pdf](http://appserv.pace.edu/emplibary/pace_poll_102604_topline.pdf)

John E. Nienstedt, Sr.  
john@cerc.net

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Thu, 28 Oct 2004 15:17:34 -0700  
Reply-To: ericmcghee@mindspring.com  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Eric McGhee <ericmcghee@MINDSPRING.COM>  
Subject: Re: Rock the Vote Poll of new voters  
Comments: To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

It's worth noting that these are not really the "new voters" everyone has been talking about recently. The poll includes anyone who registered since 2000, and so it includes the strong Republican mobilizing efforts of the 2002 campaign. The strange aspects of the sample Marc notes could also be due to incomplete registration lists (they do registration list-based sampling).

Cheers,  
Eric McGhee  
University of Oregon

-----Original Message-----  
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>  
Sent: Oct 28, 2004 2:44 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Rock the Vote Poll of new voters

John,

These might have been startling poll findings if the sample had been random, but it isn't. Where did they find a random sample that had 38% born again/evangelical Christians and 24% of people sampled in college full or part time. It just doesn't make any sense. You can forget the whole deal based on those numbers.

Marc

Marc Sapir MD, MPH  
Executive Director  
Retro Poll  
[www.retropoll.org](http://www.retropoll.org)

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of John Nienstedt  
Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2004 12:40 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Rock the Vote Poll of new voters

Thought I'd pass along the following link to the topline data from the "Rock the Vote" poll conducted recently. Surprising findings related to first-time voters.

[http://appserv.pace.edu/emplibary/pace\\_poll\\_102604\\_topline.pdf](http://appserv.pace.edu/emplibary/pace_poll_102604_topline.pdf)

John E. Nienstedt, Sr.  
john@cerc.net

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 28 Oct 2004 17:18:53 -0500  
Reply-To: "G. Donald Ferree, Jr." <gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "G. Donald Ferree, Jr." <gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Rock the Vote Poll of new voters  
Comments: To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <001501c4bd37\$4f8da3b0\$f6440718@RetroPoll>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Colleagues,

I'm not certain, but I gather from their description that they compiled a list of new registrants since 2000 (from thirty odd states and DC) and sampled from that rather than doing something like an RDD with screening for new registrants. Granted that the target population is new registrants and not the electorate in general, these demographics strike me as plausible. (Of course there may be some question about how representative a sample can be compiled from such lists), but that is another question.

Don

At 04:44 PM 10/28/2004, Marc Sapir wrote:

>John,  
>

>These might have been startling poll findings if the sample had been  
>random, but it isn't. Where did they find a random sample that had 38%  
>born again/evangelical Christians and 24% of people sampled in college  
>full or part time. It just doesn't make any sense. You can forget the  
>whole deal based on those numbers.

>  
>Marc

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

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of John Nienstedt  
>Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2004 12:40 PM  
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>Subject: Rock the Vote Poll of new voters

>  
>Thought I'd pass along the following link to the topline data from the  
>"Rock the Vote" poll conducted recently. Surprising findings related to  
>first-time voters.

>  
>[http://appserv.pace.edu/emplibary/pace\\_poll\\_102604\\_topline.pdf](http://appserv.pace.edu/emplibary/pace_poll_102604_topline.pdf)

>  
>John E. Nienstedt, Sr.  
>[john@cerc.net](mailto:john@cerc.net)

>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>  
>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

G. Donald Ferree, Jr.  
Associate Director for Public Opinion Research  
University of Wisconsin Survey Center  
1800 University Avenue, Room 102  
Madison Wisconsin 53726

608-263-3744 (voice)  
608-262-8432 (FAX)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 28 Oct 2004 18:22:37 -0400  
Reply-To: JP Murphy <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: JP Murphy <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>



Subject: Re: Rock the Vote Poll of new voters  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

He defined the universe as people who will be voting for the first time =  
(or something like that). There's no reason to expect that a random =  
sample from that universe should match expectations of a cross-section =  
of the total US adult population. A big chunk of people voting for the =  
first time would be young adults of college age. The 39 percent Born =  
Again looks like 2X what it would be in the population overall, so maybe =  
the Bushies are first-time registering lots of people of that stripe.

There is no way you can look at demographic distributions of any sample =  
and draw conclusions about its randomness or lack thereof.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY  
Post Office Box 80484  
Valley Forge, Pennsylvania 19484-0484 USA  
(610) 408-8800  
www.jpmmurphy.com=20

----- Original Message -----=20  
From: Marc Sapir=20  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu=20  
Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2004 5:44 PM  
Subject: Re: Rock the Vote Poll of new voters

John,

These might have been startling poll findings if the sample had been  
random, but it isn't. Where did they find a random sample that had 38%  
born again/evangelical Christians and 24% of people sampled in college  
full or part time. It just doesn't make any sense. You can forget the  
whole deal based on those numbers.

Marc

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

-----Original Message-----  
From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of John Nienstedt  
Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2004 12:40 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Rock the Vote Poll of new voters

Thought I'd pass along the following link to the topline data from the "Rock the Vote" poll conducted recently. Surprising findings related to first-time voters.

[http://appserv.pace.edu/emplibary/pace\\_poll\\_102604\\_topline.pdf](http://appserv.pace.edu/emplibary/pace_poll_102604_topline.pdf)

John E. Nienstedt, Sr.  
john@cerc.net

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.=20

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Date: Thu, 28 Oct 2004 17:36:56 -0700  
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>  
Subject: Re: Rock the Vote Poll of new voters  
Comments: To: "G. Donald Ferree, Jr." <gferree@SSC.WISC.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <6.1.0.6.2.20041028170820.02dfa440@ssc.wisc.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Don,

Can you see which states were left out? Were any of them major urban states? I did notice that they used the time frame of year 2000 forward, though I didn't comment on it. That too raises questions about the sample. There have been millions of new voters registered this year, many of them in the past few months. Since the Pace poll is supposedly focused on new voters, they need to declare what they did to try and actually capture a random sample of all these new potential voters whose names may not be on the county registrar lists yet? I still maintain that a sample of new voters that shows 38% born again Christians is just not a realistic cross section of new voters. It's the Democrats who have registered most people this year. And the Latino Groups claim to have registered 1.5 million just by themselves. You say PACE used only 30 "odd" states and that may be where the problem arises. But if they didn't build the list randomly from county registrars weighting urban and rural that could be an even bigger problem.

Marc

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

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of G. Donald Ferree, Jr.  
Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2004 2:19 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Rock the Vote Poll of new voters

Colleagues,

I'm not certain, but I gather from their description that they compiled a list of new registrants since 2000 (from thirty odd states and DC) and sampled from that rather than doing something like an RDD with screening for new registrants. Granted that the target population is new registrants and not the electorate in general, these demographics strike me as plausible. (Of course there may be some question about how representative a sample can be compiled from such lists), but that is another question.

Don

At 04:44 PM 10/28/2004, Marc Sapir wrote:

>John,  
>  
>These might have been startling poll findings if the sample had been  
>random, but it isn't. Where did they find a random sample that had 38%  
>born again/evangelical Christians and 24% of people sampled in college  
>full or part time. It just doesn't make any sense. You can forget the  
>whole deal based on those numbers.

>  
>Marc

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

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of John Nienstedt  
>Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2004 12:40 PM  
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
>Subject: Rock the Vote Poll of new voters

>  
>Thought I'd pass along the following link to the topline data from the

>"Rock the Vote" poll conducted recently. Surprising findings related  
to  
>first-time voters.  
>  
>[http://appserv.pace.edu/emplibrary/pace\\_poll\\_102604\\_topline.pdf](http://appserv.pace.edu/emplibrary/pace_poll_102604_topline.pdf)  
>  
>John E. Nienstedt, Sr.  
>[john@cerc.net](mailto:john@cerc.net)

>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>-----  
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

G. Donald Ferree, Jr.  
Associate Director for Public Opinion Research  
University of Wisconsin Survey Center  
1800 University Avenue, Room 102  
Madison Wisconsin 53726

608-263-3744 (voice)  
608-262-8432 (FAX)

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Thu, 28 Oct 2004 21:45:41 -0400  
Reply-To: [Ande271@AOL.COM](mailto:Ande271@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Jeanne Anderson <[Ande271@AOL.COM](mailto:Ande271@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Rock the Vote Poll of new voters  
Comments: To: [jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

It seems to me that it might be useful to make a series of estimates of the overall vote (is called the "horserace?") based on different assumptions of the turnout among new voters (or thier proportion of the total number of voters) drawn from this research. The assumption behind each estimate could be evaluated once exit poll data were available - and, of course, once all votes are tallied. (That would be in 2007, wouldn't it?)

Jeanne Anderson  
(formerly) Principal

Jeanne Anderson

P.S. This is a great time to be a "formerly!"

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Thu, 28 Oct 2004 21:00:31 -0500  
Reply-To: [slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu](mailto:slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Susan Carol Losh <[slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU](mailto:slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU)>  
Subject: Demographic composition and new voters  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain  
Content-transfer-encoding: binary  
Content-disposition: inline

Dear Colleagues:

Approximately 37 percent of the U.S. adult general public has described itself as "born again". See it now with the General Social Survey and SDA at:

[www.icpsr.umich.edu/gss](http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/gss)

and use the variable "reborn."

The percentages for 1988, 1991 and 1998 respectively were: 37.1, 35.8 and 37.5.

For selected subgroups, the percent is higher (e.g., African Americans those 3 years = 56.3% for born again; use the variable "race").

Depending on who the new voters are and how closely they resemble the U.S. adult population, the estimate looks very close to me.

Susan

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Thu, 28 Oct 2004 21:24:51 -0700  
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>  
Subject: Re: Demographic composition and new voters  
Comments: To: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <200410290200.i9T20VO2006256@ldap4.fsu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Thanks Susan. I've gone and looked at the General Social Survey and you are indeed correct that it reports consistent born again experience at 36-37.5% over the past 20 years. My supposition was in error. This supports the Pace study. Beyond that I also note that the religion questions on the GSS have not been asked that frequently. (This was last done in 1998 according to the data set). And of particular interest is that when the survey first did a breakdown on religions back in the 80s they registered 64% Protestant (with 36.5% saying they had had a born again experience) but by 1998 the Protestant proportion had fallen to 54% of total (while the Born again response was slightly increased at 37.5%). This could be consistent with the increase in the reach of religious fundamentalism in the U.S. (and worldwide). And it would be good news for Mr. Bush since this group believes in the importance of his religiosity over all else. However, the problem of why a significant number of states were not sampled in the Pace study(if that is true) and how the sample was constructed are still of interest and remain to be detailed.

Marc

Marc Sapir MD, MPH  
Executive Director  
Retro Poll  
[www.retropoll.org](http://www.retropoll.org)

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Susan Carol Losh  
Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2004 6:01 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Demographic composition and new voters

Dear Colleagues:

Approximately 37 percent of the U.S. adult general public has described itself as "born again". See it now with the General Social Survey and SDA at:

[www.icpsr.umich.edu/gss](http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/gss)

and use the variable "reborn."

The percentages for 1988, 1991 and 1998 respectively were: 37.1, 35.8 and 37.5.

For selected subgroups, the percent is higher (e.g., African Americans those 3 years = 56.3% for born again; use the variable "race").

Depending on who the new voters are and how closely they resemble the U.S. adult population, the estimate looks very close to me.

Susan

Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.  
American Statistical Association/NSF-SRS Research Fellow  
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>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 01:19:14 -0400  
Reply-To: JP Murphy <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: JP Murphy <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>  
Subject: Re: Demographic composition and new voters  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I appreciate the stability in those numbers but am not sure, other than =  
a perceived socially desirable survey answer, what they mean. (No insult =  
intended.) NORC says that Protestants, including "non-denominational" =  
and generic "Christians," are about 56 percent of total US adults. =  
(Catholics rarely if ever refer to themselves as Born Again or =  
evangelical.). 37 percent is two-thirds of 56 percent. So two-thirds of =  
all Protestants are Born Again/Evangelical? An even harder number to =  
understand is Gallup's figure ("Would you describe yourself as a 'born =  
again' or evangelical?") of 46 percent for 2002 (same year as NORC =  
data). That would be 82 percent of all Protestants. I guess this means =  
that a lot of people in mainstream Protestantism feel they have had born =

again experiences. Yet to me 20 percent seems closer to the incidence of = behaviors I would associate with this group but I guess it's a = self-perception thing more than what people actually do. (By behavior I = mean prayer breakfasts, bible study sessions outside church, = proselytizing, etc.)

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY  
Post Office Box 80484  
Valley Forge, Pennsylvania 19484-0484 USA  
(610) 408-8800  
www.jpmmurphy.com=20

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

From: Marc Sapir=20  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu=20  
Sent: Friday, October 29, 2004 12:24 AM  
Subject: Re: Demographic composition and new voters

Thanks Susan. I've gone and looked at the General Social Survey and you are indeed correct that it reports consistent born again experience at 36-37.5% over the past 20 years. My supposition was in error. This supports the Pace study. Beyond that I also note that the religion questions on the GSS have not been asked that frequently. (This was last done in 1998 according to the data set). And of particular interest is that when the survey first did a breakdown on religions back in the 80s they registered 64% Protestant (with 36.5% saying they had had a born again experience) but by 1998 the Protestant proportion had fallen to 54% of total (while the Born again response was slightly increased at 37.5%). This could be consistent with the increase in the reach of religious fundamentalism in the U.S. (and worldwide). And it would be good news for Mr. Bush since this group believes in the importance of his religiosity over all else. However, the problem of why a significant number of states were not sampled in the Pace study(if that is true) and how the sample was constructed are still of interest and remain to be detailed.

Marc

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

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Susan Carol Losh  
Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2004 6:01 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Demographic composition and new voters



Dear Colleagues:

Approximately 37 percent of the U.S. adult general public has described itself as "born again". See it now with the General Social Survey and SDA at:

[www.icpsr.umich.edu/gss](http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/gss)

and use the variable "reborn."

The percentages for 1988, 1991 and 1998 respectively were: 37.1, 35.8 and 37.5.

For selected subgroups, the percent is higher (e.g., African Americans those 3 years = 56.3% for born again; use the variable "race").

Depending on who the new voters are and how closely they resemble the U.S. adult population, the estimate looks very close to me.

Susan

Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.  
American Statistical Association/NSF-SRS Research Fellow  
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>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 09:20:09 -0400  
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>  
Subject: Zogby International Breaks New Ground: Teams with Rock the Vote  
to Poll Mobile Phone Users; Announces First-of-Its-Kind  
Text-Message Poll

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Zogby International Breaks New Ground: Teams with Rock the Vote to Poll Mobile Phone Users; Announces First-of-Its-Kind Text-Message Poll

<http://www.zogby.com/news/ReadNews.dbm?ID=914>

-Polling firm Zogby International has partnered with Rock the Vote to release a first-of-its-kind national text-message political poll of mobile phone users. The poll is centered on subscribers to the Rock the Vote Mobile (RTVMO) platform, a joint initiative of Rock the Vote and Motorola Inc. (for more information: <http://www.rtvmo.com>). The results of the poll are set to be released Sunday, just in time for this year's close election.

The poll will be conducted using a sample group from Rock the Vote Mobile's 120,000-subscriber base. In order to poll likely voters and track their demographics, selected participants were chosen from those who used Rock the Vote's online voter registration tool and invited to download their voter registration form and join the RTVMO program.

"We're anxious to see the results of this poll," said John Zogby, CEO and president of Utica, N.Y.-based Zogby International. "This poll isn't industry standard-really, we're breaking all the rules for polling-but it lets us take the pulse of a really technologically-attuned demographic that relies heavily on the mobile phone."

SNIP

The survey will be brief, consisting of a two-part question: whether the recipient plans to vote, and which candidate they plan to vote for. Motorola, which powers Rock the Vote Mobile, will send the question out to cell users. While it is too late to be added to the list of those who will be polled, Rock the Vote Mobile will send election updates to any text-messaging-capable cell-phone users who register at their website, <http://www.rtvmo.com>.

Through the efforts of Motorola and Zogby International, the results will be weighted for several demographics, including region, gender, and political party. While the nature of the poll is outside polling industry standards, Zogby International is committed to getting the most accurate possible results using its proven weighting methods that ensure a sample more accurately reflects the make-up of the general population.

SNIP

--  
Leo G. Simonetta  
Research Director  
Art & Science Group, LLC

6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
Baltimore MD 21209

---

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

---

Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 09:17:16 -0400  
Reply-To: [ckreider@kreiderresearch.com](mailto:ckreider@kreiderresearch.com)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: ckreider <[ckreider@KREIDERRESEARCH.COM](mailto:ckreider@KREIDERRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Demographic composition and new voters  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

If NORC is asking whether "born again/evangelical" as one concept, it is picking up some answers that (surprise!) may not mean what the analysts assume. One of the "mainstream" Protestant churches is the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, whose members would rarely meet the usual "born again" criteria but would say that they are "evangelical".

Christine E. Kreider, MPA  
Kreider Research & Consulting  
(207) 866-5912  
[ckreider@kreiderresearch.com](mailto:ckreider@kreiderresearch.com)

---

Sent via the WebMail system at [kreiderresearch.com](http://kreiderresearch.com)

---

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

---

Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 08:40:30 -0500  
Reply-To: Smith-Tom <[Smith-Tom@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU](mailto:Smith-Tom@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Smith-Tom <[Smith-Tom@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU](mailto:Smith-Tom@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: Demographic composition and new voters  
Comments: To: [ckreider@KREIDERRESEARCH.COM](mailto:ckreider@KREIDERRESEARCH.COM), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The General Social Survey has a variable (FUND) that classifies = denominations as Fundmanentalist, Moderate, or Liberal. The Evangelical = Lutheran Church of America is in the Moderate category. For full details = on the classification see  
Tom W. Smith, "Classifying Protestant Denominations," Review of =

Religious Research, 31 (March, 1990), 225-245.

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

From: ckreider [mailto:ckreider@KREIDERRESEARCH.COM]=20

Sent: Friday, October 29, 2004 8:17 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Demographic composition and new voters

If NORC is asking whether "born again/evangelical" as one concept, it =  
is picking up some answers that (surprise!) may not mean what the =  
analysts assume. One of the "mainstream" Protestant churches is the =  
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, whose members would rarely meet =  
the usual "born again" criteria but would say that they are =  
"evangelical".

Christine E. Kreider, MPA  
Kreider Research & Consulting  
(207) 866-5912  
ckreider@kreiderresearch.com

---

Sent via the WebMail system at kreiderresearch.com

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET. Problems?-don't =  
reply to this message, write to: [aapornet-request@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet-request@asu.edu)

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 08:41:13 -0500

Reply-To: Smith-Tom <[Smith-Tom@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU](mailto:Smith-Tom@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU)>

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

From: Smith-Tom <[Smith-Tom@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU](mailto:Smith-Tom@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU)>

Subject: FW: Demographic composition and new voters

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

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The General Social Survey has a variable (FUND) that classifies =  
denominations as Fundamentalist, Moderate, or Liberal. The Evangelical =  
Lutheran Church of America is in the Moderate category. For full details =  
on the classification see Tom W. Smith, "Classifying Protestant =  
Denominations," Review of Religious Research, 31 (March, 1990), 225-245.

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

From: ckreider [mailto:ckreider@KREIDERRESEARCH.COM]=20  
Sent: Friday, October 29, 2004 8:17 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Demographic composition and new voters

If NORC is asking whether "born again/evangelical" as one concept, it is picking up some answers that (surprise!) may not mean what the analysts assume. One of the "mainstream" Protestant churches is the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, whose members would rarely meet the usual "born again" criteria but would say that they are "evangelical".

Christine E. Kreider, MPA  
Kreider Research & Consulting  
(207) 866-5912  
ckreider@kreiderresearch.com

---

Sent via the WebMail system at kreiderresearch.com

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

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

---

Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 10:09:04 -0400  
Reply-To: JP Murphy <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: JP Murphy <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Demographic composition and new voters  
Comments: To: [ckreider@KREIDERRESEARCH.COM](mailto:ckreider@KREIDERRESEARCH.COM), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

No, I did not intend to imply that NORC was doing that.

In NORC's report (still a draft, I think) they discuss the difficulties inherent in categorizing and quantifying "Protestants." They note that some people self-identify as "Christian" or "non-denominational Christian" and discuss how these people should be counted. The main conclusion of the study ("The Dwindling Protestant Majority" or something like that) is that, even with the broadest defensible definition, Protestants are only about 56 percent of the population.

I think you are correct in stating that "born again" and "evangelical" =  
are insufficiently similar to be grouped together in the manner of =  
Gallup ("Would you describe yourself as a born again or evangelical?"). =  
Doing so inflates the size of this group (46%!). At its website Gallup =  
has a section headed, 'Born Agains' Wield Political, Economic Influence, =  
having quantified them on the basis of this question. They then note =  
that 'Born Agains' give higher approval ratings to Bush, using only the =  
first part of the expression to refer to the entire group. This is an =  
error in their conceptualization, question wording and reporting.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY  
Post Office Box 80484  
Valley Forge, Pennsylvania 19484-0484 USA  
(610) 408-8800  
www.jpmmurphy.com=20

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

From: ckreider=20  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu=20  
Sent: Friday, October 29, 2004 9:17 AM  
Subject: Re: Demographic composition and new voters

If NORC is asking whether "born again/evangelical" as one concept, it =  
is picking up some answers that (surprise!) may not mean what the =  
analysts assume. One of the "mainstream" Protestant churches is the =  
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, whose members would rarely meet =  
the usual "born again" criteria but would say that they are =  
"evangelical".

Christine E. Kreider, MPA  
Kreider Research & Consulting  
(207) 866-5912  
ckreider@kreiderresearch.com

---

Sent via the WebMail system at kreiderresearch.com

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 09:14:59 -0500  
Reply-To: Smith-Tom <Smith-Tom@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Smith-Tom <Smith-Tom@NORC.UCHICAGO.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Demographic composition and new voters  
Comments: To: JP Murphy <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The report referred to, "The Vanishing Protestant Majority," may be =  
found at [www.norc.org](http://www.norc.org) along the right side of that page.

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

From: JP Murphy [mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM]=20  
Sent: Friday, October 29, 2004 9:09 AM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: Demographic composition and new voters

No, I did not intend to imply that NORC was doing that.

In NORC's report (still a draft, I think) they discuss the difficulties =  
inherent in categorizing and quantifying "Protestants." They note that =  
some people self-identify as "Christian" or "non-denominational =  
Christian" and discuss how these people should be counted. The main =  
conclusion of the study ("The Dwindling Protestant Majority" or =  
something like that) is that, even with the broadest defensible =  
definition, Protestants are only about 56 percent of the population.

I think you are correct in stating that "born again" and "evangelical" =  
are insufficiently similar to be grouped together in the manner of =  
Gallup ("Would you describe yourself as a born again or evangelical?"). =  
Doing so inflates the size of this group (46%!). At its website Gallup =  
has a section headed, 'Born Agains' Wield Political, Economic Influence, =  
having quantified them on the basis of this question. They then note =  
that 'Born Agains' give higher approval ratings to Bush, using only the =  
first part of the expression to refer to the entire group. This is an =  
error in their conceptualization, question wording and reporting.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.  
J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY  
Post Office Box 80484  
Valley Forge, Pennsylvania 19484-0484 USA  
(610) 408-8800  
[www.jpmurphy.com](http://www.jpmurphy.com)=20

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

From: ckreider=20

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu=20  
Sent: Friday, October 29, 2004 9:17 AM  
Subject: Re: Demographic composition and new voters

If NORC is asking whether "born again/evangelical" as one concept, it =  
is picking up some answers that (surprise!) may not mean what the =  
analysts assume. One of the "mainstream" Protestant churches is the =  
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, whose members would rarely meet =  
the usual "born again" criteria but would say that they are =  
"evangelical".

Christine E. Kreider, MPA  
Kreider Research & Consulting  
(207) 866-5912  
ckreider@kreiderresearch.com

---

Sent via the WebMail system at kreiderresearch.com

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

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

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

---

Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 10:21:36 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Demographic composition and new voters  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[002f01c4bdc0\\$da013820\\$5de4c3d1@default](mailto:002f01c4bdc0$da013820$5de4c3d1@default)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

JP Murphy wrote:

>I think you are correct in stating that "born again" and  
>"evangelical" are insufficiently similar to be grouped together in  
>the manner of Gallup ("Would you describe yourself as a born again  
>or evangelical?"). Doing so inflates the size of this group (46%!).



>At its website Gallup has a section headed, 'Born Agains' Wield  
>Political, Economic Influence, having quantified them on the basis  
>of this question. They then note that 'Born Agains' give higher  
>approval ratings to Bush, using only the first part of the  
>expression to refer to the entire group. This is an error in their  
>conceptualization, question wording and reporting.

I'm sure I'll be accused once again of lese majeste, but isn't this interesting, given the well-known preferences and affiliations of Gallup Jr and James Clifton?

Isn't the appended article also rather interesting?

Doug

----

<<http://www.christianpost.com/dbase/education/406/full/1.htm>>

George Gallup Retires After 50 Years As Pollster of Faith

"When I ask a question on these subjects, what I'm always trying to find out is: 'Are we doing the will of God?'"

Saturday, Jun. 12, 2004 Posted: 9:33:42AM EST

SOUTH HAMILTON, Mass. - The notable pollster, George Gallup Jr. is retiring after 50 years of surveying the world with topics such as religion, faith, and spirituality. For the past half century, the Gallup Poll has been playing a big role in Christianity as Gallup wanted his research to be used as a tool for salvation instead of just market research data.

During his speech at the commencement ceremony of Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, Gallup commented that the most profound purpose of polls is "to see how people are responding to God."

"When I ask a question on these subjects, what I'm always trying to find out is: 'Are we doing the will of God?'" Gallup said addressing the graduates, "The world knows a lot about Jesus, but do they know him? It is for the churches to seize this moment, to take the vague spirituality of the day and turn it into a faith that is solid and transformative."

Gallup, 74, once thought of becoming a pastor while volunteering at an Episcopal church in Galveston but later he came to realize that the enterprise founded by his father in 1935 could be served as a ministry. So immediately after graduating from Princeton University with degree in religion, he started working with his father as an assistant editor starting with writing good survey questions.

Since then his works have been recognized by the general Christian population as well as the scholars and theologians by giving direction of where today's Christianity stands.

"The more you know about your audience, the more effective you can be in communicating the gospel," said Robert Coleman, professor of evangelism and discipleship at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. Gallup "always seems to be ahead of the curve, to know what's coming in the future. ... It shows how God has gifted people in many different ways. His is a ministry as a gifted pollster."

In retirement, Gallup still plans to remain influential in the business and active in Christian service by writing books and leading seminars for small-group ministries. He will also be spending more time with his wife, Kingsley, traveling and engaging in the activities that have always interested him such as playing trumpet.

As for the Gallup Poll's future, questions on religion and spirituality are sure to continue, Gallup said, under leadership of Frank Newport, who is editor-in-chief of the Gallup Poll and vice president of The George H. Gallup International Institute in Princeton, N.J.

"The inner life is the new frontier of survey research in coming years," Gallup said. "We know so little about mystical experiences, yet the religious dynamic is perhaps the most powerful of all in American culture. This is a way to unite our country on a deep level and produce a more peaceful world."

Looking over the surveys he has done, Gallup also pointed out what today's churches need to focus on. "Churches have neglected what they should be all about, and that's discipleship," Gallup said in an interview. "Therefore, there is no transformation. People look at churches, and they don't see lives being changed. The core is getting mushy. ... Anything that doesn't lead to Jesus should be cast off."

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

---

Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 11:49:18 -0400  
Reply-To: Scott Keeter <[keeters@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG](mailto:keeters@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Scott Keeter <[keeters@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG](mailto:keeters@PEOPLE-PRESS.ORG)>  
Organization: Pew Reseach Center for the People and the Press  
Subject: Advisory: Pew Research Center Look-Alike  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear AAPOR colleagues: To forestall any possible confusion that may arise, I would like to post the following message from The Pew Research Center's director:

Advisory: Pew Research Center Look-Alike

We are writing to inform you that recently we have become aware of the existence of an organization called the Pew Research Foundation. It is in no way connected or associated with The Pew Research Center or The Pew Charitable Trusts. The opinion polls that it reports are not our surveys. Please be advised that this organization has no connection or affiliation whatsoever with the longstanding research activities of The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press or related Pew Research Center projects.

For more information on The Pew Research Center, please go to <<http://www.pewresearch.org/>> [www.pewresearch.org](http://www.pewresearch.org/). For more information on our parent organization, The Pew Charitable Trusts, please go to <<http://www.pewtrusts.org/>> [www.pewtrusts.org](http://www.pewtrusts.org/).

Andrew Kohut  
Director  
Pew Research Center

--

Scott Keeter

Pew Research Center for the People and the Press

1150 18th St. NW, Suite 975

Washington, DC 20036

Phone 202-293-3126 / Personal fax 206-600-5448

[keeters@people-press.org](mailto:keeters@people-press.org)

---

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 12:35:38 -0400

Reply-To: [Ande271@AOL.COM](mailto:Ande271@AOL.COM)

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

From: Jeanne Anderson <[Ande271@AOL.COM](mailto:Ande271@AOL.COM)>

Subject: Re: Zogby International Breaks New Ground: Teams with Rock the  
Vote to Poll M...

Comments: To: [simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM), [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

It's unfortunate that they don't also ask when they last registered.

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 10:21:15 -0700

Reply-To: [ericmcghee@mindspring.com](mailto:ericmcghee@mindspring.com)

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

From: Eric McGhee <[ericmcghee@MINDSPRING.COM](mailto:ericmcghee@MINDSPRING.COM)>

Subject: Re: Demographic composition and new voters

Comments: To: Marc Sapir <[marcsapir@COMCAST.NET](mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

That said, the poll was not trying to sample the general population--it was trying to sample "new voters." That means the GSS is not the right comparison. We don't know how many evangelicals there are among "new voters"--that's why we need the poll.

Furthermore, despite the name of the poll, it samples new \*registrants\* (since 2000) not new voters. These people could easily have been motivated to register by the events of 9/11, and many could even have voted in the 2002 elections. It's more accurate to call them new \*presidential\* voters.

Eric McGhee  
University of Oregon

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

From: Marc Sapir <[marcsapir@COMCAST.NET](mailto:marcsapir@COMCAST.NET)>

Sent: Oct 28, 2004 9:24 PM

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

Subject: Re: Demographic composition and new voters

Thanks Susan. I've gone and looked at the General Social Survey and you are indeed correct that it reports consistent born again experience at 36-37.5% over the past 20 years. My supposition was in error. This supports the Pace study. Beyond that I also note that the religion questions on the GSS have not been asked that frequently. (This was last done in 1998 according to the data set). And of particular interest is that when the survey first did a breakdown on religions back in the 80s they registered 64% Protestant (with 36.5% saying they had had a born again experience) but by 1998 the Protestant proportion had fallen to 54% of total (while the Born again response was slightly increased at 37.5%). This could be consistent with the increase in the reach of religious fundamentalism in the U.S. (and worldwide). And it would be good news for Mr. Bush since this group believes in the importance of his religiosity over all else. However, the problem of why a significant number of states were not sampled in the Pace study(if that is true) and how the sample was constructed are still of interest and remain to be detailed.

Marc

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

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Susan Carol Losh  
Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2004 6:01 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Demographic composition and new voters

Dear Colleagues:

Approximately 37 percent of the U.S. adult general public has described itself as "born again". See it now with the General Social Survey and SDA at:

[www.icpsr.umich.edu/gss](http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/gss)

and use the variable "reborn."

The percentages for 1988, 1991 and 1998 respectively were: 37.1, 35.8 and 37.5.

For selected subgroups, the percent is higher (e.g., African Americans those 3 years = 56.3% for born again; use the variable "race").

Depending on who the new voters are and how closely they resemble the U.S. adult population, the estimate looks very close to me.

Susan

Susan Carol Losh, Ph.D.  
American Statistical Association/NSF-SRS Research Fellow  
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>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

---

Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 13:32:18 -0400

Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>

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

From: Leo Simonetta <[simonetta@ARTSCI.COM](mailto:simonetta@ARTSCI.COM)>

Subject: New Consortium to Analyze Exit Polls on Election Night

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

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

For those of you who were wondering about whether the networks would call states before their polls close . . .

New Consortium to Analyze Exit Polls on Election Night

BY JEANNETTE RUNDQUIST And KEVIN COUGHLIN

c.2004 Newhouse News Service

<http://www.newhousenews.com/archive/rundquist102904.html>

SNIP

But Lenski, who is a virtual encyclopedia of states' election procedures, considers election night 2000 "the wildest night of my life." He can recount, almost minute by minute, which networks made what predictions, or retracted them, and when. The Florida experience taught him some things.

"We learned in 2000 that just because an election official reports an election result, it doesn't mean it's 100 percent accurate," Lenski said. For example, in Florida's Volusia County, a computer malfunction wrongly gave Gore 16,000 extra votes, he said.

"You learn that, in addition, not all the votes are counted on election night. In certain states with large numbers of mail ballots, there might be more votes in the mail."

The networks have promised Congress they won't project statewide outcomes this year until polls close in that state. Lenski and Mitofsky have introduced more-sophisticated computers to the process, and their pooled data will be parsed by armies of geeks and lawyers at each network.

Also, absentee voters will be surveyed in 13 states, compared with three states in 2000, said CBS' Frankovic.

SNIP

--

Leo G. Simonetta  
Research Director  
Art & Science Group, LLC  
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101  
Baltimore MD 21209

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

Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 14:10:46 -0400  
Reply-To: Erik Nisbet <[ecnl@CORNELL.EDU](mailto:ecnl@CORNELL.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Erik Nisbet <[ecnl@CORNELL.EDU](mailto:ecnl@CORNELL.EDU)>  
Subject: Call for Papers: Science on Sale? 15-17 April 2005  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

SCIENCE FOR SALE?  
The Public Communication of Science in a Corporate World

CALL FOR PAPERS

15-17 April 2005

Organized by the Department of Science & Technology Studies and the  
Department of Communication  
Cornell University, Ithaca, NY

“Science for Sale?” is an interdisciplinary weekend conference for exploring the mediation of science in a corporate environment. As public presentations of science merge with marketing and as corporate research organizations do more of the work that university researchers conduct, these kinds of observations raise timely questions about the public understanding of science with respect to authorship, ownership, and relationships of practice in science and media.

The intersection of science and the corporate world presents a rich site for analyses of public communication and understanding of science, medicine and technology. We define public communication broadly for this event to allow critical inquiry into the roles of academic journals, news journalism, museums, speeches, entertainment media, doctor-patient relations, film, advertising, art, literature, the internet, and radio.

We cordially invite you to participate in this event and reflect on the theme of science, communication, and the corporate world. The conference format will include pre-circulated papers, moderated presentations, and panel discussions with scholars and practitioners from relevant fields. We welcome abstract submissions on, but not limited to, the following topics:

- The corporation, media, and public understanding of science
- Media ownership, journalistic practices, and public images of science in news, culture, and popular entertainment
- The changing images of universities: research institutions or research corporations?
- Responsibility and accountability within a corporate environment: issues for open source, research ethics, and education
- Multinational entities and communicating science in less developed countries
- The branding and advertising of science
- Corporate control of information and communication technologies

Abstracts of no more than 250 words and a CV should be submitted at our web site (<http://www.sts.cornell.edu/conferences/stscomm/index.php>), e-mailed or faxed to the abstract coordinator by December 20, 2004 (see below). Full papers for pre-circulation will be due March 10, 2005, and we hope to post conference papers online. Abstracts from scholars at all stages of their careers are encouraged. We are working to procure limited funding for travel, so please stay tuned to our web site for up-to-date registration details and news about our speakers.

Abstract Coordinator:  
Lisa Onaga, [Lao9@cornell.edu](mailto:Lao9@cornell.edu)  
Fax: +1-607-255-6044  
<http://www.sts.cornell.edu/conferences/stscomm/index.php>  
Science & Technology Studies  
311 Rockefeller Hall, Cornell University  
Ithaca, NY 14850 USA

Erik C. Nisbet  
Department of Communication  
Cornell University  
Kennedy Hall  
Ithaca, NY 14853  
Ph: 607-254-7213  
Fax: 607-255-7118  
email: [ecn1@cornell.edu](mailto:ecn1@cornell.edu)

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

---

Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 14:28:00 -0400  
Reply-To: JP Murphy <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: JP Murphy <[jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM](mailto:jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM)>  
Subject: Pace Poll / Rock the Vote Survey  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0



Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

This was received from Jonathan Trichter, director of the Pace Poll, =  
with reference to the Rock the Vote new voter survey. He requested that =  
it be distributed to the list. JPM

-----=  
-----

Greetings -

=20

My name is Jonathan Trichter and I am the Director of the Pace Poll at =  
Pace University in New York. I appreciate the comments about the most =  
recent Pace Poll study conducted in partnership with Rock the Vote on =  
new voters in the 2004 election, and I wanted to take this opportunity =  
to respond to them on AAPORNET. Unfortunately, I have been unable to =  
negotiate the Web site successfully, and I hope one of you might be kind =  
enough to post this on my behalf. I would be much obliged.

=20

Yours,

=20

- Jonathan

=20

In response to comments concerning our evangelical/born-again question =  
in the demographic section of the survey, we combined the two categories =  
under the theory that those two constituencies - notwithstanding other =  
differences - are likely to bring the same Christian values to their =  
voting practices.

=20

Also, there seems to be some confusion regarding our sample. The =  
analysis of our survey - posted on-line - makes clear what our sample =  
is. Here is the methodology section, which may clear up some confusion:

=20

This survey is based on nationwide phone interviews of 600 voters =  
between October 14 and October 21, 2004. The findings of the survey are =  
statistically significant within a =B1 4% margin of error at a 95% level =  
of confidence. Error margins increase for cross-tabulations. The =  
practical elements of fielding any survey can introduce additional =  
sources of error.

=20

For the purposes of this study, "new registrants" were defined as people =  
who registered after the 2000 Presidential election. Respondents were =  
randomly selected from a list of new registrants in 43 states and the =  
District of Columbia. Because the availability and nature of voter =  
registration lists vary from state to state, town to town, and county to =  
county, this sample is unavoidably incomplete. That is, all new voters =  
did not have an equal chance to be selected for participation in our =  
study. =20

=20

For example, we have no contact information at all for new voters in =  
seven states (Idaho, Montana, North Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, West =  
Virginia, and Wisconsin). Although we have contact information for =  
voters in the other forty-three states and the District of Columbia, =  
registration rules are not always uniform throughout an entire state; =  
consequently, we did not have contact information for voters from every =

town or county in seven additional states (Alabama, Florida, Indiana, =  
Maine, Mississippi, Pennsylvania, and Washington). In addition, =  
different registrars update their voter lists at different times; =  
consequently, we missed any new voters who registered after the most =  
recent update to which we had access. In theory, new voters could have =  
registered as early as the day after the 2000 Presidential Election or =  
as late as the day on which our sample was created.

=20  
Despite these limitations, our sample is the best, most-complete [list] =  
of new voters available. Had we attempted to contact new voters via =  
Random Digit Dialing ("RDD"), we might have overcome some of these =  
limitations, but RDD sample would have been prohibitively expensive, =  
since we would have contacted a large number of people who would have =  
been ineligible for participation in the study. To put it another way, =  
new voters are simply too small a share of the general population to =  
contact via RDD. Although final registration numbers are not yet =  
available, a substantial number of new registrants may have registered =  
after our sample was created. These late registrants may or may not =  
differ from our sample in material ways.

=20  
More importantly, the accuracy of a RDD study would have depended upon =  
the accuracy of respondents' memory regarding the date of their =  
registration. Since we have no particular reason to suspect that people =  
are likely to remember when they registered, RDD would have suffered =  
from imperfections of its own - the over-inclusion of self-described new =  
voters who actually registered before 2000 and the under-inclusion of =  
self-described old voters who actually registered after 2000. Whether =  
these imperfections would have been greater than or less than the =  
imperfections in our sample can only be resolved through further study.

=20  
Jonathan Trichter=20  
Director, Pace Poll=20  
(212) 346-1141=20  
=20

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 12:10:35 -0700  
Reply-To: Shapard Wolf <[shapwolf@MSN.COM](mailto:shapwolf@MSN.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Shapard Wolf <[shapwolf@MSN.COM](mailto:shapwolf@MSN.COM)>  
Subject: AAPORNET outage Friday night, tonight  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

AAPORNET will be out of service tonight, Friday, October 29th, for about =

four hours from 8PM to midnight, MST.

This is due to emergency maintenance on the servers that run Listserv at =  
Arizona State University.

You can send posts to AAPORNET during this time; they will be queued and =  
will show up when the servers are restarted.

During the outage you will not receive any AAPORNET messages and the web =  
archives will be unavailable. While IT reserves the full four hours, =  
they usually finish up more quickly.

I apologize for the late notice; they just sent it out to listowners, =  
indicating some late-breaking problem at the server end.

Shap Wolf  
Associate Chair, Publications & Information  
shapwolf@msn.com<mailto:shapwolf@msn.com>=

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

Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 15:00:20 -0400  
Reply-To: Nancy Whelchel <nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Nancy Whelchel <nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU>  
Subject: confidentiality question  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-disposition: inline

As distraction from electoral polling I have a purely hypothetical =  
question to get some guidance on in case it ever comes up\*. =20

Suppose (and, just suppose, since actually putting anything real in =  
writing would suddenly make it all extremely legal) in an open-end comment =  
on a student survey, a respondent writes in some detail about an incident =  
involving a named professor engaging in some inappropriate behavior with =  
the student several years earlier. The alleged behavior would classify as =  
sexual harassment by any definition, but in his/her comment the respondent =  
says he/she was too afraid to do anything about it at the time. The =  
survey is, of course, confidential, but not anonymous (the researchers =  
could identify the respondent, and confirm that he/she was in a class with =  
the named professor during the specified semester). The respondent is no =  
longer a student. The named professor is still teaching on campus.

I believe the survey research office, Office of Legal Affairs, and Equal =  
Opportunity and Equity Office would all have different opinions as to the =  
appropriate action to take (or not take).

I feel like we've had a similar thread on the listserv before, but would = appreciate hearing any thoughts you have on this completely hypothetical = situation.

Nancy (whose paranoia is based in the reality of the University CYA = environment)

\*\*\*\*\*

Nancy Whelchel, Ph.D.  
Assistant Director for Survey Research  
University Planning and Analysis  
Box 7002=20  
NCSU  
Raleigh, NC 27695-7002  
919-515-4184  
Nancy\_Whelchel@ncsu.edu

\*\*\*\*\*

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

=====  
Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 14:50:51 -0500  
Reply-To: "Steen, Bob" <[steenb@FLEISHMAN.COM](mailto:steenb@FLEISHMAN.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "Steen, Bob" <[steenb@FLEISHMAN.COM](mailto:steenb@FLEISHMAN.COM)>  
Subject: Re: confidentiality question  
Comments: To: "[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)" <[AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain

I had a similar experience on an employee survey where someone wrote something about how the theft of company materials by employees was making it difficult to get the job done. The comment was included in the report and the security officer of the company (former FBI) came asking (threatening) for the questionnaire to identify the witness, to lift prints, etc.

I explained that the survey response was confidential, as guaranteed by the company president, and following established procedures, the actual questionnaires had been destroyed following coding and keypunching (we used real cards back then). He threatened me with "tampering with evidence." I did identify for him the location of the respondent (1 out of 500 employees.)

This example is not as tough as yours. However, the guarantee of confidentiality from someone in charge and the standard procedure of destroying printed questionnaires were helpful to me. I remember doing drug usage studies and home violence studies where we put in place procedures to assure anonymity of response. If you don't want to learn about illegal behavior, don't offer a forum to learn about it. I expect, as with lawyers, the protections of "confidentiality" pledges have their limits. I wouldn't

know where to draw the lines, however.

Bob Steen

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

314-982-1752  
steenb@fleishman.com

Fax: 314-982-9105

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

From: Nancy Whelchel [mailto:nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU]  
Sent: Friday, October 29, 2004 3:00 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: confidentiality question

As distraction from electoral polling I have a purely hypothetical question to get some guidance on in case it ever comes up\*.

Suppose (and, just suppose, since actually putting anything real in writing would suddenly make it all extremely legal) in an open-end comment on a student survey, a respondent writes in some detail about an incident involving a named professor engaging in some inappropriate behavior with the student several years earlier. The alleged behavior would classify as sexual harassment by any definition, but in his/her comment the respondent says he/she was too afraid to do anything about it at the time. The survey is, of course, confidential, but not anonymous (the researchers could identify the respondent, and confirm that he/she was in a class with the named professor during the specified semester). The respondent is no longer a student. The named professor is still teaching on campus.

I believe the survey research office, Office of Legal Affairs, and Equal Opportunity and Equity Office would all have different opinions as to the appropriate action to take (or not take).

I feel like we've had a similar thread on the listserv before, but would appreciate hearing any thoughts you have on this completely hypothetical situation.

Nancy (whose paranoia is based in the reality of the University CYA environment)

\*\*\*\*\*

Nancy Whelchel, Ph.D.

Assistant Director for Survey Research  
University Planning and Analysis  
Box 7002  
NCSU  
Raleigh, NC 27695-7002  
919-515-4184  
Nancy\_Whelchel@ncsu.edu

\*\*\*\*\*

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

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

-----  
Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 16:27:51 -0400  
Reply-To: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Frank Rusciano <[rusciano@RIDER.EDU](mailto:rusciano@RIDER.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: confidentiality question  
Comments: To: Nancy Whelchel <[nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU](mailto:nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU)>  
Comments: cc: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[s1825b10.027@gw.ncsu.edu](mailto:s1825b10.027@gw.ncsu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; format=flowed; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I heard a story from another survey research institute once that was doing a study on alcoholism that if they became aware of any child or spousal abuse they would, in fact, report it. But I believe that is the law in most states, if not nationally.

Nancy Whelchel wrote:

>As distraction from electoral polling I have a purely hypothetical question to get some guidance on in case it ever comes up\*.

>

>Suppose (and, just suppose, since actually putting anything real in writing would suddenly make it all extremely legal) in an open-end comment on a student survey, a respondent writes in some detail about an incident involving a named professor engaging in some inappropriate behavior with the student several years earlier. The alleged behavior would classify as sexual harassment by any definition, but in his/her comment the respondent says he/she was too afraid to do anything about it at the time. The survey is, of course, confidential, but not anonymous (the researchers could identify the respondent, and confirm that he/she was in a class with the named professor during the specified semester). The respondent is no longer a student. The named professor is still teaching on campus.

>

>I believe the survey research office, Office of Legal Affairs, and Equal Opportunity and Equity Office would all have different opinions as to the appropriate action to take (or not take).

>

>I feel like we've had a similar thread on the listserv before, but would appreciate hearing any thoughts you have on this completely hypothetical situation.

>

>Nancy (whose paranoia is based in the reality of the University CYA environment)

>

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>Nancy Whelchel, Ph.D.

>Assistant Director for Survey Research

>University Planning and Analysis

>Box 7002

>NCSU

>Raleigh, NC 27695-7002

>919-515-4184

>Nancy\_Whelchel@ncsu.edu

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

>-----

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

>

>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

-----  
Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 17:14:23 -0400

Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>

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

From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>

Subject: Re: confidentiality question

Comments: To: Nancy Whelchel <[nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU](mailto:nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Nancy,

My reaction would be to do nothing. We are not police officers, and the respondent still has the right to make a complaint. The respondent is = an adult, with adult responsibilities. If he/she was too afraid to do = anything at the time, but is now willing to mention it in a survey, one must ask =

why  
he/she doesn't pursue legal remedies now.=20

While I don't automatically disbelieve all poll results, neither do I =  
take  
everything a respondent puts on paper as gospel. =20

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
Research Specialist  
Michigan State University=20  
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research  
Office=A0for Social Research  
321 Berkey Hall  
East Lansing, MI 48824  
517-355-6672

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

From: Nancy Whelchel [mailto:nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU]=20  
Sent: Friday, October 29, 2004 3:00 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: confidentiality question

As distraction from electoral polling I have a purely hypothetical =  
question  
to get some guidance on in case it ever comes up\*. =20

Suppose (and, just suppose, since actually putting anything real in =  
writing  
would suddenly make it all extremely legal) in an open-end comment on a  
student survey, a respondent writes in some detail about an incident  
involving a named professor engaging in some inappropriate behavior =  
with the  
student several years earlier. The alleged behavior would classify as  
sexual harassment by any definition, but in his/her comment the =  
respondent  
says he/she was too afraid to do anything about it at the time. The =  
survey  
is, of course, confidential, but not anonymous (the researchers could  
identify the respondent, and confirm that he/she was in a class with =  
the  
named professor during the specified semester). The respondent is no =  
longer  
a student. The named professor is still teaching on campus.

I believe the survey research office, Office of Legal Affairs, and =  
Equal  
Opportunity and Equity Office would all have different opinions as to =  
the  
appropriate action to take (or not take).

I feel like we've had a similar thread on the listserv before, but =  
would  
appreciate hearing any thoughts you have on this completely =



hypothetical  
situation.

Nancy (whose paranoia is based in the reality of the University CYA  
environment)

\*\*\*\*\*

Nancy Whelchel, Ph.D.  
Assistant Director for Survey Research  
University Planning and Analysis  
Box 7002=20  
NCSU  
Raleigh, NC 27695-7002  
919-515-4184  
Nancy\_Whelchel@ncsu.edu

\*\*\*\*\*

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

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====  
Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 14:42:07 -0700  
Reply-To: Steve Johnson <stevej@NSDSSURVEY.ORG>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Steve Johnson <stevej@NSDSSURVEY.ORG>  
Subject: Re: confidentiality question  
Comments: To: Nancy Whelchel <nlwhelch@gw.fis.ncsu.edu>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Typically criminal behavior, even very serious criminal behavior should not be used as a reason to go back on the pledge of confidentiality. However, some states have laws about this, in particular those related to child abuse. This issue can get very complicated. One case we had when I was at the University of Oregon survey center concerned a telephone interview we did with someone in prison, where the respondent told of committing a serious unsolved crime. At the time we did not consider informing authorities. This inmate subsequently died and we sought opinions of ethicists around the country and in the end still did not inform authorities. However, opinions were mixed. On a federal grant I once had we had a "certificate of confidentiality" from the feds - we were asking about criminal drug behavior by teens. However, we informed the teens that we could not keep confidential any information about child abuse. Subsequently two subjects did tell us about such abuse (probably looking for

someone to tell) and we did inform authorities. By the way, the child abuse laws also work for health care practitioners, who are generally required to report any case or suspicion of a case.

Stephen Johnson, Ph.D.

President, Northwest Survey & Data Services

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

From: "Nancy Whelchel" <nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Friday, October 29, 2004 12:00 PM

Subject: confidentiality question

As distraction from electoral polling I have a purely hypothetical question to get some guidance on in case it ever comes up\*.

Suppose (and, just suppose, since actually putting anything real in writing would suddenly make it all extremely legal) in an open-end comment on a student survey, a respondent writes in some detail about an incident involving a named professor engaging in some inappropriate behavior with the student several years earlier. The alleged behavior would classify as sexual harassment by any definition, but in his/her comment the respondent says he/she was too afraid to do anything about it at the time. The survey is, of course, confidential, but not anonymous (the researchers could identify the respondent, and confirm that he/she was in a class with the named professor during the specified semester). The respondent is no longer a student. The named professor is still teaching on campus.

I believe the survey research office, Office of Legal Affairs, and Equal Opportunity and Equity Office would all have different opinions as to the appropriate action to take (or not take).

I feel like we've had a similar thread on the listserv before, but would appreciate hearing any thoughts you have on this completely hypothetical situation.

Nancy (whose paranoia is based in the reality of the University CYA environment)

\*\*\*\*\*

Nancy Whelchel, Ph.D.

Assistant Director for Survey Research

University Planning and Analysis

Box 7002

NCSU

Raleigh, NC 27695-7002

919-515-4184

Nancy\_Whelchel@ncsu.edu

\*\*\*\*\*

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 17:11:48 -0500

Reply-To: cnelson@niu.edu

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Cynthia Nelson <cnelson@NIU.EDU>

Subject: Re: Survey ratings and "localness"

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To:

<06C64DE644F85843A90884803225A80704CED1B7@exchng12.noam.gallup.com>

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

Perhaps the speed and interest of recent threads (I am just playing catch up and

found this one) is why this one hasn't been picked up on more...

Although this may be conflation, I'd like to add:

Wanting term limits, and voting for the incumbent from my district

Favoring control closer to home (school board over state officials, state over federal)

I'll suggest "home-field advantage" although I like BIMBY very much.

I'm also interested in whether there has been work on explaining the tendency?

regards, Cynthia Nelson

\*\*\*\*\* REPLY SEPARATOR \*\*\*\*\*

On 10/15/2004 at 9:45 AM Moore, David wrote:

>My phrase for this...is the "BIMBY" phenomenon...I think it is my  
>phrase...

>

>"Better In My Back Yard"....

>

>Not to be confused with the more widely known NIMBY (Not In My Back

>Yard) phrase, referring to support, say, for nuclear power plants or

>Wal-Marts, as long as they are not in one's own town or location...

>

>

>David

>

>

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

>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Jim Ellis

>Sent: Friday, October 15, 2004 10:32 AM

>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

>Subject: Survey ratings and "localness"

>

>I'd actually prefer to combine some thoughts about Star Trek, librarian  
>and AAPOR action figures, and political polling, but those threads are  
>moving way too fast for my feeble brain.

>

>I will ask a different question, possibly a dumb one:

>

>It seems well established that survey respondents tend to give lower  
>quality/satisfaction ratings to Congress generally than to their own  
>representatives. The same is true for ratings of school quality in  
>general versus local schools. The same is probably well established for  
>a number of other things. I imagine the difference between firsthand and  
>secondhand knowledge has been proposed as an explanation, as well as  
>cognitive dissonance. But is there a name for this phenomenon as it  
>appears in surveys? A literature? An explanation supported by research?  
>It's one of those things that seems so obvious, I am a bit embarrassed  
>that I can't seem to latch on to the literature after some journal  
>searches and scans of some books I have on hand.

>

>Jim Ellis

>Virginia Commonwealth University

>

>-----

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>

>-----

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

>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

>

>-----

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====

Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 18:40:04 -0400

Reply-To: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>

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

From: "Ehrlich, Nathaniel" <[Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU](mailto:Nathaniel.Ehrlich@SSC.MSU.EDU)>

Subject: Re: confidentiality question

Comments: To: Steve Johnson <[stevej@NSDSSURVEY.ORG](mailto:stevej@NSDSSURVEY.ORG)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The issue of child abuse is a perfect example of why I would do nothing =  
in

Nancy's hypothetical. When the alleged victim is a minor, we do have a  
responsibility to report the incident for further investigation. When =  
the

alleged victim is an adult, we have no such responsibility.

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
Research Specialist  
Michigan State University=20  
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research  
Office=A0for Social Research  
321 Berkey Hall  
East Lansing, MI 48824  
517-355-6672

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

From: Steve Johnson [mailto:stevej@NSDSSURVEY.ORG]=20  
Sent: Friday, October 29, 2004 5:42 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: confidentiality question

Typically criminal behavior, even very serious criminal behavior should =  
not  
be used as a reason to go back on the pledge of confidentiality. =  
However,  
some states have laws about this, in particular those related to child  
abuse. This issue can get very complicated. One case we had when I =  
was at  
the University of Oregon survey center concerned a telephone interview =  
we  
did with someone in prison, where the respondent told of committing a  
serious unsolved crime. At the time we did not consider informing  
authorities. This inmate subsequently died and we sought opinions of  
ethicists around the country and in the end still did not inform  
authorities. However, opinions were mixed. On a federal grant I once =  
had  
we had a "certificate of confidentiality" from the feds - we were =  
asking  
about criminal drug behavior by teens. However, we informed the teens =  
that  
we could not keep confidential any information about child abuse.  
Subsequently two subjects did tell us about such abuse (probably =  
looking for  
someone to tell) and we did inform authorities. By the way, the child =  
abuse  
laws also work for health care practitioners, who are generally =  
required to  
report any case or suspicion of a case.

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

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

From: "Nancy Whelchel" <nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU>  
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
Sent: Friday, October 29, 2004 12:00 PM  
Subject: confidentiality question

As distraction from electoral polling I have a purely hypothetical =  
question

to get some guidance on in case it ever comes up\*.

Suppose (and, just suppose, since actually putting anything real in = writing would suddenly make it all extremely legal) in an open-end comment on a student survey, a respondent writes in some detail about an incident involving a named professor engaging in some inappropriate behavior = with the student several years earlier. The alleged behavior would classify as sexual harassment by any definition, but in his/her comment the = respondent says he/she was too afraid to do anything about it at the time. The = survey is, of course, confidential, but not anonymous (the researchers could identify the respondent, and confirm that he/she was in a class with = the named professor during the specified semester). The respondent is no = longer a student. The named professor is still teaching on campus.

I believe the survey research office, Office of Legal Affairs, and = Equal Opportunity and Equity Office would all have different opinions as to = the appropriate action to take (or not take).

I feel like we've had a similar thread on the listserv before, but = would appreciate hearing any thoughts you have on this completely = hypothetical situation.

Nancy (whose paranoia is based in the reality of the University CYA environment)

\*\*\*\*\*

Nancy Whelchel, Ph.D.  
Assistant Director for Survey Research  
University Planning and Analysis  
Box 7002  
NCSU  
Raleigh, NC 27695-7002  
919-515-4184  
Nancy\_Whelchel@ncsu.edu

\*\*\*\*\*

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

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

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

Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 15:57:54 -0700  
Reply-To: "Pollack, Lance" <LPollack@PSG.UCSF.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "Pollack, Lance" <LPollack@PSG.UCSF.EDU>  
Subject: Re: confidentiality question  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

You would break confidentiality to report...what? You did not observe the behavior, which is now several months past. You cannot substantiate the allegation in any way, shape, or form. Even if this were a criminal issue rather than a civil one (harassment) or an ethical one (university rules and procedures), what investigative body would proceed without the victim preferring charges? What you can offer is to provide contact information for counseling and/or the proper university office for reporting the incident, but not much else.

Lance M. Pollack, Ph.D.  
Health Survey Research Unit (HSRU)  
University of California, San Francisco  
lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu

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

From: Nancy Whelchel [mailto:nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU]  
Sent: Friday, October 29, 2004 12:00 PM  
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU  
Subject: confidentiality question

As distraction from electoral polling I have a purely hypothetical question to get some guidance on in case it ever comes up\*.

Suppose (and, just suppose, since actually putting anything real in writing would suddenly make it all extremely legal) in an open-end comment on a student survey, a respondent writes in some detail about an incident involving a named professor engaging in some inappropriate behavior with the student several years earlier. The alleged behavior would classify as sexual harassment by any definition, but in his/her comment the respondent says he/she was too afraid to do anything about it at the time. The survey is, of course, confidential, but not anonymous (the researchers could identify the respondent, and confirm that he/she was in a class with the named professor during the specified semester). The respondent is no longer

a student. The named professor is still teaching on campus.

I believe the survey research office, Office of Legal Affairs, and Equal Opportunity and Equity Office would all have different opinions as to the appropriate action to take (or not take).

I feel like we've had a similar thread on the listserv before, but would appreciate hearing any thoughts you have on this completely hypothetical situation.

Nancy (whose paranoia is based in the reality of the University CYA environment)

\*\*\*\*\*

Nancy Whelchel, Ph.D.  
Assistant Director for Survey Research  
University Planning and Analysis  
Box 7002  
NCSU  
Raleigh, NC 27695-7002  
919-515-4184  
Nancy\_Whelchel@ncsu.edu

\*\*\*\*\*

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

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

-----  
Date: Fri, 29 Oct 2004 20:00:41 -0400  
Reply-To: Ward Kay <[wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM](mailto:wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Ward Kay <[wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM](mailto:wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM)>  
Organization: Adirondack Communications  
Subject: Re: confidentiality question  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
In-Reply-To: <[C5E0665BB776D311868400805FF5603A0591B63A@sscintex.ssc.msu.edu](mailto:C5E0665BB776D311868400805FF5603A0591B63A@sscintex.ssc.msu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

But sexual harassment has an institutional effect -- a future victim can claim that the school knew about the first incident (through the survey) and did nothing to protect future violations and the university could be liable for damages.

While you have no cause to break the confidentiality -- the suggestion of trying to verify the validity of the response (was the student in the



professor's class?) has merit. If the basic facts do not back up the story, then drop it.

My personal opinion that the professor and the person who has supervisory role over the professor should be told of the report in such a way that they believe that it is anonymous and that the person cannot be identified. The professor should not be punished by this backhanded accusation -- but I'd want the supervisor to be ready to believe a future victim -- and the professor to be put on notice that he/she is being monitored.

But I agree with Nat that it is not the researcher's responsibility to do something that the adult victim is not willing to do.

Ward Kay  
Adirondack Communications, Inc.

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Ehrlich, Nathaniel  
Sent: Friday, October 29, 2004 6:40 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: confidentiality question

The issue of child abuse is a perfect example of why I would do nothing in

Nancy's hypothetical. When the alleged victim is a minor, we do have a responsibility to report the incident for further investigation. When the alleged victim is an adult, we have no such responsibility.

Nat Ehrlich, Ph.D.  
Research Specialist  
Michigan State University=20  
Institute for Public Policy and Social Research  
Office=A0for Social Research  
321 Berkey Hall  
East Lansing, MI 48824  
517-355-6672

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

From: Steve Johnson [mailto:stevej@NSDSSURVEY.ORG]=20  
Sent: Friday, October 29, 2004 5:42 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Re: confidentiality question

Typically criminal behavior, even very serious criminal behavior should not

be used as a reason to go back on the pledge of confidentiality.

However,

some states have laws about this, in particular those related to child abuse. This issue can get very complicated. One case we had when I was at the University of Oregon survey center concerned a telephone interview we did with someone in prison, where the respondent told of committing a

serious unsolved crime. At the time we did not consider informing authorities. This inmate subsequently died and we sought opinions of ethicists around the country and in the end still did not inform authorities. However, opinions were mixed. On a federal grant I once had we had a "certificate of confidentiality" from the feds - we were asking about criminal drug behavior by teens. However, we informed the teens that we could not keep confidential any information about child abuse. Subsequently two subjects did tell us about such abuse (probably looking for someone to tell) and we did inform authorities. By the way, the child abuse laws also work for health care practitioners, who are generally required to report any case or suspicion of a case.

Stephen Johnson, Ph.D.

President, Northwest Survey & Data Services

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

From: "Nancy Whelchel" <nlwhelch@GW.FIS.NCSU.EDU>

To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>

Sent: Friday, October 29, 2004 12:00 PM

Subject: confidentiality question

As distraction from electoral polling I have a purely hypothetical question to get some guidance on in case it ever comes up\*.

Suppose (and, just suppose, since actually putting anything real in writing would suddenly make it all extremely legal) in an open-end comment on a student survey, a respondent writes in some detail about an incident involving a named professor engaging in some inappropriate behavior with the student several years earlier. The alleged behavior would classify as sexual harassment by any definition, but in his/her comment the respondent says he/she was too afraid to do anything about it at the time. The survey is, of course, confidential, but not anonymous (the researchers could identify the respondent, and confirm that he/she was in a class with the named professor during the specified semester). The respondent is no longer a student. The named professor is still teaching on campus.

I believe the survey research office, Office of Legal Affairs, and Equal Opportunity and Equity Office would all have different opinions as to the appropriate action to take (or not take).

I feel like we've had a similar thread on the listserv before, but would appreciate hearing any thoughts you have on this completely hypothetical

situation.

Nancy (whose paranoia is based in the reality of the University CYA environment)

\*\*\*\*\*

Nancy Whelchel, Ph.D.  
Assistant Director for Survey Research  
University Planning and Analysis  
Box 7002  
NCSU  
Raleigh, NC 27695-7002  
919-515-4184  
Nancy\_Whelchel@ncsu.edu

\*\*\*\*\*

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

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

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

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

=====  
Date: Sat, 30 Oct 2004 09:34:11 -0400  
Reply-To: [JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM](mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM)  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <[JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM](mailto:JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM)>  
Subject: Re: confidentiality question  
Comments: To: [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

There's another option, isn't there? Recontact the respondent and let her know that comments made in the survey are not actionable in and of themselves. Thank her for her illustrative comments describing a difficult situation but

to protect her anonymity, nothing beyond a mention in the report will happen as a result. If she intended her comment to have greater consequence, she will need to take further action herself. It may be all the respondent wanted was for SOMEONE to know, yet she may not wish to take more action. On the other hand, she is responding to a university-sponsored survey and may think that she has just notified them formally of a potentially legal liability. This route obviously isn't required of the researcher, but, if handled properly, could help. JAS

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

visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)

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

In a message dated 10/29/2004 7:31:25 PM Central Daylight Time, [wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM](mailto:wkay@ADIRONDACK-INC.COM) writes:

But sexual harassment has an institutional effect -- a future victim can claim that the school knew about the first incident (through the survey) and did nothing to protect future violations and the university could be liable for damages.

While you have no cause to break the confidentiality -- the suggestion of trying to verify the validity of the response (was the student in the professor's class?) has merit. If the basic facts do not back up the story, then drop it.

My personal opinion that the professor and the person who has supervisory role over the professor should be told of the report in such a way that they believe that it is anonymous and that the person cannot be identified. The professor should not be punished by this backhanded accusation -- but I'd want the supervisor to be ready to believe a future victim -- and the professor to be put on notice that he/she is being monitored.

But I agree with Nat that it is not the researcher's responsibility to do something that the adult victim is not willing to do.

Ward Kay  
Adirondack Communications, Inc.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Sat, 30 Oct 2004 14:05:48 -0400  
Reply-To: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Doug Henwood <[dhenwood@PANIX.COM](mailto:dhenwood@PANIX.COM)>  
Subject: OBL  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Any thoughts or data on the effects of the Bin Laden tape? Will it give an advantage to Bush, because it increases the salience of security issues, or could it be to Kerry's advantage, because it reminds us that he's still on the loose, giving the outsourcing argument some traction?

--

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>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Sat, 30 Oct 2004 14:41:34 -0400  
Reply-To: Ken Sherrill <ken@KENSHERILL.COM>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Ken Sherrill <ken@KENSHERILL.COM>  
Subject: Re: OBL  
Comments: To: Doug Henwood <dhenwood@PANIX.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <p05200f0ebda98846bedc@[192.168.1.100]>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

My guess is no net effect. Voters predisposed toward each candidate should perceive the Bin Laden tape as evidence to reinforce existing predispositions. If you like Bush, it's a reason to vote for him. If you don't like Bush, it's a reason to vote against him.

Ken

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Doug Henwood  
Sent: Saturday, October 30, 2004 2:06 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: OBL

Any thoughts or data on the effects of the Bin Laden tape? Will it give an advantage to Bush, because it increases the salience of security issues, or could it be to Kerry's advantage, because it reminds us that he's still on the loose, giving the outsourcing argument some traction?

--

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>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Sat, 30 Oct 2004 15:15:34 -0700  
Reply-To: [ellis.godard@csun.edu](mailto:ellis.godard@csun.edu)  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Ellis Godard <[ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU](mailto:ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU)>  
Subject: Re: OBL  
Comments: To: [aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Fox poll shows Bush down a few points, although the tape was released during (not before) polling.

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,137163,00.html>

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Sat, 30 Oct 2004 18:31:10 -0700  
Reply-To: Sam Popkin <[spopkin@UCSD.EDU](mailto:spopkin@UCSD.EDU)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Sam Popkin <[spopkin@UCSD.EDU](mailto:spopkin@UCSD.EDU)>  
Subject: Final Polling in 2000  
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

There has been a lot of discussion about possible biases in the polls because of the growth of cellphone-only households, or the surge in registration. There has also been a lot of discussion about historical patterns in the final choices of undecided voters and whether there is a particular pattern for or against incumbents. =20

=20

It is not likely that the cellphones will affect the polls since =  
demographic  
weighting should account for much of the possible bias in missing these  
potential voters. And it is not likely that most of the surge of newly  
registered would be missed by most pollsters -( with the exception of  
Gallup's archaic likely voter methodology.)

=20

That being said, it is still entirely possible that the polls might have =  
an  
overall bias, for example because of under surveying of less-educated =  
and  
non-English speaking potential voters, two groups who have trouble with  
telephone interviews and who might say they are not registered or =  
otherwise  
shrug off the interview.

=20

So I looked back at all the national polls in the last seven days of the  
last presidential election reported in HOTLINE.

=20

Poll

Dates

Bush

Gore

Battleground

11/5-6

50

45

Zogby

11/5--6

46

48

CBS

11/4-6

44

45

REUTERS/MSNBC/Zogby

11/2-5

47

46

CNN/USA TODAY/Gallup

11/4-5

47

45

NBC/WSJ

11/3-5

47

44

ABC

11/2-4

49

45

PEW

11/1-4

46

43



Washington Post

11/1-3

48

46

FOX/Opinion Dynamics

11/1-2

43

43

Newsweek

10/31-11/2

45

43

Democracy Corps (Greenberg)

10/30-31

45

45

=20

=20

There is a consistent under prediction of the Democratic vote in these polls. The polls correctly show that Gore was surging at the end. The closer the closing day of the poll was to election day, the closer are = the polls (on average)

=20

At no point, though, do the polls for any time period show Gore ahead.

=20

You can read this several ways. =20

=20

Polls in 2000 understated votes for the Democrat - a good omen for =  
Kerry

=20

Polls in 2000 understated votes for the incumbent party - a good omen =  
for  
Bush

=20

Polls in 2000 show the trend and Gore just gained another point after =  
the  
polling stopped. No omens

=20

=20

Sam Popkin

=20

=20

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Sat, 30 Oct 2004 23:18:01 -0400  
Reply-To: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU>  
Subject: Re: Final Polling in 2000  
Comments: To: Sam Popkin <spopkin@ucsd.edu>  
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
In-Reply-To: <007f01c4bee9\$50735690\$0500a8c0@Sam>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Thanks for this, Sam. You must be the same Samuel Popkin who was Ithiel  
Pool's sidekick back in the 60s. Good to see you on the list! I was  
introduced to your work by Doug Price when I was a Nieman Fellow in 1967.

cheers, p.

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

=====

On Sat, 30 Oct 2004, Sam Popkin wrote:

> Date: Sat, 30 Oct 2004 18:31:10 -0700  
> From: Sam Popkin <spopkin@ucsd.edu>  
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
> Subject: Final Polling in 2000

>  
> There has been a lot of discussion about possible biases in the polls  
> because of the growth of cellphone-only households, or the surge in  
> registration. There has also been a lot of discussion about historical  
> patterns in the final choices of undecided voters and whether there is a  
> particular pattern for or against incumbents.

>  
>  
> It is not likely that the cellphones will affect the polls since demographic  
> weighting should account for much of the possible bias in missing these  
> potential voters. And it is not likely that most of the surge of newly  
> registered would be missed by most pollsters -( with the exception of  
> Gallup's archaic likely voter methodology.)

>  
>  
> That being said, it is still entirely possible that the polls might have an  
> overall bias, for example because of under surveying of less-educated and  
> non-English speaking potential voters, two groups who have trouble with  
> telephone interviews and who might say they are not registered or otherwise  
> shrug off the interview.

>  
>  
> So I looked back at all the national polls in the last seven days of the  
> last presidential election reported in HOTLINE.

>  
>  
> Poll  
>  
> Dates  
>  
> Bush  
>  
> Gore  
>  
>  
> Battleground  
>  
> 11/5-6  
>  
> 50

>  
> 45  
>  
>  
> Zogby  
>  
> 11/5--6  
>  
> 46  
>  
> 48  
>  
>  
> CBS  
>  
> 11/4-6  
>  
> 44  
>  
> 45  
>  
>  
> REUTERS/MSNBC/Zogby  
>  
> 11/2-5  
>  
> 47  
>  
> 46  
>  
>  
> CNN/USA TODAY/Gallup  
>  
> 11/4-5  
>  
> 47  
>  
> 45  
>  
>  
> NBC/WSJ  
>  
> 11/3-5  
>  
> 47  
>  
> 44  
>  
>  
> ABC  
>  
> 11/2-4  
>  
> 49

>  
> 45  
>  
>  
> PEW  
>  
> 11/1-4  
>  
> 46  
>  
> 43  
>  
>  
> Washington Post  
>  
> 11/1-3  
>  
> 48  
>  
> 46  
>  
>  
> FOX/Opinion Dynamics  
>  
> 11/1-2  
>  
> 43  
>  
> 43  
>  
>  
> Newsweek  
>  
> 10/31-11/2  
>  
> 45  
>  
> 43  
>  
>  
> Democracy Corps (Greenberg)  
>  
> 10/30-31  
>  
> 45  
>  
> 45  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> There is a consistent under prediction of the Democratic vote in these  
> polls. The polls correctly show that Gore was surging at the end. The

> closer the closing day of the poll was to election day, the closer are the  
> polls (on average)  
>  
>  
>  
> At no point, though, do the polls for any time period show Gore ahead.  
>  
>  
>  
> You can read this several ways.  
>  
>  
>  
> Polls in 2000 understated votes for the Democrat - a good omen for Kerry  
>  
>  
>  
> Polls in 2000 understated votes for the incumbent party - a good omen for  
> Bush  
>  
>  
>  
> Polls in 2000 show the trend and Gore just gained another point after the  
> polling stopped. No omens  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> Sam Popkin  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> -----  
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
> Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Date: Sun, 31 Oct 2004 09:32:14 -0500  
Reply-To: Joe Lenski <[jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM](mailto:jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Joe Lenski <[jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM](mailto:jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM)>  
Subject: Re: Final Polling in 2000  
Comments: To: Sam Popkin <[spopkin@UCSD.EDU](mailto:spopkin@UCSD.EDU)>, [AAPORNET@asu.edu](mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu)  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

One other point to consider from the 2000 polls is that every single = final poll overstated the number for Ralph Nader. The NCPP analysis = showed an average 1.3 point overstatement of Nader's vote in the final = polls.

[http://www.ncpp.org/poll\\_perform.htm](http://www.ncpp.org/poll_perform.htm)

This should be factored in to the understatement of the Gore vote by the = final polls in 2000. Since the average poll number for Nader is now = 0.9% (as calculated by realclearpolitics.com), an overstatement of the = Nader vote is much less likely to be a factor in 2004.

Joe Lenski  
edison media research

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Sam Popkin  
Sent: Saturday, October 30, 2004 9:31 PM  
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
Subject: Final Polling in 2000

There has been a lot of discussion about possible biases in the polls because of the growth of cellphone-only households, or the surge in registration. There has also been a lot of discussion about historical patterns in the final choices of undecided voters and whether there is a particular pattern for or against incumbents. =20

=20

It is not likely that the cellphones will affect the polls since = demographic weighting should account for much of the possible bias in missing these potential voters. And it is not likely that most of the surge of newly registered would be missed by most pollsters -( with the exception of Gallup's archaic likely voter methodology.)

=20

That being said, it is still entirely possible that the polls might have = an overall bias, for example because of under surveying of less-educated = and non-English speaking potential voters, two groups who have trouble with telephone interviews and who might say they are not registered or = otherwise shrug off the interview.

=20

So I looked back at all the national polls in the last seven days of the last presidential election reported in HOTLINE.

=20

Poll

Dates

Bush

Gore

Battleground

11/5-6

50

45

Zogby

11/5--6

46

48

CBS

11/4-6

44

45

REUTERS/MSNBC/Zogby

11/2-5

47

46

CNN/USA TODAY/Gallup

11/4-5

47



45

NBC/WSJ

11/3-5

47

44

ABC

11/2-4

49

45

PEW

11/1-4

46

43

Washington Post

11/1-3

48

46

FOX/Opinion Dynamics

11/1-2

43

43

Newsweek

10/31-11/2

45

43

Democracy Corps (Greenberg)

10/30-31

45

45

=20

=20

There is a consistent under prediction of the Democratic vote in these polls. The polls correctly show that Gore was surging at the end. The closer the closing day of the poll was to election day, the closer are = the polls (on average)

=20

At no point, though, do the polls for any time period show Gore ahead.

=20

You can read this several ways. =20

=20

Polls in 2000 understated votes for the Democrat - a good omen for = Kerry

=20

Polls in 2000 understated votes for the incumbent party - a good omen = for Bush

=20

Polls in 2000 show the trend and Gore just gained another point after = the polling stopped. No omens

=20

=20

Sam Popkin

=20

=20

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====  
Date: Sun, 31 Oct 2004 08:53:24 -0600  
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Sender: AAPORNET <[AAPORNET@ASU.EDU](mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU)>  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM](mailto:mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM)>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
Subject: [Fwd: Re: Final Polling in 2000]  
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <[aapornet@asu.edu](mailto:aapornet@asu.edu)>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Sent this note to Sam and Phil. Can't send an attachment to the list.

Nick

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

Subject: Re: Final Polling in 2000  
Date: Sun, 31 Oct 2004 08:46:10 -0600  
From: Nick Panagakis <[mail@marketsharescorp.com](mailto:mail@marketsharescorp.com)>  
Organization: Market Shares Corporation  
To: Sam Popkin <[spopkin@UCSD.EDU](mailto:spopkin@UCSD.EDU)>  
CC: Philip Meyer <[pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU](mailto:pmeyer@EMAIL.UNC.EDU)>

Here are the \*final\* 2000 poll results, after allocation of undecideds from pollsters who do so.

<http://www.ncpp.org/1936-2000.htm>

Re: incumbency.

Thought you might want to see the attached spreadsheet which was used for my Public Perspective piece below. It shows final national poll outcomes through 1996, the last time an incumbent ran for president. Note: the incumbent, not incumbent party.

Note that these are polls prior to allocation of undecideds which is what we are reading now. They were provided directly to me by the pollsters who allocate; e.g., Gallup, Harris, etc. The data are also free of allocation error.

From below: "The national polls do confirm what we have noticed on the state and local level. In 26 of 36 cases or 72%, more undecideds appear to vote for the challenger. Undecideds split equally in six cases and three of these are consistent with our description of exceptions. Undecideds appear to vote for the incumbent in four cases, all of which could be described as exceptions."

The null hypotheses would be a 50%/50% distribution.

Only 36 incumbent poll cases, but it could be said that Kerry's chances of picking up more undecideds appear better than even.

Nick

- >
- > Incumbent Races: A National Perspective
- > The Public Perspective; December/January, 1997
- >
- > In the traditional analysis of pre-election poll voting preference data,
- > undecided response has always been interpreted literally. Undecided
- > voters are thought to be ambivalent between candidates so their
- > percentage was expected to break about evenly between candidates on
- > election day. Unconditional probability is assumed and poll point
- > spreads are used to characterize the race. This traditional assumption
- > about undecided voters is still in use by the media and continues to
- > lead to wrong characterizations of poll findings. Moreover, this
- > assumption unfairly adds to a challenger's campaign burden by
- > exaggerating the incumbent's lead.
- >
- > SNIP
- >
- > NATIONAL POLLS
- >
- > A question raised about the pattern we noticed was that in typical
- > come-from-behind races, challengers may be gaining; i.e., that the
- > effect we noticed could be a trend for the challenger which continued or
- > even began after the final media polls we examined were taken. Even if
- > this was true, how poll data are reported should not be affected but it
- > is one reason to examine national [presidential] poll data.
- >
- > Turning to the 36 polls in the table, election outcomes shown are
- > percentages based on major candidates because this is the vote pollsters
- > measure and because votes for other candidates are often included with
- > undecideds. Also, 1996 election result data current as of the time this
- > writing showed Dole at 41.45%. Final official results may show him
- > getting 42% which would add one percentage point to his election day
- > gain.
- >
- > In three-way races, two challengers against one incumbent could mean an
- > unconditional probability of challengers picking up twice as many
- > undecideds as the incumbent. This could have been a factor in 1992 when
- > Perot pulled 19% of the vote but not when Perot, McCarthy or Anderson
- > got single-digit support. In 1992, we looked for net challenger

- > percentage change from poll to election day to be double or more of the
- > percentage picked up by the incumbent.
- >
- > In 1996, the distribution is clearly skewed with seven of nine polls
- > showing challengers, primarily Dole, picking up two-thirds or more of
- > the undecideds. Challengers got the majority in one other poll.
- >
- > In 1992, when he was more of a factor, Perot picked up two-thirds or
- > more of the undecided vote in five of six cases. In the sixth case,
- > undecideds split equally between George Bush and Ross Perot. It could be
- > speculated that the character issues which had been raised about Clinton
- > made him as well known as the incumbent on an issue important to many.
- >
- > Results in 1984 are decidedly mixed: undecideds in two polls split
- > evenly to equal the election day point spread (the only year two splits
- > happen), two deciding in favor of the challenger and two in favor of the
- > incumbent. But in 1984 Walter Mondale was an "incumbent-like" challenger
- > because he had been Vice President in the administration Ronald Reagan
- > defeated in 1980. In Landslide, authors Mayer and McManus say "Reagan
- > won because his skilled campaign team had succeeded in framing the
- > election as a choice between the bad old days of the Carter-Mondale past
- > and Reagan".
- >
- > In 1980, challenger Reagan picked up far more undecideds than incumbent
- > Jimmy Carter in four of four polls.
- >
- > In 1976, Gerald Ford was a clear example of a short-term incumbent who
- > assumed the office without even being elected Vice President. This is
- > the only case other than 1984 when results are mixed. In all other years
- > when full-term incumbents faced conventional challengers, there is no
- > case when the incumbent picks up more percentage points than the
- > challenger on election day.
- >
- > In 1972, two of three polls show the challenger gaining most of the
- > point spread. In 1964, short-term incumbent Lyndon Johnson loses all of
- > the undecideds to Barry Goldwater. But Johnson had served as Vice
- > President. In 1956, the Gallup poll shows all undecided voters deciding
- > in favor of the challenger.
- >
- > A word about the three polls in races with no incumbent not appearing in
- > the table. In 1988 and 1960, five of six polls show undecideds deciding
- > against candidates who had been Vice Presidents in preceding
- > administrations, George Bush and Richard Nixon. In 1968, more undecideds
- > went to Nixon in one case and more went to Hubert Humphrey in another.
- >
- > \*The national polls do confirm what we have noticed on the state and
- > local level. In 26 of 36 cases or 72%, more undecideds appear to vote
- > for the challenger. Undecideds split equally in six cases and three of
- > these are consistent with our description of exceptions. Undecideds
- > appear to vote for the incumbent in four cases, all of which could be
- > described as exceptions.\*
- >
- > In closing, please note that this analysis helps support a procedure for
- > characterizing poll results and is not system for allocating the

> undecided vote which is often presumed whenever the subject of undecided  
> voters comes up. Cognitive dissonance may lead to that conclusion. If  
> anything, past analysis of state and local polls shows no pattern for  
> allocating percentage points and indicates this would be very difficult  
> to attempt after considering that one-fourth overstate the incumbent's  
> percentage.  
>

-----  
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.  
=====

Date: Sun, 31 Oct 2004 15:35:28 -0500  
Reply-To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM  
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>  
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>  
Subject: Re: Final Polling in 2000  
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

A couple of observations. If turnout is as high as predicted, then weighting adjustments that could take care of cellphones likely add rather than subtract error. Second, in order to vote, one must be a citizen. To be a citizen, one must live in the country five years and speak reasonably good English. The citizenship test is in English. So, concerns about non-English speaking likely voters are probably overstated. JAS

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

visit our website: [www.SelzerCo.com](http://www.SelzerCo.com)

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

In a message dated 10/30/2004 7:42:39 PM Central Standard Time, [spopkin@UCSD.EDU](mailto:spopkin@UCSD.EDU) writes:  
There has been a lot of discussion about possible biases in the polls because of the growth of cellphone-only households, or the surge in registration. There has also been a lot of discussion about historical patterns in the final choices of undecided voters and whether there is a particular pattern for or against incumbents.

It is not likely that the cellphones will affect the polls since demographic weighting should account for much of the possible bias in missing these

potential voters. And it is not likely that most of the surge of newly registered would be missed by most pollsters -( with the exception of Gallup's archaic likely voter methodology.)

That being said, it is still entirely possible that the polls might have an overall bias, for example because of under surveying of less-educated and non-English speaking potential voters, two groups who have trouble with telephone interviews and who might say they are not registered or otherwise shrug off the interview.

So I looked back at all the national polls in the last seven days of the last presidential election reported in HOTLINE.

Poll

Dates

Bush

Gore

Battleground

11/5-6

50

45

Zogby

11/5--6

46

48

CBS

11/4-6

44

45

REUTERS/MSNBC/Zogby

11/2-5

47

46

CNN/USA TODAY/Gallup

11/4-5

47

45

NBC/WSJ

11/3-5

47

44

ABC

11/2-4

49

45

PEW

11/1-4

46

43

Washington Post

11/1-3

48

46



FOX/Opinion Dynamics

11/1-2

43

43

Newsweek

10/31-11/2

45

43

Democracy Corps (Greenberg)

10/30-31

45

45

There is a consistent under prediction of the Democratic vote in these polls. The polls correctly show that Gore was surging at the end. The closer the closing day of the poll was to election day, the closer are the polls (on average)

At no point, though, do the polls for any time period show Gore ahead.

You can read this several ways.

Polls in 2000 understated votes for the Democrat - a good omen for Kerry

Polls in 2000 understated votes for the incumbent party - a good omen for Bush

Polls in 2000 show the trend and Gore just gained another point after the polling stopped. No omens

Sam Popkin

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

---

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>  
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.