

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 LOG0505"

Date: Sun, 1 May 2005 06:01:53 -0700
Reply-To: draughon.research@insightbb.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Katherine Draughon, PhD, MPH" <draughon.research@INSIGHTBB.COM>
Subject: Small Business Owner/Consultants breakfast meeting
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Small Business Owners / Consultants

You are invited to an informal networking meeting on Saturday morning 7am-9am in Imperial II at the conference. (BYOB&C - bring your own breakfast & coffee)

Let's share ideas, experiences and perhaps develop some partnerships. We will be developing a 'directory' with contact information and specialties.

Other topics may include sharing information on marketing, RFP solicitation, sub-contracting for services (ex. focus group transcription, etc), and more.

If you are interested in attending or would like more information, please let me know.

Kat Draughon

Draughon.Research@insightbb.com

Katherine "Kat" Lind Draughon, PhD, MPH

Draughon Research
draughon.research@insightbb.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 2 May 2005 14:03:39 -0400
Reply-To: Ana Maria Arumi <amarumi@PUBLICAGENDA.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ana Maria Arumi <amarumi@PUBLICAGENDA.ORG>
Subject: Things that a survey instrument doesn't always pick up . .
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To: <20050501130154.74447.qmail@web52001.mail.yahoo.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

For those of you who haven't been following this story closely - the developer Bruce Ratner is trying to build a new stadium for the New Jersey Nets and other major developments in the Prospect Heights area of Brooklyn. He is facing significant opposition from many local residents, activists, etc.

Apparently, someone he hired to do "polling" for him unwittingly called one of the leading anti-Ratner activists. . . she taped the call and the transcripts are here:

http://www.brooklynpapers.com/html/issues/_vol28/28_13/28_13nets2.html

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Mon, 2 May 2005 16:06:12 -0400
Reply-To: "Frankovic, Kathleen" <KAF@CBSNEWS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Frankovic, Kathleen" <KAF@CBSNEWS.COM>
Subject: WAPOR BREAKFAST AT AAPOR
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

TO WAPOR MEMBERS ATTENDING THE MIAMI AAPOR MEETING

Every other year, WAPOR meets with AAPOR. This is NOT one of those years -- so as we've done before, one breakfast time is being set aside for interested WAPOR members (or those interested in becoming WAPOR members) to meet each other, discuss issues, and learn about WAPOR's projects and plans (including details of this year's WAPOR conference -- to be held in Cannes, France this September.

This year's meeting will take place in room Imperial II, between 7 and 9 a.m., Friday morning, May 13. Breakfast is not part of the AAPOR meal plan, but you will be able to bring your Cash and Carry breakfast into our meeting room.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Mon, 2 May 2005 19:35:07 -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: Certified Mail

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Dear All:

In a situation that I do not want to fully describe there has been a suggestion that using Certified Mail to distribute jury questionnaires to individuals, who fill out a questionnaire and then are summoned for service will improve the response rate.

Is there anything that would bear on this?

Please e-mail directly or to the list.

Thanks in advance for any help.

Andy

Andrew A. Beveridge
Professor of Sociology
Queens College and Graduate Center CUNY
Office: 718-997-2837
Email: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Suite 233 Powdermaker Hall
65-30 Kissena Blvd
Flushing, NY 11367-1597
www.socialexplorer.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Mon, 2 May 2005 20:35:17 -0400
Reply-To: "Lavrakas, Paul" <Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <Paul.Lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>
Subject: Cell Phone Sampling Statements
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Below, please find four "advisory" statements from the Cell Phone Sampling Summit II about issues that researchers who conduct surveys with respondents on cell phones should consider. =20

A full set of notes from the Summit, as well as copies of presentations, will be available at a read-access website soon.

Cell Phone Sampling Summit II=20
Proposed Statements on=20
"Accounting for Cell Phones in
Telephone Survey Research in the U.S."

Prepared by Paul J. Lavrakas and Charles D. Shuttles, Nielsen Media
Research
=09

In February 2005, a meeting of statistical sampling and methodological
research experts from the private, academic, and governmental sectors
convened in New York City. The purpose of this meeting was to
facilitate the discourse within the telephone survey industry on the
treatment of cell phones in Random Digit Dial (RDD) surveys of the
general public in the United States. =20

As a result of this meeting, it was proposed that several "advisory"
statements be drafted for the research community concerning reaching
cell phones while conducting telephone surveys. =20

The statements address: (1) the overall issue of accounting for cell
phones in survey research sampling, (2) safety concerns of conducting
research with a respondent while they are on a cell phone, (3) data
quality concerns, and (4) the ethics of conducting research interviews
with a respondent who is using a cell phone.

What follows are statements that reflect the general consensus of the
Summit attendees about cell phone-related issues that should be
considered by anyone conducting a RDD survey of the general population
in the U.S. As experience grows with conducting research interviews
with people on their cell phones, these statements will need to be
adapted to take into account that new knowledge.=20

Statement 1: Overall Statement on Considerations for Conducting
Telephone Surveys with Respondents on Their Cell Phones

The impact of the increasing penetration of cell phones upon the Total
Telephone Frame (TTF) in the United States is a legitimate concern to
the survey research industry; especially as it applies to reaching
housing units that are "cell phone only" (without a so-called landline).

Cell phones traditionally have been excluded, whenever possible, from
most RDD studies because they pose numerous challenges, such as: (a)
determining sample design weights, (b) defining new response codes and
response rate formulas (cf. Callegaro et al, 2005), (c) defining new
calling and interview protocols, (d) re-evaluating the necessity for
compensation for respondents, (e) working with cell phone providers to
obtain 800 numbers that are truly free for cell phone calls and can be
used by survey companies when asking the respondents to call back, (f)
complying with the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA)
restrictions, and (g) foregoing the geographic precision of landline
telephone numbers. =20

Currently, national estimates for the number of U.S. households with cell phones is approximately 70% (Piekarski, 2005), with cell phone-only households estimated to be upwards of 7% of all U.S. households and growing annually (cf. Blumberg, Luke, and Cynamon, 2005; Keeter, 2005; Piekarski, 2005; and Tucker, Meekins, Brick, and Morganstein, 2005). Some research has shown that the exclusion of cell phone households does not bias survey results when poststratification includes weighting by age, e.g., with health survey estimates and with political polls (Blumberg, Luke, and Cynamon, in press; and Keeter, 2005). It behooves the research industry to explicitly consider and clearly state/disclose how they are treating cell phones in their telephone surveys of the public. Furthermore, researchers need to continue to conduct empirical investigations of this issue on an on-going basis.

The decision to exclude or include cell phones in a sampling frame often will have major impacts upon a telephone survey. At the simplest level, the total U.S. telephone frame can be partitioned into three components: (a) land-line telephone exchanges, (b) cellular telephone exchanges, and (c) mixed-use telephone exchanges. It is important to understand that cellular telephone numbers are located in all three components of the frame; including the so-called "zero banks" (ENI) that traditionally have been excluded from list-assisted RDD samples.

Also, a researcher should account for many other cell phone-related issues, including but not limited to:

- * Ported numbers from a landline exchange to a cell phone;
- * Landline numbers that are forwarded to a cell phone number;
- * The geographic implications of reaching a cell phone user in light of the target population that the survey is meant to represent, including whether any geographic screening of those reached on their cell phone is necessary;=20
- * Cell phones can be for personal usage, business usage, or a mixture of personal and business usage. Thus whether these varied potential uses were taken into account when determining the eligibility of a respondent (e.g., the random selection of an adult from a sample household, or the identification of the person in the household most knowledgeable about a topic) should be disclosed;=20
- * Cell phone ownership among teens and pre-teens is on the rise. Thus it is more likely to reach an ineligible person when doing RDD cell phone surveys of adults, and researchers should disclose how age eligibility of respondents was determined and assured (Kornblum, 2005); and
- * Weighting for unequal probability of selection, including whether the cell phone is a personal device reaching only one potential respondent or a household device reaching more than one potential respondent.

Additionally, it is recommended that each telephone survey researcher should explicitly disclose how their survey is treating respondents who are reached on a cell phone. This includes, but is not limited to,=20

- * Disclosure of how cell phone numbers are handled in sampling;=20
- * How it was determined if a respondent was reached on a cell phone;=20
- * At least a brief description of the procedures used to comply

with the TCPA-related regulations regarding contacting someone on a cell-phone;

- * Whether any inducements to stimulate cooperation (e.g., incentives) were provided to those reached on a cell phone;=20

- * Response outcomes and response rate(s) for those reached on a cell phone;

- * Safety precautions that were taken to determine that the cell phone respondent was not put in harm by being interviewed; and

- * Whether (and how) any weighting was done to adjust for those sampled from a cell phone.

As progress is made in further understanding how respondents reached via cell phones are best accommodated in telephone surveys of the general U.S. population, these suggested considerations concerning surveying respondents reached on their cell phones need to be continually updated.

Statement 2: Safety Concerns When Reaching a Respondent on a Cell Phone

The mobile nature of cell phone technology allows for a respondent to be engaged in numerous activities and to be physically present in various locations that would not normally be expected in reaching someone on a fixed landline number. In particular, the operation of a motor vehicle or any type of potentially harmful machinery by a respondent during a research interview presents a potential hazard to the respondent and to anyone else in the general vicinity of the respondent (e.g., fellow passengers in the car). =20

As such, any researcher who conducts a survey that includes respondents being interviewed on a cell phone should take appropriate measures to protect the safety of the respondent and those around the respondent. =20

Statement 3: Data Quality Concerns When Reaching a Respondent on a Cell Phone

Many users of cell phones appear very willing to talk in all kinds of locations, including public and semi-private places, in which they are seemingly oblivious of those around them. Nevertheless, a survey respondent reached on a cell phone may consciously or unconsciously limit the candor/openness, and thus the accuracy, of her/his responses depending on the sensitivity of the research questions (e.g., health and other sensitive topics; income, age, and other demographic data; etc.).

As such, whenever it is appropriate and based on the nature of the topics being surveyed, the researcher should determine whether the respondent on a cell phone is in an environment that is conducive to providing full and accurate answers to the questions the interviewer is asking.

Statement 4: Ethical Concerns and Good Business Practices When Reaching a Respondent on a Cell Phone

Each researcher should anticipate the range of ethical and other business considerations associated with conducting a research interview with a respondent on a cell phone. These considerations include, but are not limited to the following:

- * Because of the cost structure of cell phone billing currently in the United States, there may be a financial burden upon the respondent for an incoming research call - one that does not occur with a landline phone. Therefore, when appropriate, survey respondents reached on their cell phone should be properly reimbursed for their time on a research call.=20
- * "Do No Harm" - survey researchers must proactively guard against putting anyone's safety in jeopardy when contacting respondents on a cell phone. (see Statement 2)
- * "Leave the Respondent With a Good Experience" - because people often are under special time constraints when speaking on their cell phones, survey researchers should take this explicitly into account whenever planning a questionnaire that may be used to interview someone on a cell phone. Thus, researchers should consider explicitly whether the length of an interview that is conducted on a cell phone should be shorter in duration than one conducted on a landline.
=20

Bibliography

Blumberg, Stephen, Luke, Julian V., and Cynamon, Marcie L. February 2005. "NHIS Estimates of Wireless-Only Population Size and Characteristics." Presentation at the Cell Phone Summit II meeting, New York, NY.

Blumberg, Stephen, Luke, Julian V., and Cynamon, Marcie L. (in press). "Telephone Coverage and Health Survey Estimates: Is Concern About Wireless Substitution Warranted?" American Journal of Public Health.

Callegaro, Mario, Buskirk, Trent D., Steeh, Charlotte, Piekarski, Linda, Vehovar, Vasja, and Kuusela, Vesa. February 2005. "Calculating Outcome Rates for Mobile Phone Surveys: A Proposal of a Modified AAPOR Standard and its Application to Three Case Studies." Presentation at the Cell Phone Summit II meeting, New York, NY.

Keeter, Scott. February 2005. "Cell Phone Non-Coverage Bias in the 2004 Presidential Election." Presentation at the Cell Phone Summit II meeting, New York, NY.

Kornblum, Janet. March 9, 2005. "Cellphones dial into the preteen market." USA TODAY, p. 8D.

Piekarski, Linda. February 2005. "Wireless Challenge: What We Know and Don't Know." Presentation at the Cell Phone Summit II meeting, New York, NY.

Tucker, Clyde, Meekins, Brian, Brick, J. Michael, and Morganstein, David. February 2005. "Household Telephone Service and Usage Patterns in the United States in 2004." Presentation at the Cell Phone Summit II

meeting, New York, NY.

ENDNOTES

(EN1) A "bank" of telephone numbers is defined as the set of 100 possible telephone numbers having the same 3-digit area code, 3-digit exchange/prefix, and the next 2 digits, e.g., 555-555-55XX, where XX denotes any value from 00 to 99. A "zero-bank" is a working bank of 100 telephone numbers with no listed residential number.

=20
=20
=20

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Tue, 3 May 2005 11:21:24 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: UPI - Outside View: A skunk in the polls
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Outside View: A skunk in the polls
<http://washingtontimes.com/upi-breaking/20050429-044250-9124r.htm>
By Herman Cain
Outside View Commentator

Atlanta, GA, Apr. 30 (UPI) -- Nearly every day we are bombarded with reports on television, radio and in the newspapers alleging that a majority of the public does not support President Bush's plan to restructure Social Security.

The major media outlets have based most of their headlines and stories on their own polling data. The skunk in the polls is that most media outlets are predetermining the results of their polls by asking the wrong questions. They then distort their stories to indicate that the public opposes personal retirement accounts. The question pollsters ask to determine support for personal retirement accounts rarely focuses on the accounts, but rather on the president himself and his handling of Social Security.

For example, an April 24 ABC News/Washington Post poll asked, "Do you approve or disapprove of the way Bush is handling Social Security?" 64 percent of respondents disapproved, and 31 percent approved.

SNIP

The next time you read or hear a story or poll claiming to show weak public support for the personal accounts option, make sure it passes the smell test. There could be a skunk in the poll.

--

(Herman Cain is chief executive of The New Voice, Inc. and New Voters Alliance, and host of the nationally syndicated radio talk show "The Bottom Line with Herman Cain." He is past chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, and past chairman and chief executive of Godfather's Pizza, Inc.)

--

(United Press International's "Outside View" commentaries are written by outside contributors who specialize in a variety of issues. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect those of United Press International. In the interests of creating an open forum, original submissions are invited.)

--

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: Tue, 3 May 2005 12:16:35 -0400
Reply-To: AmyRSimon@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Amy Simon <AmyRSimon@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: Certified Mail
Comments: To: andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

In 2002, the state of California's court system did an extensive qualitative and quantitative focus group project on how to improve citizen participation in the jury system (I moderated some focus groups as part of the project).

They did a direct mail test, sending out 3 or 4 different versions of a jury summons to 5,000 people in several different areas of the state (rural, urban, suburban), and also did qualitative testing of the mocked-up summonses.

Paid for with tax dollars, it's all public record. You might want to get a hold of their research to guide your own.

Amy

In a message dated 5/2/2005 4:37:08 P.M. Pacific Standard Time, andy@TROLL.SOC.QC.EDU writes:

Dear All:

In a situation that I do not want to fully describe there has been a suggestion that using Certified Mail to distribute jury questionnaires to individuals, who fill out a questionnaire and then are summoned for service will improve the response rate.

Is there anything that would bear on this?

Please e-mail directly or to the list.

Thanks in advance for any help.

Andy

Andrew A. Beveridge
Professor of Sociology
Queens College and Graduate Center CUNY
Office: 718-997-2837
Email: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Suite 233 Powdermaker Hall
65-30 Kissena Blvd
Flushing, NY 11367-1597
www.socialexplorer.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

=====
Date: Tue, 3 May 2005 15:33:52 -0400
Reply-To: LDElia@SCARBOROUGH.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Lise D'Elia <LDElia@SCARBOROUGH.COM>
Subject: contact info needed
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Does anyone have contact info for Bob Groves?
I need to locate contact info (email/phone #) for Bob Groves, (professor from the University of Michigan.) because we just need to get clarification from him on a citation we are using in a paper being presented at the upcoming AAPOR conference.

Thank you.

Lisa D'Elia
Research Analyst
Scarborough Research
770 Broadway 13th floor
New York, NY 10003-9595
(646) 654-8418

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: Tue, 3 May 2005 15:44:06 -0500
Reply-To: Timothy Johnson <tjohnson@SRL.UIC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Timothy Johnson <tjohnson@SRL.UIC.EDU>
Subject: Position Available in Urbana-Champaign
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu, KAF@CBSNEWS.COM
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable
Content-disposition: inline

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT U-C
Project Coordinator, LRC

The Library Research Center (LRC) in the Graduate School of Library and =
Information Science (GSLIS) is seeking applicants for a regular, full-time, =
12-month, academic professional position as Project Coordinator.=20

The LRC is a content-supported agency of GSLIS. Its mission is to assist =
researchers in the field of library and information science as well as to =
conduct independent investigations in the field. The Center staff consists =
of specialists in project management, data analysis, and data management, =
and is supported by technical staff. This position is a new position =
intended to strengthen the ability of the Center to design, implement and =
analyze surveys. Demands from libraries and from researchers for =
web-based and paper surveys have increased significantly and the LRC =
desires not only to conduct more such surveys; but also increase the level =
of sophistication of analysis of data collected.

Responsibilities: The Project Coordinator coordinates all on-going =
projects; provides support to public libraries (advice and technical =
assistance, materials) as needed to gather survey data for the Illinois =
Public Library Annual Report (IPLAR); oversees coding and processing of =
IPLAR survey data as returned from public libraries through a web-based =
system; generates Microsoft Access forms to aid in error reporting and =
call generation by undergraduate students; produces a statistical summary, =

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

Date: Wed, 4 May 2005 12:20:29 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Push polls or Positioning polls or bad polls
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Resident blasts poll by Cox as anti-LUS

By KEVIN BLANCHARD

Acadiana bureau

LAFAYETTE -- Cox Communications has sponsored a new poll calling city residents about the Lafayette Utilities System plan to enter the telecommunications business.

This is the fourth reported poll since April 2004, when LUS announced it wanted to enter the phone, cable and high-speed Internet business.

SNIP

Cox Communications official Tim Tippit confirmed Cox was sharing the cost of the poll with another entity, though he did not know who the other sponsor was.

"It was not our intent to upset any of the citizens," Tippit said. "We are always interested in finding out more about citizens there (in Lafayette) and how that relates back to Cox."

Ringo, who does marketing in the oil and gas industry, said he didn't see how the questions asked in the poll would actually be useful to judge public opinion.

Ringo called the poll a "push poll," advertising disguised as a public opinion poll meant to sway opinion rather than measure it.

SNIP

One question went like "Don't you agree, that LUS should stay out of business?" Ringo said.

Another question said LUS refuses to reveal the rates it plans to charge for services and asked the resident what he thought about that, Ringo said.

SNIP

The poll is being conducted by Market Research Insight -- a company run by Pensacola pollster Verne Kennedy.

A company representative confirmed they were running the poll, but said it could not provide any more information.

Tippit said Tuesday he wasn't sure how many people the pollsters were going to call.

Last summer, Cox Communications ran an automated poll that called 46,000 homes in Lafayette Parish and asked questions such as: "LUS, the city-owned utility, is considering borrowing \$100 million to provide cable, phone and Internet services for its customers. Opponents say it is unnecessary for the city utility to borrow this money because other companies already provide cable, phone and Internet services to your home.

"Considering this, should the city-parish government authorize LUS to borrow money for this plan?"

Fifty-eight percent of the 4,871 respondents said "no."

LUS and Lafayette officials called the poll a push poll. Cox countered that an earlier survey by LUS was also a push poll.

The LUS survey called each of its customers and asked, in part, "Would you switch to LUS if they offered lower rates?"

About 76 percent of respondents answered "yes."

Later that summer, Cox hired Kennedy's firm to run a poll with a smaller sample of about 600 people and a 4-percent margin of error, which is closer to the industry standard for gauging public opinion.

Sixty-four percent said they had a favorable opinion of the LUS plan in that survey.

Click here to return to story:

http://www.theadvocate.com/stories/050405/sub_cox001.shtml

--

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, 4 May 2005 13:01:03 -0400
Reply-To: "Peter C. Bruce" <pbruce@STATISTICS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Peter C. Bruce" <pbruce@STATISTICS.COM>
Subject: Online Course: Using the Census's American Community Survey
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Online Course: Using the Census's American Community Survey

For market researchers, in fact for all social science researchers, the U.S. Census Bureau's new American Community Survey (ACS) is a major development.

No longer must analysts make do with increasingly out-of-date detailed information about households and individuals while they wait for the next decennial census. Starting in 2006, this information will be made available annually.

Cynthia Tauber's new online course at statistics.com (June 3 - July 1) shows what sort of information is included, how to obtain it, and what methodological and sample size issues present themselves.

If you have not made use of similar Census data previously, learn how you can leverage the vast improvements in currency and timeliness for your projects. If you have used decennial census data before, you will benefit by learning about the methodological differences between this Survey and the decennial census long form.

Ms. Taeuber, a senior policy advisor at the University of Baltimore Jacob France Institute, has 30 years of experience at the U.S. Census Bureau, directed the analytic staff for the American Community Survey, and received the Commerce Dept.'s Gold Medal Award for her innovative work on the American Community Survey. She is the author of *The American Community Survey: Updated Information for America's Communities* and more.

As with all online courses at statistics.com, there are no set hours when you must be online, and you can interact with the instructor over a period of 4 weeks via a private discussion board. We estimate you will need about 10 hours per week.

Register: <http://www.statistics.com/content/courses/census/index.html>

Peter Bruce
pbruce@statistics.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
=====

Date: Wed, 4 May 2005 13:02:26 -0500
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Job Opportunity
Comments: To: Aapornet@asu.edu
Comments: cc: "Downing, Kim (downink)" <DOWNINK@UCMAIL.UC.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Research Associate

(Survey

Researcher)

=20

Job Description

=20

The University of Cincinnati (UC) Institute for Policy Research (IPR) is seeking an experienced Survey Researcher to plan, design and administer major survey research projects and other social, behavioral and health science research projects. This person will seek external funding and participate in ongoing survey projects and programs of the IPR. This person will recommend appropriate research and data analysis methodologies. The Survey Researcher will provide computational, substantive and methodological consultation on research conducted with UC faculty, other researchers in the community and contract clients. It is expected that the Survey Researcher will also conduct and publish public opinion, public policy and survey methodology academic research. The Survey Researcher will also collaborate with the team of researchers in the development of IPR's research infrastructure and capabilities. (Salary will be commensurate with experience and qualifications.)

=20

Minimum Qualifications

- * Earned doctorate in social, behavioral or health sciences=20
- * Demonstrated training and 5 years experience in survey research
- * Steadily increasing experience and responsibility in survey-based social, behavioral or health research
- * Demonstrable record of ability to generate a continuing stream of externally funded grants and/or contracts
- * Experience in developing relationships with potential research funders

* Demonstrated ability to collaborate with teams of researchers

* Familiarity with database management and the ability to design, write and modify complex statistical systems and programs (e.g. SAS, SPSS, SUDAAN)

* Publications in public opinion and/or public policy or survey methodology

* Strong oral and written communication skills

=20

Preferred Qualifications

* Experience in developing research infrastructure and capabilities

* Experience with multi-client projects (e.g., omnibus surveys)

* Peer reviewed publications in national and/or international disciplinary journals

=20

Send letter, resume and contact information for three references to:

=20

Chair, Search Committee

Research Associate Position (Survey Research)=20

Institute for Policy Research, University of
Cincinnati

PO Box 210132, Cincinnati, OH 45221-0132

Phone: 513-556-5028 Fax: 513-556-9023

=20

IPR representatives will be attending the 2005 AAPOR conference.=20

=20

The University of Cincinnati is an Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity Employer.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 4 May 2005 14:52:19 -0700
Reply-To: Vicki Siemers <vicki.siemers@RBCDAIN.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Vicki Siemers <vicki.siemers@RBCDAIN.COM>
Subject: Scales on Internet Surveys

My co-worker and I have been debating scales. When it comes to web and telephone surveys, he has always placed the negative end of the scale on the left side and the positive end of the scale on the right side (Very Difficult to Very Easy or Not At All Important to Very Important). He does the exact opposite on paper surveys (Very Easy to Very Difficult and Very Important to Not At All Important). I keep my scales consistent for every type of survey (positive on the left and negative on the right). I'd love to hear your opinion on this subject.

Thank you,

Vicki Siemers
Sr. Marketing Research Analyst
RBC Dain Rauscher
Minneapolis, MN 55402
vicki.siemers@rbcdain.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 4 May 2005 15:57:55 -0700
Reply-To: Kristin Wade <wadek@PDX.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Kristin Wade <wadek@PDX.EDU>
Subject: Re: Scales on Internet Surveys
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
In-Reply-To: <LISTSERV%2005050414521996@LISTS.ASU.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The first thing that comes to my mind is the coding that goes along with the response choices. We always try to keep the numeric coding lowest with the negative responses and the highest coding with the positive responses. It just makes more sense to us in analysis. So then going from left to right - we would have it negative to positive because it would then also be in numeric order (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Somewhat Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Strongly Agree).

Kristin Wade
Project Manager, Survey Research Lab
Portland State University
wadek@pdx.edu

Vicki Siemers wrote:

>My co-worker and I have been debating scales. When it comes to web and
>telephone surveys, he has always placed the negative end of the scale on
>the left side and the positive end of the scale on the right side (Very
>Difficult to Very Easy or Not At All Important to Very Important). He does
>the exact opposite on paper surveys (Very Easy to Very Difficult and Very
>Important to Not At All Important). I keep my scales consistent for every
>type of survey (positive on the left and negative on the right). I'd love
>to hear your opinion on this subject.

>

>Thank you,

>

>Vicki Siemers

>Sr. Marketing Research Analyst

>RBC Dain Rauscher

>Minneapolis, MN 55402

>vicki.siemers@rbcdain.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, 4 May 2005 17:48:44 -0700

Reply-To: Hank Zucker <hank@surveysystem.com>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Hank Zucker <hank@SURVEYSYSTEM.COM>

Subject: Re: Scales on Internet Surveys

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I agree with Vicki that it is more natural visually to have the positive answers on the left. It is one of our standard recommendations. This goes with reading scales to someone over the phone or in person. Saying "would you rate this product poor, fair, good, or excellent?" will sound odd to many people. Saying the strongly disagree choice first will also sound odd to many. Since we read left-to-right (assuming English), that should be the positive-to-negative presentation order.

I agree with Kristin that it is often more convenient for analysis to have the positive answers have the higher codes.

Good software should allow showing choices in 5-4-3-2-1 code order in CATI and Web surveys. That way strongly agree can be both code 5 and on the

left (or top).

Hank

Hank Zucker, Ph.D.
Creative Research Systems
www.surveysystem.com
(707) 765-1001

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

From: "Kristin Wade" <wadek@PDX.EDU>
To: <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2005 3:57 PM
Subject: Re: Scales on Internet Surveys

> The first thing that comes to my mind is the coding that goes along with
> the response choices. We always try to keep the numeric coding lowest
> with the negative responses and the highest coding with the positive
> responses. It just makes more sense to us in analysis. So then going
> from left to right - we would have it negative to positive because it
> would then also be in numeric order (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Somewhat
> Disagree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Strongly Agree).

>
> Kristin Wade
> Project Manager, Survey Research Lab
> Portland State University
> wadek@pdx.edu

>
>
> Vicki Siemers wrote:

>> My co-worker and I have been debating scales. When it comes to web and
>> telephone surveys, he has always placed the negative end of the scale on
>> the left side and the positive end of the scale on the right side (Very
>> Difficult to Very Easy or Not At All Important to Very Important). He
does
>> the exact opposite on paper surveys (Very Easy to Very Difficult and Very
>> Important to Not At All Important). I keep my scales consistent for
every
>> type of survey (positive on the left and negative on the right). I'd
love
>> to hear your opinion on this subject.

>>
>> Thank you,

>>
>> Vicki Siemers
>> Sr. Marketing Research Analyst
>> RBC Dain Rauscher
>> Minneapolis, MN 55402
>> vicki.siemers@rbcdain.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.
>
>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Wed, 4 May 2005 18:41:07 -0700
Reply-To: Richard Rands <rrands@CFMC.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Richard Rands <rrands@CFMC.COM>
Subject: Re: Scales on Internet Surveys
Comments: To: Vicki Siemers <vicki.siemers@RBCDAIN.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <LISTSERV%2005050414521996@LISTS.ASU.EDU>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Hi Vicky,

This reminds me of one of the very first research seminars I attended some 15 years ago where a session was held on rating scales. By the end of the first half hour, some of the attendees were almost ready to physically attack each other because the discussion was so heated and they had such strong opinions about what they felt was the only correct way to handle rating scales.

I'll offer my unpretentious opinion. Telephone surveys are very different from web and paper surveys because there is no notion of left to right or right to left. The telephone interviewer reads the rating scale and the respondent will perceive them in a sequence that will vary from one person to the next. It may be top to bottom, left to right, or right to left. There will always be a bias inherent in the order presented to the respondent. If you are using a CATI system, you have the option of reversing the sequence for half the respondents, but we have found that the confusion caused for the interviewers who have to present the different orders introduces more error than would occur from typical order effects. A secondary aspect of interviewers reading rating scales is how the rating points are identified. If you associate a numeric value to the points, it is our experience that there is less error if the larger number is associated with the most positive value of the scale. For example, using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very unimportant and 5 is very important, will produce less error than the opposite. On the other hand, by removing the numeric values and reading the scale points without values, a typical interviewer will make enough errors that the results will still

have about the same error rate.

Once we varied the order on a questionnaire and the results were so obviously bad that we never tried it again. All you have to do is ask a rating question and then present an open-ended question to find out why they gave that rating. The open-end response often disagrees with the rating value. This technique is popular in satisfaction surveys and is useful in reducing the error. One suggestion that we give to our web survey clients is to have a "dummy" question near the start of a questionnaire that sets the respondent's mind set for the rating scale order that will be used throughout the remainder of the survey.

For example, a survey about commuting might have a question, "If your community had a rapid transit system that is convenient for your commute, how likely would you be to use it? On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very unlikely and 5 is very likely, would you be very unlikely, somewhat unlikely, neither likely nor unlikely, somewhat likely, or very likely to use the rapid transit system?" Every respondent would be presented an open-end that referred to their specific response. "Please explain why you would be [very unlikely] to use a rapid transit system." The wording of the question would force the respondent to correct a misunderstood rating, and you would also have an opportunity to exclude cases that have a discrepancy.

I suggest that the specific order might not be as critical as how the questionnaire is phrased and how you administer the questionnaire. There is potential error for any sequence, and you will do well to pay attention to all possible factors that will help reduce error.

Richard Rands
CfMC

At 02:52 PM 5/4/2005 -0700, Vicki Siemers wrote:

>My co-worker and I have been debating scales. When it comes to web and
>telephone surveys, he has always placed the negative end of the scale on
>the left side and the positive end of the scale on the right side (Very
>Difficult to Very Easy or Not At All Important to Very Important). He does
>the exact opposite on paper surveys (Very Easy to Very Difficult and Very
>Important to Not At All Important). I keep my scales consistent for every
>type of survey (positive on the left and negative on the right). I'd love
>to hear your opinion on this subject.

>

>Thank you,

>

>Vicki Siemers

>Sr. Marketing Research Analyst

>RBC Dain Rauscher

>Minneapolis, MN 55402

>vicki.siemers@rbcdain.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: Thu, 5 May 2005 11:27:37 -0400
Reply-To: Michel Rochon <mrochon@SURVEYSAMPLER.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Michel Rochon <mrochon@SURVEYSAMPLER.COM>
Subject: Re: Scales on Internet Surveys
Comments: To: Richard Rands <rRANDS@CFMC.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I think Richard Rand's response is a model in discussions. Abundant knowledge presented with true civility based on real knowledge. Congrats!!!

Michel Rochon

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Richard Rands
Sent: May 4, 2005 9:41 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Scales on Internet Surveys

Hi Vicky,

This reminds me of one of the very first research seminars I attended some 15 years ago where a session was held on rating scales. By the end of the first half hour, some of the attendees were almost ready to physically attack each other because the discussion was so heated and they had such strong opinions about what they felt was the only correct way to handle rating scales.

I'll offer my unpretentious opinion. Telephone surveys are very different from web and paper surveys because there is no notion of left to right or right to left. The telephone interviewer reads the rating scale and the respondent will perceive them in a sequence that will vary from one person to the next. It may be top to bottom, left to right, or right to left. There will always be a bias inherent in the order presented to the respondent. If you are using a CATI system, you have the option of reversing the sequence for half the respondents, but we have found that the confusion caused for the interviewers who have to present the different orders introduces more error than would occur from typical order effects. A secondary aspect of interviewers reading rating scales is

how the rating points are identified. If you associate a numeric value to the points, it is our experience that there is less error if the larger number is associated with the most positive value of the scale. For example, using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very unimportant and 5 is very important, will produce less error than the opposite. On the other hand, by removing the numeric values and reading the scale points without values, a typical interviewer will make enough errors that the results will still have about the same error rate.

Once we varied the order on a questionnaire and the results were so obviously bad that we never tried it again. All you have to do is ask a rating question and then present an open-ended question to find out why they gave that rating. The open-end response often disagrees with the rating value. This technique is popular in satisfaction surveys and is useful in reducing the error. One suggestion that we give to our web survey clients is to have a "dummy" question near the start of a questionnaire that sets the respondent's mind set for the rating scale order that will be used throughout the remainder of the survey.

For example, a survey about commuting might have a question, "If your community had a rapid transit system that is convenient for your commute, how likely would you be to use it? On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very unlikely and 5 is very likely, would you be very unlikely, somewhat unlikely, neither likely nor unlikely, somewhat likely, or very likely to use the rapid transit system?" Every respondent would be presented an open-end that referred to their specific response. "Please explain why you would be [very unlikely] to use a rapid transit system." The wording of the question would force the respondent to correct a misunderstood rating, and you would also have an opportunity to exclude cases that have a discrepancy.

I suggest that the specific order might not be as critical as how the questionnaire is phrased and how you administer the questionnaire. There is potential error for any sequence, and you will do well to pay attention to all possible factors that will help reduce error.

Richard Rands
CfMC

At 02:52 PM 5/4/2005 -0700, Vicki Siemers wrote:

>My co-worker and I have been debating scales. When it comes to web and
>telephone surveys, he has always placed the negative end of the scale
on
>the left side and the positive end of the scale on the right side (Very
>Difficult to Very Easy or Not At All Important to Very Important). He
does
>the exact opposite on paper surveys (Very Easy to Very Difficult and
Very
>Important to Not At All Important). I keep my scales consistent for
every
>type of survey (positive on the left and negative on the right). I'd
love
>to hear your opinion on this subject.

>
>Thank you,
>
>Vicki Siemers
>Sr. Marketing Research Analyst
>RBC Dain Rauscher
>Minneapolis, MN 55402
>vicki.siemers@rbcdain.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.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Thu, 5 May 2005 11:33:04 -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: Scales on Internet Surveys
Comments: To: Vicki Siemers <vicki.siemers@RBCDAIN.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

Asking people to choose from a visual array is very different from asking people to respond to spoken cues or prompts; the primary difference is that spoken cues require memory and the patience to wait for the interviewer to present the prompts; the tone of voice, accent, and pacing of the prompts all confound the issue of order, but psychological research has demonstrated that the memory load in responding to spoken cues will bias respondents to over-respond to both either the first or last cue [primacy and recency] thereby exaggerating the extremes of response.

But your question deals with visual presentation and a horizontal orientation. Why not use a vertical orientation, with the highest, most

positive value on the top? Our culture is permeated with this sort of presentation, from election results, to baseball standings, golf leaderboards, to the most basic one of all, the thermometer.

Personally, the only time I have used a horizontal visual orientation in a survey was in asking people to rank themselves from Liberal [on the left] to Conservative [on the right].

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: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Vicki Siemers
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2005 5:52 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Scales on Internet Surveys

My co-worker and I have been debating scales. When it comes to web and telephone surveys, he has always placed the negative end of the scale on the left side and the positive end of the scale on the right side (Very Difficult to Very Easy or Not At All Important to Very Important). He does the exact opposite on paper surveys (Very Easy to Very Difficult and Very Important to Not At All Important). I keep my scales consistent for every type of survey (positive on the left and negative on the right). I'd love to hear your opinion on this subject.

Thank you,

Vicki Siemers
Sr. Marketing Research Analyst
RBC Dain Rauscher
Minneapolis, MN 55402
vicki.siemers@rbcdain.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: Thu, 5 May 2005 13:21:49 -0400
Reply-To: "Steve, Kenneth" <Kenneth.Steve@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Steve, Kenneth" <Kenneth.Steve@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>

Subject: Re: Scales on Internet Surveys
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

=20

When I think of a string of numbers say, -2 -1 0 1 2, the negative numbers (commonly associated with negative response options) are always on the left. I read/write left to right. It always seems counterintuitive when I see positive response options to the left, but maybe this is a conditioned response. The only time I've seen this association purposely breeched is when are multiple items that do not share response options, and you want the respondent to carefully consider each set of options independently (i.e., you want to keep the respondent on their toes). =20

When the response options are stacked vertically, the positive (i.e., Good) response options are typically placed on top. I'm sure many can think of associations where good is above and bad is below. Unnumbered, this would imply a scale where positive values are on top, negative values below. If the response options are numbered however, it is common practice to begin with number 1 down to x since the respondent will be reading downward. In this case, I think it is better to invert the scale (i.e., good on top, numbered 1 down to x) in order to preserve preset associations in the mind of the respondent. Data can be recoded.

I wonder if it is pure coincidence that a Cartesian Matrix is laid out in such a fashion (i.e., negative values to the left on the horizontal axis and at the bottom of the vertical axis).

=20

I don't believe these associations to be as critical when items are presented verbally for many of the same reason's that Richard Rands mentioned in his post. From Hank Zucker's post, it appears that these associations are not perfectly generalizable, at least in reference to horizontal presentation. So I suppose we've begged the question.

My 2 cents.
Ken Steve

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Wed, 4 May 2005 16:12:44 -0700
Reply-To: Harry Heller <hheller@RCASITE.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Harry Heller <hheller@RCASITE.COM>
Subject: Increasing Respondent Cooperation
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Dear AAPOR Members:

In the past 6 months or so I have been Director of Respondent Cooperation for CMOR (The Council for Marketing and Opinion Research.) The task has been a real eye-opener because I have, for the first time in my 40 year career, had the time to concentrate on this issue. I've become an optimist. We can increase respondent cooperation.

The Do not Call Rules have taken many of those telemarketing calls out of the lives of those homes that care not to receive them. Since the opinion research industry is not part of the DNC rules, we have fewer competitors for the precious free time of our respondents, even though respondents are not completely aware of this fact. Studies presented at CMOR respondent cooperation conferences demonstrate that if you give the respondent a chance to re-schedule a call or if you pre-invite the sample to participate in the survey and schedule it to their convenience, cooperation rates will go up =96 significantly. We are even developing an Industry Identifier so that legitimate opinion research companies and research institutes can identify themselves quickly.

I have come to realize that one of the great challenges to increasing respondent cooperation is the training and level of the first line of contact =96 the interviewer. Companies have always known (and some have had=

on staff) a small number of interviewers who are experts in converting hard-to-get respondents to participate. I always wondered -- can we clone these interviewers? Clone no (it=92s against the law) but train yes.

CMOR will be presenting a new training module that joins our Introduction to Survey Training Course. It deals with Avoidance Refusal Training, training interviewers to deal with respondents who refuse to be interviewed. This training program is about ready to be made available to all of our members and the industry. I think it=92s probably the most efficient way to get better respondent participation. It is being presented at our conference in September.

That is why we are creating a training day at our Managing Our Assets IV conference to be held in Washington D.C. September 7th through the 9th in the Hotel Washington. I believe that all segments of the opinion research industry will find it valuable to attend the conference and get an update on what we can do at this special window of opportunity to increase respondent cooperation.

For more information try www.cmor.org for details of program and registering for the conference.

Harry E. Heller, Ph.D.
CMOR Director of Respondent Cooperation
(631) 329-7004
hheller@cmor.org or

Research Consulting Agency
hheller@rcasite.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Sun, 8 May 2005 07:52:44 -0400
Reply-To: RSimm32573@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Robert O. Simmons" <RSimm32573@AOL.COM>
Subject: And now for sports . . .
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Giacomo, upset winner of the Kentucky Derby, is distantly inbred to a horse named Questionnaire, born in 1927.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Sun, 8 May 2005 16:20:45 -0700
Reply-To: Mike O'Neil <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike O'Neil <mike.oneil@ALUMNI.BROWN.EDU>
Subject: Jop Posting: Mid- to Senior Researcher
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

This is a job posting. O'Neil Associates is looking to add a mid- to senior-level staff member for our Phoenix-based full service opinion research firm. We are looking for talent and can consider an analyst, account/sales executive, or phone room supervisor. Ideal would be someone with a graduate degree (or equivalent experience) and 5+ years survey research experience (2+ years minimum).

We are an established firm (25 years in business) with a repeat clientele. There is equity and/or profit sharing potential. Our firm, position requirements, and application procedures are described in some detail on our website <<http://www.oneilresearch.com/>> <http://www.oneilresearch.com/>

This is an expansion position, not a replacement position for someone who is leaving. Must be able to start no later than August 1.

(And for the numerous people I have discussed this with over the last couple of years, you should know that we have made one recent "career" hire and hope to deepen our staff further with this hire.). My original desire (expressed in the original posting of a couple of years ago, is on its way to fulfillment. But, deeper "bench strength" is always a good idea.

If you have an interest in this position, and will be at the AAPOR meetings, please email by midnight Monday and indicate how I may reach you at AAPOR.

I will be in Miami starting Tuesday at 8pm and can be reached by cell phone at 602.316.8079 if you don't see this until Tuesday. Experience suggests contacting me very early in the meetings due to the hit-or-miss logistics. But do look at the web site first. It is a very good statement of who we are and what we do.

I posted much of what follows last year....it produced some of the most interesting conversations I have ever had at AAPOR. So I repost, with some edits in the hopes of more of the same-or more.

Mike O'Neil

-----original post..with some modifications

It finally came. The dreaded AARP invitation. Certifiable old-fartdom. Damn tough pill to swallow for a rock n roll-raised/forever young baby boomer. (For those who have not yet reached this milestone, the vultures start mailing you when you are 49+ -- and they always find you).

Made me think of a conversation I had with the sage Mayer Zald when he visited here over 20 years ago. The subject was retirement. In all of my then-late-twenties innocence I asked him "Why would you ever want to retire?" I have remembered his response ever since, "After you have been doing the same thing for many years, you get to the point where you want to do something else. I heard him, but didn't really understand.

All these years later, I do now.

(2004 Note: after posting it last year a colleague of his wrote me: "You know, he never did retire". Oh, well, the point was valid nonetheless.)

I have founded and run a research firm for over 20 years. I do high-level conceptualization, research design; edit all analytical reports, the usual stuff. I am also go-to guy when the toilet backs up (I know how to use a plunger and have the phone number of a handyman), do phone wiring, figure out how to manage when three people call in sick on the same day (work harder and faster and juggle), or just about anything else happens.

Twenty plus years. Doing more or less the same thing. And I would like not to be doing exactly this forever. I am looking for a five- to ten-year Plan to extricate myself from day-to-day responsibilities.

The point of all this: I am looking to associate myself with a highly trained younger person to associate with, someone with long-term interests. While I am looking to hire someone, what sets this apart from the usual job offer, is that the job has the potential for very substantial equity in a successful profitable firm with a twenty year history. And in a location with 350 bright sunny days a year in America's fifth -largest (which surprises most of the people I tell this) and fastest-growing city to boot.

While I am open to a wide range of possibilities, anyone interested should know that this is a VERY HANDS ON organization (note above discussion of plumbing). The exact seniority of the person would seem to me to have some flexibility. For a more junior type, we could do the ten-year plan; for a

more mid-career type, the five-year plan.

I assume anyone who is potentially interested is on AAPORnet, but if not, feel free to pass this on.

Mike O'Neil

oneil@oneilresearch.com

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
=====

Date: Mon, 9 May 2005 10:12:40 -0500
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Job Opportunity
Comments: To: Aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Research Program Director=20

The Survey Research Group, a project of the Public Health Institute, seeks a Research Program Director to direct the research activities of a staff of 70 +. This unit is devoted to the collection, analysis, and dissemination of public health data. Call center interviewers carry out the majority of data collection. This position reports directly to the CEO of the Public Health Institute and is located in Sacramento, CA.=20

RESPONSIBILITIES:

The Research Program Director will collaborate with public health researchers to plan and conduct health-related, survey research. The incumbent will advise, coordinate and manage questionnaire development, sampling design and sampling strategies, data analysis, management, and weighting, and data collection quality control. =20

Additionally, the incumbent will: coordinate all data collection activities; supervise the development, planning and direction of the work of SRG scientific, programming and technical assistance staff; direct the hiring and interviewing of all scientific staff; respond to inquiries for SRG services and to federal and state RFAs; identify potential clients; manage all contracts to insure that contractual obligations are met; and attend professional meetings and conferences representing SRG.=20

REQUIREMENTS: Ph.D. (or Doctorial Candidate (A.B.D.) actively working on degree and with a verifiable completion date) in survey methodology, social science research, statistics, public health, epidemiology or other related field; and a minimum of 10 years of survey research experience with increasing levels of responsibility. Additionally, the incumbent must have: extensive knowledge of and experience with survey research methods and survey research design; demonstrated experience in the management of multiple projects; excellent computer skills and experience in SAS; the ability to lead from within a team; previous supervisory experiences, including demonstrated ability to develop, plan, direct and evaluate the work of various levels of support staff; and experience working with a large and diverse staff. The incumbent must possess strong organizational skills, and have the ability to interact well with others. This person must be customer oriented. Salary is commensurate with experience. Send C.V. with cover letter, salary requirements and 3 references by April 29, 2005 to:=20

Public Health Institute=20

555 12th Street=20

Department 42=20

Oakland, CA 94607=20

jobs@phi.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

=====
Date: Mon, 9 May 2005 08:31:32 -0700
Reply-To: Harry Heller <hheller@RCASITE.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Harry Heller <hheller@RCASITE.COM>
Subject: Re: And now for sports . . .

On Sun, 8 May 2005 07:52:44 -0400, Robert O. Simmons <RSimm32573@AOL.COM> wrote:

>Giacomo, upset winner of the Kentucky Derby, is distantly inbred to a horse
>named Questionnaire, born in 1927.

>
>-----
>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Is Questionnaire the horse out of "Too Long" by "Boring" or the one out of "Call me Later" by "Busy"?

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: Mon, 9 May 2005 12:35:19 -0700

Reply-To: Paolo Gardinali <paolo@SURVEY.UCSB.EDU>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Paolo Gardinali <paolo@SURVEY.UCSB.EDU>

Subject: Bad surveys needed ...

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To: <20050426204354.LOEI6804.lakermmtao09.cox.net@reactor>

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Matt Mutchler, a former graduate student in the Sociology Department here at UCSB is looking for "bad examples" of survey research to use for training. Here is his request:

---Begin included text

yes, you read correctly...I am in search of really badly constructed surveys, preferably from well recognized government or corporate entities.

As some of you know, I run a research and evaluation department at AIDS project Los Angeles. We have a contract from the county to train other community-based organizations to develop surveys; we'd like to show them some bad examples to boost their confidence and compare to good examples. Should you have any, I would greatly appreciate the opportunities to have or make a copy. I am teaching on campus this quarter on Mondays, and have a box in the soc. dept.

THANKS, a million. It will be very helpful.

Matt Mutchler

---End included text

If you have anything in mind, you can mail me offlist and I can forward them to Matt. Thank you in advance!

--

Paolo A. Gardinali, Ph.D.

Associate Director

UCSB Social Science Survey Center

<http://www.survey.ucsb.edu>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

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

=====
Date: Mon, 9 May 2005 13:09:43 -0700
Reply-To: Linda Bourque <lbourque@UCLA.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Linda Bourque <lbourque@UCLA.EDU>
Subject: Re: Bad surveys needed ...
Comments: To: Paolo Gardinali <paolo@SURVEY.UCSB.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <Pine.BSF.4.33.0505091232380.89962-100000@isber.ucsb.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

Do you mean bad surveys or bad questionnaires?

At 12:35 PM 5/9/05, Paolo Gardinali wrote:

>Matt Mutchler, a former graduate student in the Sociology Department here
>at UCSB is looking for "bad examples" of survey research to use for
>training. Here is his request:

>
>---Begin included text

>
>yes, you read correctly...I am in search of really badly constructed
>surveys, preferrably from well recognized government or corporate
>entities.

>
>
>As some of you know, I run a research and evaluation department at AIDS
>project Los Angeles. We have a contract from the county to train other
>community-based organizations to develop surveys; we'd like to show them
>some bad examples to boost their confidence and compare to good examples.
>Should you have any, I would greatly appreciate the opportunities to have
>or make a copy. I am teaching on campus this quarter on Mondays, and have
>a box in the soc. dept.

>
>THANKS, a million. It will be very helpful.

>
>Matt Mutchler

>
>
>---End included text

>
>If you have anything in mind, you can mail me offlist and I can forward
>them to Matt. Thank you in advance!

>
>
>--

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

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

>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: Mon, 9 May 2005 12:57:28 -0700
Reply-To: Paolo Gardinali <paolo@SURVEY.UCSB.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Paolo Gardinali <paolo@SURVEY.UCSB.EDU>
Subject: Re: Bad surveys needed ...
Comments: To: Linda Bourque <lbouque@ucla.edu>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <6.0.2.0.2.20050509130929.037dfa40@mail.ucla.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

I think he means bad questionnaires rather than bad research designs.
Rethinking about it, I should have worded the request better. I also
don't want to cause any controversy by pointing out "bad" outfits.

But if you have a pet peeve which might be useful for training purposes,
please send it (it does not need to mention what corporation/institute
fielded it).

Thank you,

On Mon, 9 May 2005, Linda Bourque wrote:

> Do you mean bad surveys or bad questionnaires?
>
> At 12:35 PM 5/9/05, Paolo Gardinali wrote:
>> Matt Mutchler, a former graduate student in the Sociology Department here
>> at UCSB is looking for "bad examples" of survey research to use for
>> training. Here is his request:
>>
>> ---Begin included text
>>
>> yes, you read correctly...I am in search of really badly constructed
>> surveys, preferably from well recognized government or corporate
>> entities.
>>
>>
>> As some of you know, I run a research and evaluation department at AIDS
>> project Los Angeles. We have a contract from the county to train other
>> community-based organizations to develop surveys; we'd like to show them
>> some bad examples to boost their confidence and compare to good examples.
>> Should you have any, I would greatly appreciate the opportunities to have
>> or make a copy. I am teaching on campus this quarter on Mondays, and have
>> a box in the soc. dept.
>>
>> THANKS, a million. It will be very helpful.
>>

>>Matt Mutchler
>>
>>
>>---End included text
>>
>>If you have anything in mind, you can mail me offlist and I can forward
>>them to Matt. Thank you in advance!
>>
>>
>>--
>>Paolo A. Gardinali, Ph.D.
>>Associate Director
>>UCSB Social Science Survey Center
>><http://www.survey.ucsb.edu>
>>
>>-----
>>Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
>>Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
>>Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
>
>
>

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

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

Date: Mon, 9 May 2005 16:50:24 -0400
Reply-To: "Erin St.Onge" <estonge@BENDIXENANDASSOCIATES.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Erin St.Onge" <estonge@BENDIXENANDASSOCIATES.COM>
Subject: Haitian polling firm?
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Does anyone happen to know of any decent survey research companies or universities with polling centers in Haiti? A second choice would be a company/university in the U.S. that has done surveys in Haiti. Any help would be much appreciated - feel free to reply to the list or offline.

Thanks in advance!

Erin St.Onge

Erin C. St.Onge

Research Director

Bendixen & Associates

2800 Ponce de Leon Blvd., Suite 1111

Coral Gables, FL 33134

Office: 305-529-9916

Fax: 305-529-9069

estonge@bendixenandassociates.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
=====

Date: Mon, 9 May 2005 14:18:17 -0700
Reply-To: egodard@csun.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ellis Godard <ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU>
Subject: Re: Bad surveys needed ...
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Coalating these into a web location would make a useful resource, at least for those already publicly disseminated or available. I would be happy to host and index any examples appropriate for such a project.

-eg

> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Paolo Gardinali
> Sent: Monday, May 09, 2005 12:35 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Bad surveys needed ...
>
>
> Matt Mutchler, a former graduate student in the Sociology
> Department here at UCSB is looking for "bad examples" of
> survey research to use for training. Here is his request:
>
> ---Begin included text
>
> yes, you read correctly...I am in search of really badly
> constructed surveys, preferably from well recognized
> government or corporate entities.
>
>
> As some of you know, I run a research and evaluation
> department at AIDS project Los Angeles. We have a contract
> from the county to train other community-based organizations
> to develop surveys; we'd like to show them some bad examples
> to boost their confidence and compare to good examples.
> Should you have any, I would greatly appreciate the
> opportunities to have or make a copy. I am teaching on
> campus this quarter on Mondays, and have a box in the soc. dept.
>
> THANKS, a million. It will be very helpful.
>
> Matt Mutchler
>
>
> ---End included text
>
> If you have anything in mind, you can mail me offlist and I
> can forward them to Matt. Thank you in advance!
>
>
> --
> Paolo A. Gardinali, Ph.D.
> Associate Director
> UCSB Social Science Survey Center
> <http://www.survey.ucsb.edu>
>
> -----
> Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
> 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: Tue, 10 May 2005 10:18:44 -0400

Reply-To: "Trussell, Norman" <Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Trussell, Norman" <Norman.Trussell@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>
Subject: 2005 AAPOR Golf Outing Confirmation email was sent
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Note to Golfers:

An informational email with pairings and logistical information for the AAPOR golf outing has been emailed to all participants. Please let me know immediately if you thought you were signed up but did not receive that email.

Looking forward to seeing many of you in Miami Beach.

Norm Trussell
AAPOR Golf Organizer
Cell: 727-215-5742
Email: norman.trussell@nielsenmedia.com
<mailto:norman.trussell@nielsenmedia.com> =20

Please disregard if not interested.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Tue, 10 May 2005 10:32:17 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: BBC- How did the opinion polls fare in this general election?
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Did the opinion polls get it right?

ANALYSIS
By David Cowling
Editor, BBC Political Research

How did the opinion polls fare in this general election?

Generally remarkably accurately, is the honest answer, especially compared to some of the concerns that have been expressed at previous elections.

The traditional test for the pollsters is their last published poll before

election day.

Overall five of the six polls tracked by the BBC gave an accurate result within their margin of error.

SNIP

Full article at:

http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/vote_2005/frontpage/4528655.stm

--

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, 10 May 2005 08:22:01 -0700
Reply-To: David Weakliem <weakliem@UCONN.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: David Weakliem <weakliem@UCONN.EDU>
Subject: Project to find and preserve data
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Last fall AAPORNET carried an announcement of a joint project to locate and preserve social science data. The data from many=97perhaps most=97=

studies of public opinion and other topics in the social sciences have never been archived, and therefore are in danger of being lost. Much of the information still exists scattered in offices of individual researchers and institutions, and we want to save this vital heritage of information about American society while there is still a chance. The project, which we are calling DATA-PASS, is a three-year effort involving the Library of Congress, the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research at the University of Michigan, the Roper Center at the University of Connecticut, the Odum Institute at the University of North Carolina, the National Archives and Records Administration, the Murray Institute at Harvard, and the Harvard-MIT Data Center.

One of the first steps in the project is to identify as many surviving datasets as possible. Many members of AAPOR may have data, or leads on how to find data, so we are asking you for help in this effort. Representatives of the Roper Center will be at the upcoming AAPOR meeting, and we will be happy to talk to you about the project. Or you may contact Myron Gutmann at ICPSR (e-mail: Gutmann@icpsr.umich.edu). We are open to a wide range of data, including state and local surveys and records from qualitative studies, so if you are in doubt, please ask.

David Weakliem
Interim Director, Roper Center for Public Opinion Research
Univ. of Connecticut

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Tue, 10 May 2005 16:22:54 -0400
Reply-To: Scott Keeter <skeeter@PEWRESEARCH.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Scott Keeter <skeeter@PEWRESEARCH.ORG>
Subject: new Pew typology study
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Today the Pew Research Center released its fourth political typology = study. The report entitled "The 2005 Political Typology: Beyond Red vs. = Blue" finds significant cleavages within both major parties that go well = beyond the familiar red-blue divide. It identifies challenges for both = parties with their core constituencies and with voters in the middle of = the electorate.

=20

AAPORites may be particularly interested in our new interactive website = where users can find out where they fit in the Political Typology, and = see how the various typology groups feel about major issues of the day. = The special website can be found at <http://typology.people-press.org> = <<http://typology.people-press.org>> .

=20

I hope that this message will be of sufficient general interest that you = will pardon the marketing effort.

=20

Scott Keeter
Pew Research Center for the People and the Press
1615 L St., NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
Voice 202 419 4362
Personal fax 206 600 5448
E-mail skeeter@pewresearch.org
Web site <http://pollcats.net>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Tue, 10 May 2005 15:08:35 -0500
Reply-To: hgordon@grfiltd.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Howard Gordon <hgordon@GRFILTD.COM>
Subject: FW: BBC- How did the opinion polls fare in this general election?
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

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

From: Leo Simonetta [mailto:simonetta@artsci.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2005 3:17 PM
To: hgordon@grfiltd.com
Subject: RE: BBC- How did the opinion polls fare in this general election?

Howard - that is the right address.

--

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

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

> From: Howard Gordon [mailto:hgordon@grfiltd.com]
> Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2005 3:55 PM
> To: Leo Simonetta
> Subject: RE: BBC- How did the opinion polls fare in this
> general election?

>
> Thanks, Leo. Do you know how I get this to everyone? Do I mail to:
> AAPORNET@asu.edu to cast the wide net?

>
> Howard

>

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

> From: Leo Simonetta [mailto:simonetta@artsci.com]
> Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2005 2:12 PM
> To: hgordon@grfiltd.com
> Subject: RE: BBC- How did the opinion polls fare in this
> general election?

>

>

> Howard

>

> I am not sure but it appears that your response went only to me.

>

>

> --

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

>
>

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

>> From: Howard Gordon [mailto:hgordon@grfiltd.com]
>> Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2005 1:38 PM
>> To: Leo Simonetta
>> Subject: RE: BBC- How did the opinion polls fare in this general
>> election?

>>
>> Leo, thanks, this is useful.

>>
>> But let me add a hitchhike question concerning the exit
> polling of the
>> general election in November 2004. The press ran many
> stories on why
>> people voted as they did. The various reasons resulted from two
>> different questionnaire designs.
>> The aided questionnaire (multichotomous) included a choice
> of reason
>> for voting called "moral values." As a result the press screamed
>> "moral values" was the main driver in the voting.
>>
>> The unaided (open-ended questions) questionnaire design produced a
>> different result. It showed the main drivers in the voting
> focused on
>> the war and the economy.

>>
>> Does anyone know where to retrieve the results of the two different
>> survey questionnaire methods?
>> This is a good example of the open-ended and closed question issue.

>>
>> Will appreciate your help.

>>
>> Howard Gordon
>> GRFI Ltd.
>> Chicago
>> 312-856-1444
>> FX 312-856-0025
>> hgordon@grfiltd.com

>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>

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

>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu]On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
>> Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2005 9:32 AM

>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>> Subject: BBC- How did the opinion polls fare in this
> general election?
>>
>>
>> Did the opinion polls get it right?
>>
>> ANALYSIS
>> By David Cowling
>> Editor, BBC Political Research
>>
>> How did the opinion polls fare in this general election?
>>
>> Generally remarkably accurately, is the honest answer, especially
>> compared to some of the concerns that have been expressed
> at previous
>> elections.
>>
>> The traditional test for the pollsters is their last published poll
>> before election day.
>>
>> Overall five of the six polls tracked by the BBC gave an accurate
>> result within their margin of error.
>>
>> SNIP
>>
>> Full article at:
>>
>>
> http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/vote_2005/frontpage/4528655.stm
>>
>> --
>> 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, 10 May 2005 17:38:46 -0400
Reply-To: Steven Kull <skull@HIS.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Steven Kull <skull@HIS.COM>
Subject: Re: new Pew typology study
Comments: To: Scott Keeter <skeeter@PEWRESEARCH.ORG>, AAPORNET@asu.edu

In-Reply-To:

<080C2A53CBC1444A9CD47BFB9830FA642838E6@exchange.pew.pewtrusts.org>

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Bouncing off of Scott's last comment (reflecting concern that his posting might appear as marketing) I thought I would take the opportunity to raise the question of how people feel about AAPORnetters putting information about new public opinion studies on AAPORnet. Most of the discussion tends to focus on methodological issues. I, for one, am interested in public opinion content as well and would like to see more of such material. AAPORites have sometimes suggested that I should post it on AAPORnet when PIPA does an interesting new study. But I have not been sure if there is some assumed norm on the issue. What do others think?

Steven Kull

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

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

Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2005 4:23 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: new Pew typology study

Today the Pew Research Center released its fourth political typology study. The report entitled "The 2005 Political Typology: Beyond Red vs. Blue" finds significant cleavages within both major parties that go well beyond the familiar red-blue divide. It identifies challenges for both parties with their core constituencies and with voters in the middle of the electorate.

AAPORites may be particularly interested in our new interactive website where users can find out where they fit in the Political Typology, and see how the various typology groups feel about major issues of the day. The special website can be found at <http://typology.people-press.org>
<<http://typology.people-press.org>> .

I hope that this message will be of sufficient general interest that you will pardon the marketing effort.

Scott Keeter

Pew Research Center for the People and the Press

1615 L St., NW, Suite 700

Washington, DC 20036

Voice 202 419 4362

Personal fax 206 600 5448

E-mail skeeter@pewresearch.org

Web site <http://pollcats.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: Tue, 10 May 2005 17:49:56 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Re: new Pew typology study
Comments: To: Steven Kull <skull@HIS.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <200505102138.j4ALcexg028401@mail.his.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

As I am sure everyone could have guessed I am all for the posting of public opinion studies of broad interest to AAPORnet.

I have been known to do it myself.

And I think the way Scott did it is excellent - a couple of sentences describing the study and/or its finding and a link to more information.

--

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 Steven Kull

> Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2005 5:39 PM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Re: new Pew typology study

>

> Bouncing off of Scott's last comment (reflecting concern that
> his posting might appear as marketing) I thought I would take
> the opportunity to raise the question of how people feel
> about AAPORnetters putting information about new public
> opinion studies on AAPORnet. Most of the discussion tends to
> focus on methodological issues. I, for one, am interested in
> public opinion content as well and would like to see more of
> such material. AAPORites have sometimes suggested that I
> should post it on AAPORnet when PIPA does an interesting new
> study. But I have not been sure if there is some assumed
> norm on the issue. What do others think?

>

> Steven Kull

>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Scott Keeter
> Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2005 4:23 PM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: new Pew typology study

>
> Today the Pew Research Center released its fourth political
> typology study.
> The report entitled "The 2005 Political Typology: Beyond Red
> vs. Blue" finds significant cleavages within both major
> parties that go well beyond the familiar red-blue divide. It
> identifies challenges for both parties with their core
> constituencies and with voters in the middle of the electorate.

>
>
> AAPORites may be particularly interested in our new
> interactive website where users can find out where they fit
> in the Political Typology, and see how the various typology
> groups feel about major issues of the day. The special
> website can be found at <http://typology.people-press.org>
> <<http://typology.people-press.org/>> .

>
>
> I hope that this message will be of sufficient general
> interest that you will pardon the marketing effort.

>
>
> Scott Keeter
> Pew Research Center for the People and the Press
> 1615 L St., NW, Suite 700
> Washington, DC 20036
> Voice 202 419 4362
> Personal fax 206 600 5448
> E-mail skeeter@pewresearch.org
> Web site <http://pollcats.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: Tue, 10 May 2005 17:00:59 -0500

Reply-To: "Norval D. Glenn" <ndglenn@MAIL.LA.UTEXAS.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Norval D. Glenn" <ndglenn@MAIL.LA.UTEXAS.EDU>
Subject: Re: new Pew typology study
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <0IGA00ND8N8Y0Q@chimmx05.algx.net>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Getting this kind of information is one of the main reasons I subscribe to the list.

Norval Glenn

On Tue, 10 May 2005, Leo Simonetta wrote:

> As I am sure everyone could have guessed I am all for the posting of public
> opinion studies of broad interest to AAPORnet.
>
> I have been known to do it myself.
>
> And I think the way Scott did it is excellent - a couple of sentences
> describing the study and/or its finding and a link to more information.

>
> --
> 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 Steven Kull
>> Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2005 5:39 PM
>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>> Subject: Re: new Pew typology study

>>> Bouncing off of Scott's last comment (reflecting concern that
>>> his posting might appear as marketing) I thought I would take
>>> the opportunity to raise the question of how people feel
>>> about AAPORnetters putting information about new public
>>> opinion studies on AAPORnet. Most of the discussion tends to
>>> focus on methodological issues. I, for one, am interested in
>>> public opinion content as well and would like to see more of
>>> such material. AAPORites have sometimes suggested that I
>>> should post it on AAPORnet when PIPA does an interesting new
>>> study. But I have not been sure if there is some assumed
>>> norm on the issue. What do others think?

>>> Steven Kull

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

>> From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Scott Keeter
>> Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2005 4:23 PM
>> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>> Subject: new Pew typology study

>> Today the Pew Research Center released its fourth political
>> typology study.
>> The report entitled "The 2005 Political Typology: Beyond Red
>> vs. Blue" finds significant cleavages within both major
>> parties that go well beyond the familiar red-blue divide. It
>> identifies challenges for both parties with their core
>> constituencies and with voters in the middle of the electorate.

>> AAPORites may be particularly interested in our new
>> interactive website where users can find out where they fit
>> in the Political Typology, and see how the various typology
>> groups feel about major issues of the day. The special
>> website can be found at <http://typology.people-press.org>
>> <<http://typology.people-press.org/>> .

>> I hope that this message will be of sufficient general
>> interest that you will pardon the marketing effort.

>> Scott Keeter
>> Pew Research Center for the People and the Press
>> 1615 L St., NW, Suite 700
>> Washington, DC 20036
>> Voice 202 419 4362
>> Personal fax 206 600 5448
>> E-mail skeeter@pewresearch.org
>> Web site <http://pollcats.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.

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Tue, 10 May 2005 17:40:04 -0500
Reply-To: "Wolf, James G" <jamwolf@IUPUI.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Wolf, James G" <jamwolf@IUPUI.EDU>
Subject: Re: new Pew typology study
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I sent Scott a note off list about this. I feel there is no need for a member to apologize to the group for posting research of interest to many, particularly when it is a link that readers can choose to follow or not.

This adds tremendous value to AAPORNet.

Of course, there are the two or three cranky-pants members who will flame these attempts to share knowledge as "marketing under the guise of legitimate intellectual networking and generosity" (MUGLING) or some such nonsense... but nobody listens to those guys anyway!

See ya'll in Miami,

Jim

=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D-=3D=

Jim Wolf jamwolf@iupui.edu
Director, Indiana University Public Opinion Laboratory
(317) 278-9230

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@ASU.EDU] On Behalf Of Steven Kull
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2005 4:39 PM
To: AAPORNET@ASU.EDU
Subject: Re: new Pew typology study

Bouncing off of Scott's last comment (reflecting concern that his posting might appear as marketing) I thought I would take the opportunity to raise the question of how people feel about AAPORnetters putting information about new public opinion studies on AAPORnet. Most of the discussion tends to focus on methodological issues. I, for one, am interested in public opinion content as well and would like to see more of such material. AAPORites have sometimes suggested that I should post it on AAPORnet when PIPA does an interesting new study. But I have not been sure if there is some assumed

norm on the issue. What do others think?

Steven Kull

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Scott Keeter
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2005 4:23 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: new Pew typology study

Today the Pew Research Center released its fourth political typology study.

The report entitled "The 2005 Political Typology: Beyond Red vs. Blue" finds significant cleavages within both major parties that go well beyond the familiar red-blue divide. It identifies challenges for both parties with their core constituencies and with voters in the middle of the electorate.

AAPORites may be particularly interested in our new interactive website where users can find out where they fit in the Political Typology, and see how the various typology groups feel about major issues of the day. The special website can be found at <http://typology.people-press.org> <<http://typology.people-press.org>> .

I hope that this message will be of sufficient general interest that you will pardon the marketing effort.

Scott Keeter
Pew Research Center for the People and the Press
1615 L St., NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
Voice 202 419 4362
Personal fax 206 600 5448
E-mail skeeter@pewresearch.org
Web site <http://pollcats.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: Tue, 10 May 2005 16:03:09 -0700
Reply-To: Doug Strand <dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doug Strand <dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU>
Subject: interest in Miami chat on state polls network?
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu

Hi folks,

If anyone connected with a state poll is interested in gathering over a drink at AAPOR in Miami, to explore the possibilities for reviving or renovating the National Network of State Polls (NNSP), I'd be most enthusiastic to try to coordinate something.

Please respond to me at my Public Policy Institute of California email -- strand@ppic.org -- and I will try to gather a list of people to email. Also tell me good times when you could do it, and I'll see if we can find a good time in common.

Or I can be called at the cell phone number below while I'm in Miami. I will be there by tomorrow evening.

Regardless of your level of interest in this organizing issue, I look forward to seeing you all in Miami Beach!

Cheers,
Doug Strand

Douglas Strand, Ph.D.
Associate Survey Director
Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC)
500 Washington Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94111
Cell: 415-586-4198
Office: 415-291-4437

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Tue, 10 May 2005 17:30:18 -0700
Reply-To: Doug Strand <dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Doug Strand <dstrand@CSM.BERKELEY.EDU>
Subject: seeking recommendations of evaluator for website usage/development
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu

Hi all,

Please respond to me off list if you have any recommendation of any organization or company that would provide evaluation services to people considering the development of a new state-government related web portal. These services might include focus groups and/or surveys of potential users.

Thanks,
Doug Strand

Douglas Strand, Ph.D.

Associate Survey Director

Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC)

Rm 614

415-291-4437

strand@ppic.org

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====

Date: Wed, 11 May 2005 09:50:21 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: If accurate more than just a bad poll
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

I posted something on this before but the reference to rationing TV was enough to prompt me to post again.

BellSouth says it took part in survey

Claire Taylor
ctaylor@theadvertiser.com

BellSouth is a co- sponsor with Cox Communications of a controversial telephone survey centered on a proposed Lafayette fiber project.

SNIP

Lafayette Utilities System is hoping to expand its telecommunications business, competing against Cox and BellSouth for cable TV, telephone and Internet customers. Both companies offer the services LUS plans to provide. LUS says it can offer more Internet bandwidth and the services at a lower price.

SNIP

Pollsters with Market Research Insight of Pensacola, Fla., launched the telephone survey Monday.

SNIP

Residents who received the calls reported the questions were slanted in favor of BellSouth and Cox and against LUS. The pollsters reportedly said things such as the separation of church and state may mean LUS cannot offer religious TV channels, or because LUS rations lawn watering during the summer, it might also offer Internet or TV only on certain days.

<http://www.theadvertiser.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20050506/SPECIALSECTION03/505060348/1054>

--

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, 11 May 2005 09:55:36 -0400
Reply-To: Thomas Duffy <thomas.p.duffy.jr@ORCMACRO.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Thomas Duffy <thomas.p.duffy.jr@ORCMACRO.COM>
Subject: Job opportunity
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

POSITION DESCRIPTION =E2=80=93 OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION

Title: Survey Methodologist

Reports to: Vice President, Technical Services

Location: Princeton, NJ _____

Responsibilities:

=E2=80=A2=09Responsible for survey design methodology with focus on internet research=20

=E2=80=A2=09Work with research staff and ORC clients on methodological issues associated with internet research projects

=E2=80=A2=09Present research findings at conferences showcasing ORC work with internet research methods

=E2=80=A2=09Work with statistical staff on advancement of statistical methods for the design of survey sample and interpretation of online survey results

=E2=80=A2=09Conduct experimental work with surveys with focus on determining and improving reliability and validity of measurement.=20

=E2=80=A2=09Report on what current methodological research is telling us about the impacts of design features on survey data.

=E2=80=A2=09Train company research staff on best practices

=E2=80=A2=09Work with technical staff to ensure proper implementation of survey design
=09

Experience:

=E2=80=A2=093-5 years some experience working with internet survey research projects

=E2=80=A2=09Experience with commercial and social and policy research is beneficial

=E2=80=A2=09Masters degree or higher
=09

If interested please contact:

Todd Myers
(609) 452-5220
todd.myers@opinionresearch.com

At the AAPOR conference, please stop by the booth of our subsidiary, ORC Macro.

Tom Duffy
ORC Macro
116 John Street, Suite 800
New York, NY 10038
(212) 941-5555
(212) 941-7031 fax
Thomas.P.Duffy.Jr@orcmacro.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Wed, 11 May 2005 09:14:41 -0700

Reply-To: Election Science Institute <forum@VOTEWATCH.US>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Election Science Institute <forum@VOTEWATCH.US>
Subject: ESI briefing paper: Election Transparency in 2004

The Election Science Institute invites list members to preview our briefing
"Election Transparency: How Ready Are States and Counties?"

We conducted this study because we believe that usable voting data, provided in a timely manner, could facilitate statistical analysis to detect anomalies or explain apparent anomalies, reduce pressure on election officials, and increase confidence among the electorate. But we conclude that difficulty in accessing usable voting data in a timely manner is widespread.

Download the briefing here:
http://www.electionscience.org/reports/view_reports

We attempted to collect voting data in eight of the nine states that held primaries on Super Tuesday 2004, and in 49 counties in Ohio in the general election. Of the eight Super Tuesday states studied, only California and Ohio publicly posted comprehensive results on election night and made complete results available before certification.

We also studied Ohio's procedures on for the general election in detail. We attempted to verify a wide range of critically important election procedures meant to safeguard the integrity of the election, but found that few counties were able to document their procedures in a way that allowed citizens and public institutions to help verify the integrity of the process.

The briefing closes with a set of recommendations for election officials to make these data available for analysis before certification.

Regards,

Steven Hertzberg
Project Director
Election Science Institute

By the way, we hope to see you at two AAPOR 2005 sessions at which we'll be presenting:

Outcomes and Lessons Learned from Polling Voters about the Voting Experience
Saturday 10:00 am-11:30 am

ESI will present a paper on the exit polling it conducted (under the name Votewatch) in the battleground state of New Mexico during the 2004 presidential election. The 962 respondents were randomly selected from Albuquerque-area voters via two-stage probability sampling and asked about their voting experiences. The method was unique in that it used trained survey professionals, including AAPOR members, to supervise citizen volunteers. We'll present the results of the poll along with our conclusions about the implications for US voting systems and how they might be

scientifically monitored in future elections.

2004 Exit Polls

Saturday 12:00 pm-2:15 pm - Lunch Plenary

Fritz Scheuren, Vice President for Statistics of NORC, will present the findings of a study commissioned by ESI. With Warren Mitofsky of Mitofsky International and Kathy Frankovic of CBS News.

Edison Media Research and Mitofsky International conducted exit polls in 2004 for the nation's news media. The analytic data were and still are widely reported by the news media and others, but controversy arose out of premature interpretation on election day of the early results by some news organizations, and leaked results reported on the Internet in the early afternoon. The reports led many to assume John Kerry was headed for victory, and led to accusations of election fraud by some academics, particularly for Ohio and Florida. Mitofsky, Frankovic and Scheuren discuss where the data lead.

The Election Science Institute is an independent, non-partisan, election science organization founded under the name Votewatch in 2002 to monitor and improve elections nationwide. See <http://www.electionscience.org> for further information.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Wed, 11 May 2005 12:51:23 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Filibuster polls bias empty heads
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Not (IMNSHO) Vox worthy but . . .

Filibuster polls bias empty heads
<http://www.thehill.com/thehill/export/TheHill/Comment/Pollsters/DavidHill/051105.html>

Reading the latest public polling on filibusters convinces me that media polling is becoming something like blogging, only without the wit and delightful cynicism.

Public polls and political blogs both purport to be about facts and information, but they're mainly editorials. I was reminded of these thoughts this week when reading Dr. Frank Newport's dismal treatise "Public Favors Keeping Filibuster Rule in U.S. Senate: Majority of Americans not Following Issue Closely, However."

Newport is the editor of the Gallup Poll. Perhaps smarting from persistent and informed criticism of recent filibuster polls by the Media Research Center, Newport rises not only to defend his own organization's polls for USA Today and CNN but also to be an apologist for polls by several other media consortia.

The only point that Newport makes convincingly is that Americans consistently oppose changing the filibuster as described by pollsters. The problem with his analysis is that the pollsters' descriptions are hopelessly inadequate and often biased in favor of the filibuster. By inadequate, I mean that polls try to explain "filibusters" in 50 words or fewer to people who are generally uninformed and disinterested.

Ask any political-science professor if he's ever been able satisfactorily to explain the filibuster to a class of daydreaming college freshmen in 50 words or fewer. Even with the specter of a grade hanging over their heads, most students won't get it the first time. Imagine how attentive a Gallup Poll respondent must be if he's a 30-something guy watching ESPN while taking the poll, or a mother cooking dinner with a kid on her hip, or a senior citizen straining even to hear the description.

These policy polls all face the same problem. Only a handful of Americans are truly interested in issues. Public polls are fine for election trial heats such as Bush versus Kerry. Voters get that. But policy polls reveal empty heads.

SNIP

Hill is director of Hill Research Consultants, a Texas-based firm that has polled for GOP candidates and causes since 1988.

--

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, 11 May 2005 12:12:48 -0500
Reply-To: "Newport, Frank" <Frank_Newport@GALLUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Newport, Frank" <Frank_Newport@GALLUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Filibuster polls bias empty heads
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Dear AAPOR members:

Since Leo Simonetta has posted a snippet of the tendentious column by David Hill (a GOP pollster) about filibuster polling and my recent article on the issue, I think it's important to post for AAPOR members who are interested the entire text of the article as published on Gallup.com. It's pasted in below. =20

This will allow AAPOR members to read through the entire article.

In fact, I wrote the piece specifically to caution readers and users of polls about the impact of question wording on this issue. I say:=20

"Summarizing American public opinion on a complex issue like the Senate's filibuster rule must be undertaken with caution. As noted in the section above, it has not attracted a great deal of attention among Americans. Thus, it is a fair assumption that relatively few Americans are wholly conversant with the specific details of the filibuster issue. This in turn means that most pollsters attempt to explain the filibuster rule to survey respondents before asking their opinions, creating a situation in which response patterns may vary, depending on the exact question wording of the survey. "

I then go on to present the exact question wording of questions asked about the filibuster by Gallup, ABC/Washington Post, NBC/WSJ, and Newsweek.

This allows readers to examine the precise wording themselves and thus put the responses in appropriate context.=20

Furthermore, in this situation I spend a good deal of time looking at the level of attention being paid to the issue to highlight the fact that it is not one with which most Americans are wholly conversant.=20

Beyond that, I break out the responses of those following the issue closely from those not following the issue closely to allow the reader to see the opinions of the "informed" public as compared to those who are not informed.=20

I'm not sure what more could be said to provide guidance and context for understanding of public opinion on this issue, which -- as noted -- was the main purpose of the piece.

Sincerely,

Frank Newport
Gallup Poll

Public Favors Keeping Filibuster Rule in U.S. Senate

Majority of Americans not following issue closely, however

by Frank Newport =20

Page: 1, 2 Next=20

GALLUP NEWS SERVICE

PRINCETON, NJ -- As the U.S. Senate returns Monday from a week of recess, it faces a wide range of challenges, but perhaps none so visible as wrangling over the Senate filibuster rule. Democrats have used the filibuster to hold up votes on selected Bush judicial nominees, and Republicans have responded by threatening to vote to change the filibuster rule. This would mean a simple majority vote (rather than the current 60 votes) would end floor debate on a nominee, clearing the way for an up-or-down vote to confirm or reject the nominee. The debate has extended for weeks, with intense lobbying from all sides involved. The issue has taken on greater significance in light of the high probability that the Senate will be voting to confirm at least one presidential nominee for the U.S. Supreme Court within the next several years.=20

A review of recent public opinion data on this issue suggests four conclusions:

The filibuster debate per se has not attracted the attention of the majority of the American public. It is not a high-salience issue to rank-and-file Americans.=20

When the filibuster situation is explained to Americans, the majority appear to favor keeping the rule in place. A plurality also favors the Democratic approach over the Republican approach to the issue.=20 Americans following the filibuster situation closely are more likely to favor keeping it in place than are those who are not following it as closely. Republicans and those who attend church most frequently are more likely to oppose the filibuster rule than are independents, Democrats, and those who do not attend church as frequently.=20

One unanticipated consequence of the rancorous debate appears to be a general diminution of Congress' status, as well as that of both parties in Congress, in the eyes of the American public.

Filibuster Debate Not Being Closely Followed

Thirty-five percent of Americans say they are following news about the filibuster situation either very or somewhat closely.

How closely have you been following the news about the use of the filibuster on judicial nominations in the U.S. Senate -- very closely, somewhat closely, not too closely, or not at all?

=20

Very
closely

Somewhat
closely

Not too=20

closely
Not
at all
No=20
opinion
=20
2005 Apr 29-May 1
12%
23
28
37
*
=20
* Less than 0.5%
=20

This is a relatively low level of attention. Gallup has asked this "closely following" question about 148 news stories over the past decade and a half. The average percentage following these stories very or somewhat closely is 60%, slightly less than twice the level measured for the filibuster story.=20

To help put the filibuster issue into some context, here is a list of the 11 news stories that have attracted the most attention of those Gallup has measured.=20

Poll dates
Percentage who
are following story
"very closely"
or "somewhat closely"
=20
2001 Sep 14-15
Terrorist attacks on New York City and Washington, D.C.
97
=20
2003 Mar 22-23
War between U.S. and Iraq
95
=20
2002 Oct 21-22
The sniper shootings in the Washington, D.C., area
91
=20
2005 Jan 3-5
The tsunami that struck parts of Asia
89
=20
2003 Jan 3-5
The situation with Iraq
89
=20
2003 Jan 23-25
U.N. inspections for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq

88
=20
2000 Nov 11-12
Situation surrounding Tuesday's presidential election

87
=20

1997 Sep 6-7
Death of Princess Diana

85
=20

1991 Feb 24
Beginning of ground war in Iraq

84
=20

1999 Apr 13-14
Situation in Kosovo

84
=20

1998 Aug 21-23
Clinton-Lewinsky matter

83
=20

On the other hand, here are the stories that have attracted the least attention:

Poll dates
Percentage who
are following story
"very closely"
or "somewhat closely"

=20

2001 Jun 28-Jul 1
A patient's bill of rights

36
=20

1999 Mar 19-21
Situation in Kosovo

36
=20

2005 Apr 29-May 1
Filibuster in the Senate

35
=20

1992 Dec 18-20
Clinton economic conference in Little Rock

35
=20

2003 May 19-21
New York Times reporter Jayson Blair (falsified stories)

34
=20

1998 Jun 5-7
Clinton race initiative

34

=20

2003 Aug 25-26

Candidates for the Democratic nomination in 2004

34

=20

2005 Apr 18-21

Michael Jackson child molestation trial

33

=20

1999 Feb 19-21

Situation in Kosovo

30

=20

1999 Feb 8-9

Situation in Kosovo

30

=20

2000 May 5-7

China and the World Trade Organization

29

=20

1994 Feb 1-3

Vote in Japan for political reforms

22

=20

2000 Aug 11-12

CBS show "Survivor"

17

=20

Note that the filibuster issue is tied for 10th from the bottom on the "least attention" list, underscoring the finding that as a news story, it has not galvanized the attention of the average American -- at least not yet. (Of some solace to those who would argue for the importance of the filibuster issue is the fact that it has attracted slightly more attention than the highly publicized child molestation trial of pop star Michael Jackson.)=20

Recent news reports have focused on the intense lobbying to remove the filibuster rule by Republicans and leaders of the religious right. Americans who identify with the Republican Party and those who attend church frequently, however, are neither more nor less likely to be following the issue closely than are independents, Democrats, and those who seldom or never attend church.=20

Majority Favors Keeping Filibuster Rule in Place

Summarizing American public opinion on a complex issue like the Senate's filibuster rule must be undertaken with caution. As noted in the section above, it has not attracted a great deal of attention among Americans. Thus, it is a fair assumption that relatively few Americans are wholly conversant with the specific details of the filibuster issue. This in turn means that most pollsters attempt to explain the filibuster rule to

survey respondents before asking their opinions, creating a situation in which response patterns may vary, depending on the exact question wording of the survey.=20

Still, a review of the responses to several recent questions that independent survey organizations have asked about the filibuster rule suggests that a majority of the public has no evident desire to change the rule. Regardless of question format, a majority of respondents favor keeping the filibuster rule in place.

The April 29-May 1 CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll asked about the filibuster situation as follows:

As you may know, the filibuster is a Senate procedure which has been used to prevent the Senate from passing controversial legislation or confirming controversial appointments by the president, even if a majority of senators support that action. A vote of at least 60 senators out of 100 is needed to end a filibuster. Do you favor or oppose the use of the filibuster in the U.S. Senate?

=20
Favor
Oppose
No opinion

=20
2005 Apr 29-May 1
52%
40
8
=20

In the current controversy over the filibuster, whose side do you generally favor -- [ROTATED: the Republicans in the Senate (or) the Democrats in the Senate]?

=20
=20
Republicans
=20
Democrats
BOTH=20

(vol.)
NEITHER
(vol.)
No=20
opinion

=20
2005 Apr 29-May 1
36%
45
*
8
11
=20

* Less than 0.5%

=20

(vol.) =3D Volunteered response

=20

In response to this question wording, a slight majority of Americans favor keeping the filibuster rule in place. Importantly, when asked to choose between the two parties' approaches to the controversy, Democrats win out over Republicans by about a 10-point margin.=20

Other polls have asked about the filibuster in other ways, but with similar results.

An April 21-24 ABC News/Washington Post poll used a two-part question to query respondents about filibusters:=20

The Senate has confirmed 35 federal appeals court judges nominated by Bush, while Senate Democrats have blocked 10 others. Do you think the Senate Democrats are right or wrong to block these nominations?

=20

Right

Wrong

BOTH

(vol.)

Unsure

=20

2005 Apr 21-24

48%

36

3

13

=20

(vol.) =3D Volunteered response

=20

Would you support or oppose changing Senate rules to make it easier for the Republicans to confirm Bush's judicial nominees?

=20

Support

Oppose

Unsure

=20

2005 Apr 21-24

26%

66

8

=20

This wording does not use the word "filibuster," and the second question is focused very specifically on one outcome of changing the Senate rules, rather than a broad question on the value of the filibuster rule more generally. As can be seen, in response to this specific question,

about two-thirds of Americans say they are opposed to this type of change.=20

An NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll conducted in late March and early April used a more complex question wording, as follows:

As you may know, in the last term of Congress some senators used a procedure called a filibuster when it came to some of President Bush's judicial nominees. When this happens, it takes the votes of 60 senators instead of 51 to end debate and hold a confirmation vote for a nominee. In your opinion, should the Senate maintain the filibuster rule or eliminate the filibuster for judicial nominations?

Maintain
Filibuster
Eliminate
Filibuster
Unsure

=20
%
%
%

2005 Mar 31-Apr 3

50
40
10
=20

2005 Jan 13-17

48
39
13
=20

The responses to this question about the filibuster rule are quite similar to those obtained in the recent CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll; about half favor keeping the rule, while about 40% would like to see it eliminated.=20

A March Newsweek poll used still more words to describe the filibuster situation to respondents before asking their opinions about changing the rule:

U.S. Senate rules allow 41 senators to mount a filibuster -- refusing to end debate and agree to vote -- to block judicial nominees. In the past, this tactic has been used by both Democrats and Republicans to prevent certain judicial nominees from being confirmed. Senate Republican leaders -- whose party is now in the majority -- want to take away this tactic by changing the rules to require only 51 votes, instead of 60, to break a filibuster. Would you approve or disapprove of changing Senate rules to take away the filibuster and allow all of George W. Bush's judicial nominees to get voted on by the Senate?

=20

Approve
Disapprove
Unsure

=20
2005 Mar 17-18
32%
57
11
=20

By almost a 2-to-1 margin, respondents in this context say they would disapprove of changing the rules to eliminate the filibuster -- at least in situations involving President Bush's judicial nominees.=20

Although the wording (and time frame) differs across these various surveys' measures of the filibuster situation, the results are similar: Americans oppose changing the rules to get rid of filibusters, no matter how the question is put to them. It also appears that Americans are somewhat more opposed to changing the rules when questions emphasize the specifics of the current situation involving Bush's judicial appointments than when the questions are phrased to focus more broadly on the filibuster rule per se.

Americans who are following the filibuster situation most closely are most in favor of keeping the rule in place.

Attitude Toward Filibuster Rule=20
by How Closely Following Filibuster News

=20
Favor
Oppose
Don't know/
Refused

=20
Following news of filibuster
%
%
%

=20
Very closely
62
37
1

=20
Somewhat closely
59
37
4

=20
Not too closely/not closely at all
48
41

11
=20

At the same time, as would be expected given the political battle lines being drawn around the issue in the current environment, support for the filibuster is lowest among Republicans and those who most frequently attend church.

Attitude Toward Filibuster Rule=20
by Partisanship and Church Attendance

=20
=20
Favor
Oppose
Don't know/
Refused

=20
%
%
%

=20
Republicans
43
50
7

=20
Independents
52
39
9

=20
Democrats
62
31
7

=20
Attend church weekly
43
47
10

=20
Attend church nearly weekly/monthly
58
38
4

=20
Attend church seldom/never
56
36
8

=20

Congress Sinks in Public's Esteem

Gallup's latest polling suggests that Americans have become increasingly negative about the job Congress is doing, and that the public's displeasure is being heaped roughly equally on both sides of the aisle. There may be a wide variety of causes for this downward drift in approval for the nation's representative bodies. It is impossible to determine the precise impact of the seemingly incessant wrangling over what many Americans may see as arcane Senate rules on the decline in the image of Congress, but it is not unreasonable to assume that the two are somewhat related.=20

Most tellingly, a new May 2-5 Gallup Poll shows that only 35% of Americans now approve of the job Congress is doing. This is down several points from April and March, and is the lowest congressional approval rating Gallup has measured in about eight years.=20

In addition, the April 29-May 1 CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll shows that ratings of the Republicans in Congress have fallen to 42% (lowest since April 2000) and ratings of the Democrats in Congress are at 40% (the lowest of any of the 13 times this question has been asked since June 1999).=20

Do you approve or disapprove of the way [ROTATED] are handling their job?

A. The Republicans in Congress

=20

Approve

Disapprove

No opinion

=20

%

%

%

=20

2005 Apr 29-May 1

42

50

8

=20

=20

=20

=20

=20

2003 Nov 14-16

48

49

3

=20

2003 Oct 10-12

51

44

5
=20
2002 Apr 5-7
59
30
11
=20
2001 Aug 3-5
49
40
11
=20
2001 Jun 8-10
49
43
8
=20
2000 Aug 18-19
45
44
11
=20
2000 Jul 25-26
46
39
15
=20
2000 Apr 28-30
42
46
12
=20
1999 Nov 4-7
38
53
9
=20
1999 Oct 8-10
37
55
8
=20
1999 Aug 16-18
36
53
11
=20
1999 Jun 25-27
40
53
7
=20

B. The Democrats in Congress

=20
Approve
Disapprove
No opinion
=20
%
%
%
=20
2005 Apr 29-May 1
40
52
8
=20
=20
=20
=20
=20
2003 Nov 14-16
47
50
3
=20
2003 Oct 10-12
45
48
7
=20
2002 Apr 5-7
57
32
11
=20
2001 Aug 3-5
52
38
10
=20
2001 Jun 8-10
54
37
9
=20
2000 Aug 18-19
56
34
10
=20
2000 Jul 25-26
51
36
13
=20

2000 Apr 28-30

46

42

12

=20

1999 Nov 4-7

49

42

9

=20

1999 Oct 8-10

48

44

8

=20

1999 Aug 16-18

48

41

11

=20

1999 Jun 25-27

46

46

8

=20

Neither of the two Senate leaders -- Bill Frist (Republican) and Harry Reid (Democrat) -- are well-known to Americans. Those who do have an opinion of Frist are more positive than negative -- by an 11-point margin. Those with an opinion of Reid essentially break even.=20

Interestingly, Americans' views of Frist have become slightly more positive between Gallup's early April poll and the current poll.=20

Next, we'd like to get your overall opinion of some people in the news. As I read each name, please say if you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of these people -- or if you have never heard of them. First, ... How about ... ? [ITEMS A-C ROTATED, ITEM D READ LAST]

B. Senate Republican Leader Bill Frist

=20

Favorable

Unfavorable

Never heard of

No opinion

=20

%

%

%

%

=20

2005 Apr 29-May 1

32

21
31
16
=20
=20
=20
=20
=20
=20
2005 Apr 1-2

26
24
31
19
=20
2003 Jan 3-5
36
11
30
23
=20

C. Senate Democratic Leader, Harry Reid

=20
Favorable
Unfavorable
Never heard of
No opinion
=20
2005 Apr 29-May 1
21%
18
44
17
=20

=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2005 12:51 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Filibuster polls bias empty heads

Not (IMNSHO) Vox worthy but . . .

Filibuster polls bias empty heads
<http://www.thehill.com/thehill/export/TheHill/Comment/Pollsters/DavidHil1/051105.html>

Reading the latest public polling on filibusters convinces me that media polling is becoming something like blogging, only without the wit and

delightful cynicism.

Public polls and political blogs both purport to be about facts and information, but they're mainly editorials. I was reminded of these thoughts this week when reading Dr. Frank Newport's dismal treatise "Public Favors Keeping Filibuster Rule in U.S. Senate: Majority of Americans not Following Issue Closely, However."

Newport is the editor of the Gallup Poll. Perhaps smarting from persistent and informed criticism of recent filibuster polls by the Media Research Center, Newport rises not only to defend his own organization's polls for USA Today and CNN but also to be an apologist for polls by several other media consortia.

The only point that Newport makes convincingly is that Americans consistently oppose changing the filibuster as described by pollsters. The problem with his analysis is that the pollsters' descriptions are hopelessly inadequate and often biased in favor of the filibuster. By inadequate, I mean that polls try to explain "filibusters" in 50 words or fewer to people who are generally uninformed and disinterested.

Ask any political-science professor if he's ever been able satisfactorily to explain the filibuster to a class of daydreaming college freshmen in 50 words or fewer. Even with the specter of a grade hanging over their heads, most students won't get it the first time. Imagine how attentive a Gallup Poll respondent must be if he's a 30-something guy watching ESPN while taking the poll, or a mother cooking dinner with a kid on her hip, or a senior citizen straining even to hear the description.

These policy polls all face the same problem. Only a handful of Americans are truly interested in issues. Public polls are fine for election trial heats such as Bush versus Kerry. Voters get that. But policy polls reveal empty heads.

SNIP

Hill is director of Hill Research Consultants, a Texas-based firm that has polled for GOP candidates and causes since 1988.

--

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: Wed, 11 May 2005 14:56:35 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Re: Filibuster polls bias empty heads
Comments: To: "Newport, Frank" <Frank_Newport@GALLUP.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To:
<06C64DE644F85843A90884803225A80709BDE3A7@exchng12.noam.gallup.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

In case anyone was wondering, I posted the portion of the article and the link to it not because I agreed with Hill but because it is a pretty broad, partisan attack on polling in general (though he did seem to concentrate his vitriol on Frank Newport and Gallup).

I read the Gallup article and I agree with what Frank Newport says about it - the only reason I didn't post a link to it to AAPORnet or for consideration for inclusion in VoxBox was that Gallup's free links are typically only good for one day.

--

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 Newport, Frank
> Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2005 1:13 PM
> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
> Subject: Re: Filibuster polls bias empty heads

> Dear AAPOR members:

> Since Leo Simonetta has posted a snippet of the tendentious
> column by David Hill (a GOP pollster) about filibuster
> polling and my recent article on the issue, I think it's
> important to post for AAPOR members who are interested the
> entire text of the article as published on Gallup.com. It's
> pasted in below.

> This will allow AAPOR members to read through the entire article.

> In fact, I wrote the piece specifically to caution readers
> and users of polls about the impact of question wording on
> this issue. I say:

> "Summarizing American public opinion on a complex issue like

> the Senate's filibuster rule must be undertaken with caution.
> As noted in the section above, it has not attracted a great
> deal of attention among Americans. Thus, it is a fair
> assumption that relatively few Americans are wholly
> conversant with the specific details of the filibuster issue.
> This in turn means that most pollsters attempt to explain the
> filibuster rule to survey respondents before asking their
> opinions, creating a situation in which response patterns may
> vary, depending on the exact question wording of the survey. "
>
> I then go on to present the exact question wording of
> questions asked about the filibuster by Gallup.
> ABC/Washington Post, NBC/WSJ, and Newsweek.
>
> This allows readers to examine the precise wording themselves
> and thus put the responses in appropriate context.
>
> Furthermore, in this situation I spend a good deal of time
> looking at the level of attention being paid to the issue to
> highlight the fact that it is not one with which most
> Americans are wholly conversant.
>
> Beyond that, I break out the responses of those following the
> issue closely from those not following the issue closely to
> allow the reader to see the opinions of the "informed" public
> as compared to those who are not informed.
>
> I'm not sure what more could be said to provide guidance and
> context for understanding of public opinion on this issue,
> which -- as noted -- was the main purpose of the piece.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Frank Newport
> Gallup Poll
>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Wed, 11 May 2005 11:59:07 -0700
Reply-To: egodard@csun.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ellis Godard <ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU>
Subject: Re: Filibuster polls bias empty heads
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The inability of most citizens to grasp complex issues in a few short sentences is a condemnation of the citizenry (or perhaps a justification for *representative* democracy), not

polling.

I know you knew that, and so does Hill. But what are the implications - that we shouldn't care whether there's popular support for filibusters? That seems odd, coming from a polster for the party that's been ratching up popular opposition.

-eg

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

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

> Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2005 9:51 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Filibuster polls bias empty heads

>

>

> Not (IMNSHO) Vox worthy but . . .

>

> Filibuster polls bias empty heads

> <http://www.thehill.com/thehill/export/TheHill/Comment/Pollster>

> s/DavidHill/0

> 51105.html

>

> Reading the latest public polling on filibusters convinces me

> that media polling is becoming something like blogging, only

> without the wit and delightful cynicism.

>

> Public polls and political blogs both purport to be about

> facts and information, but they're mainly editorials. I was

> reminded of these thoughts this week when reading Dr. Frank

> Newport's dismal treatise "Public Favors Keeping Filibuster

> Rule in U.S. Senate: Majority of Americans not Following

> Issue Closely, However."

>

> Newport is the editor of the Gallup Poll. Perhaps smarting

> from persistent and informed criticism of recent filibuster

> polls by the Media Research Center, Newport rises not only to

> defend his own organization's polls for USA Today and CNN but

> also to be an apologist for polls by several other media

> consortia.

>

> The only point that Newport makes convincingly is that

> Americans consistently oppose changing the filibuster as

> described by pollsters. The problem with his analysis is that

> the pollsters' descriptions are hopelessly inadequate and

> often biased in favor of the filibuster. By inadequate, I

> mean that polls try to explain "filibusters" in 50 words or

> fewer to people who are generally uninformed and disinterested.

>

> Ask any political-science professor if he's ever been able

> satisfactorily to explain the filibuster to a class of

> daydreaming college freshmen in 50 words or fewer. Even with

> the specter of a grade hanging over their heads, most

- > students won't get it the first time. Imagine how attentive a
- > Gallup Poll respondent must be if he's a 30-something guy
- > watching ESPN while taking the poll, or a mother cooking
- > dinner with a kid on her hip, or a senior citizen straining
- > even to hear the description.
- >
- > These policy polls all face the same problem. Only a handful
- > of Americans are truly interested in issues. Public polls are
- > fine for election trial heats such as Bush versus Kerry.
- > Voters get that. But policy polls reveal empty heads.
- >
- > SNIP
- >
- > Hill is director of Hill Research Consultants, a Texas-based
- > firm that has polled for GOP candidates and causes since 1988.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====

Date: Wed, 11 May 2005 15:01:48 -0400
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Re: Filibuster polls bias empty heads
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <0IGC00EBF43COR@chimmx02.algx.net>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

If anyone pays attention to anything David Hill has to say they are wasting their time. Hill writes derogatory things about pollsters as a way to get attention. There doesn't seem to be any other point to what he has to say.

Frank Newport wrote a commendable piece about filibuster polls. It is well worth reading.
warren mitofsky

At 12:51 PM 5/11/2005, Leo Simonetta wrote:

- >Not (IMNSHO) Vox worthy but . . .
- >
- >Filibuster polls bias empty heads
- ><http://www.thehill.com/thehill/export/TheHill/Comment/Pollsters/DavidHill/051105.html>
- >
- >Reading the latest public polling on filibusters convinces me that media
- >polling is becoming something like blogging, only without the wit and
- >delightful cynicism.
- >
- >Public polls and political blogs both purport to be about facts and
- >information, but they're mainly editorials. I was reminded of these
- >thoughts this week when reading Dr. Frank Newport's dismal treatise "Public
- >Favors Keeping Filibuster Rule in U.S. Senate: Majority of Americans not
- >Following Issue Closely, However."

>
>Newport is the editor of the Gallup Poll. Perhaps smarting from persistent
>and informed criticism of recent filibuster polls by the Media Research
>Center, Newport rises not only to defend his own organization's polls for
>USA Today and CNN but also to be an apologist for polls by several other
>media consortia.

>
>The only point that Newport makes convincingly is that Americans
>consistently oppose changing the filibuster as described by pollsters. The
>problem with his analysis is that the pollsters' descriptions are
>hopelessly inadequate and often biased in favor of the filibuster. By
>inadequate, I mean that polls try to explain "filibusters" in 50 words or
>fewer to people who are generally uninformed and disinterested.

>
>Ask any political-science professor if he's ever been able satisfactorily
>to explain the filibuster to a class of daydreaming college freshmen in 50
>words or fewer. Even with the specter of a grade hanging over their heads,
>most students won't get it the first time. Imagine how attentive a Gallup
>Poll respondent must be if he's a 30-something guy watching ESPN while
>taking the poll, or a mother cooking dinner with a kid on her hip, or a
>senior citizen straining even to hear the description.

>
>These policy polls all face the same problem. Only a handful of Americans
>are truly interested in issues. Public polls are fine for election trial
>heats such as Bush versus Kerry. Voters get that. But policy polls reveal
>empty heads.

>
>SNIP

>
>Hill is director of Hill Research Consultants, a Texas-based firm that has
>polled for GOP candidates and causes since 1988.

>
>
>--

>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: Wed, 11 May 2005 15:52:44 -0400
Reply-To: jonathan.best@psra.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jonathan Best <jonathan.best@PSRA.COM>
Organization: PSRAI

Subject: Doctor lists for Australia and New Zealand
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Does anyone know of a place to get a good (representative) sample of general practitioners in Australia and/or New Zealand? Thanks. jb.

Jonathan Best
Chief Methodologist
Princeton Survey Research Associates International
P:609.924.9204 Ext. 20
F:609.924.7499
Jonathan.Best@PSRA.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Wed, 11 May 2005 17:31:52 -0400
Reply-To: "Rockwell, Richard" <richard.rockwell@UCONN.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Rockwell, Richard" <richard.rockwell@UCONN.EDU>
Subject: Complex issues and the voter RE: filibuster polls bias empty heads
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=utf-8
Content-transfer-encoding: base64
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Zh
bmQgdGhhdCB3aGVuIGNvbGxIY3RpdmUgcG9saWN5IHByZWZlcmVuY2VzIGNoYW5nZSwgdGhleeKA
pmRvIHNVIGlu4oCmcHJlZGljdGFibGUgd2F5cy4iICBUaGlzIGNvbmlsbnNsdXNpb24gaGFzIGJlZW4g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mFjeS4g
IEI0IHVzdWFsbHkgd29ya3Mgb3V0IHJpZ2h0LCBzb3J0IG9mIGxpa2UgV2luc3RvbiBDaHVyY2hp
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cyBwcm9iYWJseSB0aGUg

Date: Wed, 11 May 2005 17:37:16 -0400
Reply-To: Paul Braun <pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Paul Braun <pbraun@BRAUNRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Positions for Projects directors
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Comments: cc: Phyllis Gearren <pgearren@braunresearch.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Braun Research is a dynamic "campaign-like" research firm. We are a telephone and internet operations center with a talented group. We service our clients and we don't fail. Our objective is to get what our clients want before they ask for it.

With that service mode in mind, we have fallen victim to our own success and need to expand our Princeton offices to include 2 project managers who can take the responsibility of overseeing several important accounts. Project managers will be responsible for maintaining the relationships we have and shepherding the work through the operations.

I encourage experienced applicants to reach out to Phyllis Gearren, director of Human Resources. We are located in Princeton NJ and we offer a 401K plan among other benefits.

In addition, we are seeking CATI programmers.

We have offices in Memphis as well if this suits a qualified applicants for either positions.

Thank you for your interest

Paul A. Braun
Braun Research Inc.
271 Wall Street
Princeton, NJ 085401

Office: (609) 279-1600 x110
Fax: (609) 279-1318
Cell: (609) 658-1434

pbraun@braunresearch.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 11 May 2005 16:07:21 -0700
Reply-To: Sharon Yates <syates@ZAGAT.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Sharon Yates <syates@ZAGAT.COM>
Subject: New York Chapter: Outstanding Achievement Award to Murray Edelman

Congratulations to Murray Edelman for receiving the Outstanding Achievement Award from NYAAPOR!

Murray Edelman will be honored on Monday, June 20th at the New York School of Social Work at 6:00 PM. This evening event is open to all members of NYAAPOR.

Refreshments: 6:00 PM
Event: 7:45 PM
Place: NYU School of Social Work
1 Washington Square North
(at the corner of University Pl. & Washington Sq.,
entrance on University Pl.)

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Wed, 11 May 2005 22:26:54 -0400
Reply-To: Ande271@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jeanne Anderson <Ande271@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: Filibuster polls bias empty heads
Comments: To: Frank_Newport@GALLUP.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The only thing I have to add is that age of respondent (and political persuasion) should be used in analyzing data. Some of us remember the Southern filibustering whenever any civil rights motion came before the legislature and until very recently I believed that the filibuster should be abolished as anti-democratic. Now, of course, I have completely reversed course. It is a tricky issue, and not only because the wording of questions is difficult.

One question that I would like someone to ask of a national sample is:

What do you think the President should do when opposition to his nomination for an office is so strong that the nominee cannot win the approval of 2/3 of

the U.S. Senate?

Press hard for approval in spite of opposition**

Try to come to an agreement with the opposition

Withdraw that nomination in favor of another nominee

**Alternative: Claim that if a simple majority of Senators approve the nomination, the nomination should be accepted as approved

The more I struggle with the wording, the more I see that someone else should work on it, too! Anyone is welcome to take it on.

It would probably be good to vary the order of the answer categories within any sample.

Jeanne Anderson
(formerly) Principal
Jeanne Anderson Research

In a message dated 5/11/2005 1:16:02 PM Eastern Daylight Time,
Frank_Newport@GALLUP.COM writes:

Dear AAPOR members:

Since Leo Simonetta has posted a snippet of the tendentious column by David Hill (a GOP pollster) about filibuster polling and my recent article on the issue, I think it's important to post for AAPOR members who are interested the entire text of the article as published on Gallup.com. It's pasted in below.

This will allow AAPOR members to read through the entire article.

In fact, I wrote the piece specifically to caution readers and users of polls about the impact of question wording on this issue. I say:

"Summarizing American public opinion on a complex issue like the Senate's filibuster rule must be undertaken with caution. As noted in the section above, it has not attracted a great deal of attention among Americans. Thus, it is a fair assumption that relatively few Americans are wholly conversant with the specific details of the filibuster issue. This in turn means that most pollsters attempt to explain the filibuster rule to survey respondents before asking their opinions, creating a situation in which response patterns may vary, depending on the exact question wording of the survey. "

I then go on to present the exact question wording of questions asked about the filibuster by Gallup, ABC/Washington Post, NBC/WSJ, and Newsweek.

This allows readers to examine the precise wording themselves and thus

put the responses in appropriate context.

Furthermore, in this situation I spend a good deal of time looking at the level of attention being paid to the issue to highlight the fact that it is not one with which most Americans are wholly conversant.

Beyond that, I break out the responses of those following the issue closely from those not following the issue closely to allow the reader to see the opinions of the "informed" public as compared to those who are not informed.

I'm not sure what more could be said to provide guidance and context for understanding of public opinion on this issue, which -- as noted -- was the main purpose of the piece.

Sincerely,

Frank Newport
Gallup Poll

Public Favors Keeping Filibuster Rule in U.S. Senate
Majority of Americans not following issue closely, however

by Frank Newport

Page: 1, 2 Next

GALLUP NEWS SERVICE

PRINCETON, NJ -- As the U.S. Senate returns Monday from a week of recess, it faces a wide range of challenges, but perhaps none so visible as wrangling over the Senate filibuster rule. Democrats have used the filibuster to hold up votes on selected Bush judicial nominees, and Republicans have responded by threatening to vote to change the filibuster rule. This would mean a simple majority vote (rather than the current 60 votes) would end floor debate on a nominee, clearing the way for an up-or-down vote to confirm or reject the nominee. The debate has extended for weeks, with intense lobbying from all sides involved. The issue has taken on greater significance in light of the high probability that the Senate will be voting to confirm at least one presidential nominee for the U.S. Supreme Court within the next several years.

A review of recent public opinion data on this issue suggests four conclusions:

The filibuster debate per se has not attracted the attention of the majority of the American public. It is not a high-salience issue to rank-and-file Americans.

When the filibuster situation is explained to Americans, the majority appear to favor keeping the rule in place. A plurality also favors the Democratic approach over the Republican approach to the issue. Americans following the filibuster situation closely are more likely to favor keeping it in place than are those who are not following it as closely. Republicans and those who attend church most frequently are more likely to oppose the filibuster rule than are independents, Democrats, and those who do not attend church as frequently. One unanticipated consequence of the rancorous debate appears to be a general diminution of Congress' status, as well as that of both parties in Congress, in the eyes of the American public.

Filibuster Debate Not Being Closely Followed

Thirty-five percent of Americans say they are following news about the filibuster situation either very or somewhat closely.

How closely have you been following the news about the use of the filibuster on judicial nominations in the U.S. Senate -- very closely, somewhat closely, not too closely, or not at all?

Very
closely
Somewhat
closely
Not too
closely
Not
at all
No
opinion

2005 Apr 29-May 1
12%
23
28
37
*

* Less than 0.5%

This is a relatively low level of attention. Gallup has asked this "closely following" question about 148 news stories over the past decade and a half. The average percentage following these stories very or somewhat closely is 60%, slightly less than twice the level measured for the filibuster story.

To help put the filibuster issue into some context, here is a list of the 11 news stories that have attracted the most attention of those Gallup has measured.

Poll dates
Percentage who

are following story
"very closely"
or "somewhat closely"

2001 Sep 14-15
Terrorist attacks on New York City and Washington, D.C.
97

2003 Mar 22-23
War between U.S. and Iraq
95

2002 Oct 21-22
The sniper shootings in the Washington, D.C., area
91

2005 Jan 3-5
The tsunami that struck parts of Asia
89

2003 Jan 3-5
The situation with Iraq
89

2003 Jan 23-25
U.N. inspections for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq
88

2000 Nov 11-12
Situation surrounding Tuesday's presidential election
87

1997 Sep 6-7
Death of Princess Diana
85

1991 Feb 24
Beginning of ground war in Iraq
84

1999 Apr 13-14
Situation in Kosovo
84

1998 Aug 21-23
Clinton-Lewinsky matter
83

On the other hand, here are the stories that have attracted the least attention:

Poll dates
Percentage who

are following story
"very closely"
or "somewhat closely"

2001 Jun 28-Jul 1
A patient's bill of rights
36

1999 Mar 19-21
Situation in Kosovo
36

2005 Apr 29-May 1
Filibuster in the Senate
35

1992 Dec 18-20
Clinton economic conference in Little Rock
35

2003 May 19-21
New York Times reporter Jayson Blair (falsified stories)
34

1998 Jun 5-7
Clinton race initiative
34

2003 Aug 25-26
Candidates for the Democratic nomination in 2004
34

2005 Apr 18-21
Michael Jackson child molestation trial
33

1999 Feb 19-21
Situation in Kosovo
30

1999 Feb 8-9
Situation in Kosovo
30

2000 May 5-7
China and the World Trade Organization
29

1994 Feb 1-3
Vote in Japan for political reforms
22

2000 Aug 11-12
CBS show "Survivor"

Note that the filibuster issue is tied for 10th from the bottom on the "least attention" list, underscoring the finding that as a news story, it has not galvanized the attention of the average American -- at least not yet. (Of some solace to those who would argue for the importance of the filibuster issue is the fact that it has attracted slightly more attention than the highly publicized child molestation trial of pop star Michael Jackson.)

Recent news reports have focused on the intense lobbying to remove the filibuster rule by Republicans and leaders of the religious right. Americans who identify with the Republican Party and those who attend church frequently, however, are neither more nor less likely to be following the issue closely than are independents, Democrats, and those who seldom or never attend church.

Majority Favors Keeping Filibuster Rule in Place

Summarizing American public opinion on a complex issue like the Senate's filibuster rule must be undertaken with caution. As noted in the section above, it has not attracted a great deal of attention among Americans. Thus, it is a fair assumption that relatively few Americans are wholly conversant with the specific details of the filibuster issue. This in turn means that most pollsters attempt to explain the filibuster rule to survey respondents before asking their opinions, creating a situation in which response patterns may vary, depending on the exact question wording of the survey.

Still, a review of the responses to several recent questions that independent survey organizations have asked about the filibuster rule suggests that a majority of the public has no evident desire to change the rule. Regardless of question format, a majority of respondents favor keeping the filibuster rule in place.

The April 29-May 1 CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll asked about the filibuster situation as follows:

As you may know, the filibuster is a Senate procedure which has been used to prevent the Senate from passing controversial legislation or confirming controversial appointments by the president, even if a majority of senators support that action. A vote of at least 60 senators out of 100 is needed to end a filibuster. Do you favor or oppose the use of the filibuster in the U.S. Senate?

Favor
Oppose
No opinion

2005 Apr 29-May 1
52%
40

In the current controversy over the filibuster, whose side do you generally favor -- [ROTATED: the Republicans in the Senate (or) the Democrats in the Senate]?

Republicans

Democrats

BOTH

(vol.)

NEITHER

(vol.)

No

opinion

2005 Apr 29-May 1

36%

45

*

8

11

* Less than 0.5%

(vol.) = Volunteered response

In response to this question wording, a slight majority of Americans favor keeping the filibuster rule in place. Importantly, when asked to choose between the two parties' approaches to the controversy, Democrats win out over Republicans by about a 10-point margin.

Other polls have asked about the filibuster in other ways, but with similar results.

An April 21-24 ABC News/Washington Post poll used a two-part question to query respondents about filibusters:

The Senate has confirmed 35 federal appeals court judges nominated by Bush, while Senate Democrats have blocked 10 others. Do you think the Senate Democrats are right or wrong to block these nominations?

Right

Wrong

BOTH

(vol.)

Unsure

2005 Apr 21-24

48%
36
3
13

(vol.) = Volunteered response

Would you support or oppose changing Senate rules to make it easier for the Republicans to confirm Bush's judicial nominees?

Support
Oppose
Unsure

2005 Apr 21-24
26%
66
8

This wording does not use the word "filibuster," and the second question is focused very specifically on one outcome of changing the Senate rules, rather than a broad question on the value of the filibuster rule more generally. As can be seen, in response to this specific question, about two-thirds of Americans say they are opposed to this type of change.

An NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll conducted in late March and early April used a more complex question wording, as follows:

As you may know, in the last term of Congress some senators used a procedure called a filibuster when it came to some of President Bush's judicial nominees. When this happens, it takes the votes of 60 senators instead of 51 to end debate and hold a confirmation vote for a nominee. In your opinion, should the Senate maintain the filibuster rule or eliminate the filibuster for judicial nominations?

Maintain
Filibuster
Eliminate
Filibuster
Unsure

%
%
%

2005 Mar 31-Apr 3
50
40
10

2005 Jan 13-17

48

39

13

The responses to this question about the filibuster rule are quite similar to those obtained in the recent CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll; about half favor keeping the rule, while about 40% would like to see it eliminated.

A March Newsweek poll used still more words to describe the filibuster situation to respondents before asking their opinions about changing the rule:

U.S. Senate rules allow 41 senators to mount a filibuster -- refusing to end debate and agree to vote -- to block judicial nominees. In the past, this tactic has been used by both Democrats and Republicans to prevent certain judicial nominees from being confirmed. Senate Republican leaders -- whose party is now in the majority -- want to take away this tactic by changing the rules to require only 51 votes, instead of 60, to break a filibuster. Would you approve or disapprove of changing Senate rules to take away the filibuster and allow all of George W. Bush's judicial nominees to get voted on by the Senate?

Approve

Disapprove

Unsure

2005 Mar 17-18

32%

57

11

By almost a 2-to-1 margin, respondents in this context say they would disapprove of changing the rules to eliminate the filibuster -- at least in situations involving President Bush's judicial nominees.

Although the wording (and time frame) differs across these various surveys' measures of the filibuster situation, the results are similar: Americans oppose changing the rules to get rid of filibusters, no matter how the question is put to them. It also appears that Americans are somewhat more opposed to changing the rules when questions emphasize the specifics of the current situation involving Bush's judicial appointments than when the questions are phrased to focus more broadly on the filibuster rule per se.

Americans who are following the filibuster situation most closely are most in favor of keeping the rule in place.

Attitude Toward Filibuster Rule
by How Closely Following Filibuster News

Favor
Oppose
Don't know/
Refused

Following news of filibuster
%
%
%

Very closely
62
37
1

Somewhat closely
59
37
4

Not too closely/not closely at all
48
41
11

At the same time, as would be expected given the political battle lines being drawn around the issue in the current environment, support for the filibuster is lowest among Republicans and those who most frequently attend church.

Attitude Toward Filibuster Rule
by Partisanship and Church Attendance

Favor
Oppose
Don't know/
Refused

%
%
%

Republicans
43
50
7

Independents

52

39

9

Democrats

62

31

7

Attend church weekly

43

47

10

Attend church nearly weekly/monthly

58

38

4

Attend church seldom/never

56

36

8

Congress Sinks in Public's Esteem

Gallup's latest polling suggests that Americans have become increasingly negative about the job Congress is doing, and that the public's displeasure is being heaped roughly equally on both sides of the aisle. There may be a wide variety of causes for this downward drift in approval for the nation's representative bodies. It is impossible to determine the precise impact of the seemingly incessant wrangling over what many Americans may see as arcane Senate rules on the decline in the image of Congress, but it is not unreasonable to assume that the two are somewhat related.

Most tellingly, a new May 2-5 Gallup Poll shows that only 35% of Americans now approve of the job Congress is doing. This is down several points from April and March, and is the lowest congressional approval rating Gallup has measured in about eight years.

In addition, the April 29-May 1 CNN/USA Today/Gallup poll shows that ratings of the Republicans in Congress have fallen to 42% (lowest since April 2000) and ratings of the Democrats in Congress are at 40% (the lowest of any of the 13 times this question has been asked since June 1999).

Do you approve or disapprove of the way [ROTATED] are handling their job?

A. The Republicans in Congress

Approve
Disapprove
No opinion

%
%
%

2005 Apr 29-May 1
42
50
8

2003 Nov 14-16
48
49
3

2003 Oct 10-12
51
44
5

2002 Apr 5-7
59
30
11

2001 Aug 3-5
49
40
11

2001 Jun 8-10
49
43
8

2000 Aug 18-19
45
44
11

2000 Jul 25-26
46
39
15

2000 Apr 28-30

42
46
12

1999 Nov 4-7
38
53
9

1999 Oct 8-10
37
55
8

1999 Aug 16-18
36
53
11

1999 Jun 25-27
40
53
7

B. The Democrats in Congress

Approve
Disapprove
No opinion

%
%
%

2005 Apr 29-May 1
40
52
8

2003 Nov 14-16
47
50
3

2003 Oct 10-12
45
48
7

2002 Apr 5-7

57

32

11

2001 Aug 3-5

52

38

10

2001 Jun 8-10

54

37

9

2000 Aug 18-19

56

34

10

2000 Jul 25-26

51

36

13

2000 Apr 28-30

46

42

12

1999 Nov 4-7

49

42

9

1999 Oct 8-10

48

44

8

1999 Aug 16-18

48

41

11

1999 Jun 25-27

46

46

8

Neither of the two Senate leaders -- Bill Frist (Republican) and Harry Reid (Democrat) -- are well-known to Americans. Those who do have an

opinion of Frist are more positive than negative -- by an 11-point margin. Those with an opinion of Reid essentially break even.

Interestingly, Americans' views of Frist have become slightly more positive between Gallup's early April poll and the current poll.

Next, we'd like to get your overall opinion of some people in the news. As I read each name, please say if you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of these people -- or if you have never heard of them. First, ... How about ... ? [ITEMS A-C ROTATED, ITEM D READ LAST]

B. Senate Republican Leader Bill Frist

Favorable
Unfavorable
Never heard of
No opinion

%
%
%
%

2005 Apr 29-May 1

32
21
31
16

2005 Apr 1-2

26
24
31
19

2003 Jan 3-5

36
11
30
23

C. Senate Democratic Leader, Harry Reid

Favorable
Unfavorable
Never heard of

No opinion

2005 Apr 29-May 1

21%
18
44
17

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

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

Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2005 12:51 PM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Filibuster polls bias empty heads

Not (IMNSHO) Vox worthy but . . .

Filibuster polls bias empty heads

<http://www.thehill.com/thehill/export/TheHill/Comment/Pollsters/DavidHil1/051105.html>

Reading the latest public polling on filibusters convinces me that media polling is becoming something like blogging, only without the wit and delightful cynicism.

Public polls and political blogs both purport to be about facts and information, but they're mainly editorials. I was reminded of these thoughts this week when reading Dr. Frank Newport's dismal treatise "Public Favors Keeping Filibuster Rule in U.S. Senate: Majority of Americans not Following Issue Closely, However."

Newport is the editor of the Gallup Poll. Perhaps smarting from persistent and informed criticism of recent filibuster polls by the Media Research Center, Newport rises not only to defend his own organization's polls for USA Today and CNN but also to be an apologist for polls by several other media consortia.

The only point that Newport makes convincingly is that Americans consistently oppose changing the filibuster as described by pollsters. The problem with his analysis is that the pollsters' descriptions are hopelessly inadequate and often biased in favor of the filibuster. By inadequate, I mean that polls try to explain "filibusters" in 50 words or fewer to people who are generally uninformed and disinterested.

Ask any political-science professor if he's ever been able satisfactorily to explain the filibuster to a class of daydreaming college freshmen in 50 words or fewer. Even with the specter of a grade hanging over their heads, most students won't get it the first time. Imagine how attentive a Gallup Poll respondent must be if he's a 30-something guy watching ESPN while taking the poll, or a mother cooking dinner with a kid on her hip, or a senior citizen straining even

to hear the description.

These policy polls all face the same problem. Only a handful of Americans are truly interested in issues. Public polls are fine for election trial heats such as Bush versus Kerry. Voters get that. But policy polls reveal empty heads.

SNIP

Hill is director of Hill Research Consultants, a Texas-based firm that has polled for GOP candidates and causes since 1988.

--

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: Thu, 12 May 2005 08:10:51 -0400
Reply-To: RFunk787@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "G. Ray Funkhouser" <RFunk787@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: Filibuster polls bias empty heads
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="ISO-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

It would be nice if someone, somewhere in this discussion, would at least=20
note that this particular use of the filibuster -- preventing judicial nomin=
ees=20
from getting an up-or-down vote in the senate -- had been virtually=20
unprecedented until the Democrats started using it recently. The Constitu=
tion=20
stipulates that a simple majority vote one way or the other is appropriate i=
n these=20

cases, whereas the "filibuster" requires a super-majority in favor. Hence, while the media delight in terming abolishing THIS PARTICULAR APPLICATION OF the filibuster the "nuclear option", conservatives call it the "constitutional option." I do not understand why anyone would ask, as Jeanne Anderson apparently wants to, this question:

What do you think the President should do when opposition to his nomination for an office is so strong that the nominee cannot win the approval of 2/3 of the U.S. Senate?

Press hard for approval in spite of opposition**

Try to come to an agreement with the opposition

Withdraw that nomination in favor of another nominee

when a 2/3 vote is absolutely irrelevant to the current situation, and nowhere is the option given for changing the rules (not that this is even a rule, right now). Another option might be "Call the Democrats' bluff and make them actually get up there and filibuster."

There are many different ways to approach this issue in an opinion survey, but given vast public ignorance and inattention regarding the nuances of Congressional procedure, an adequate explanation would be difficult in this context.

Perhaps a split sample, one half getting a wording favorable to liberal interpretation and the other a wording favorable to conservative viewpoints (provided anyone in AAPOR could conceive of a wording favorable to conservative viewpoints), would at least simulate fairness.

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

=====
Date: Thu, 12 May 2005 09:11:59 -0400
Reply-To: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDEL.EDU>
Subject: Re: Filibuster polls bias empty heads
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Well said and I might add that the House did away with the filibuster =
over a
hundred years ago and seems to have survived. There are already at last
count more than 20 situations in which the Senate rules do not allow a
filibuster. Perhaps this information can be added to the list of data =
that
potential respondents need to know.

Ed Ratledge
University of Delaware=20

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

From: G. Ray Funkhouser [mailto:RFunk787@AOL.COM]=20
Sent: Thursday, May 12, 2005 8:11 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: Filibuster polls bias empty heads

It would be nice if someone, somewhere in this discussion, would at =
least=20
note that this particular use of the filibuster -- preventing judicial
nominees=20
from getting an up-or-down vote in the senate -- had been virtually=20
unprecedented until the Democrats started using it recently. The
Constitution=20
stipulates that a simple majority vote one way or the other is =
appropriate
in these=20
cases, whereas the "filibuster" requires a super-majority in favor. =
Hence,=20
while the media delight in terming abolishing THIS PARTICULAR =
APPLICATION OF
the=20
filibuster the "nuclear option", conservatives call it the =
"constitutional=20
option." I do not understand why anyone would ask, as Jeanne Anderson
apparently=20
wants to, this question:

What do you think the President should do when opposition to his =
nomination
for an office is so strong that the nominee cannot win the approval of =
2/3=A0=20
of
the U.S. Senate?

=A0 =A0 =A0 =A0 =A0=A0 Press=A0 hard for approval in spite of =
opposition**

=A0 =A0 =A0 =A0 =A0 =A0 Try=A0 to come to an agreement with the =
opposition

=A0 =A0 =A0 =A0 =A0 =A0 Withdraw=A0 that nomination in favor of =
another=A0 nominee

when a 2/3 vote is absolutly irrelevant to the current situation, and
nowhere=20
is the option given for changing the rules (not that this is even a =
rule,=20
right now). Another option might be "Call the Democrats' bluff and =
make
them=20
actually get up there and filibuster."

There are many different ways to approach this issue in an opinion =
survey,=20
but given vast public ignorance and inattention regarding the nuances =
of=20
Congressional procedure, an adequate explanation would be difficult in =
this
context. =20
Perhaps a split sample, one half getting a wording favorable to liberal =
interpretation and the other a wording favorable to conservative =
viewpoints=20
(provided anyone in AAPOR could conceive of a wording favorable to
conservative=20
viewpoints), would at least simulate fairness.

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

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, 12 May 2005 09:28:33 -0400
Reply-To: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jason Boxt <jboxt@GLOBALSTRATEGYGROUP.COM>
Subject: Re: Filibuster polls bias empty heads
Comments: To: RFunk787@AOL.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I don't believe that this is an appropriate forum for an overtly =
political discussion, but since you have chosen to do so, I feel =
compelled to address some of your contentions, since the truth is out =
there for anyone to find should they choose to do so, rather than =

swallow the untruths that are being perpetrated (I've heavily leaned on = the information that has been gathered and put out there):

1) Your first claim is that this is "virtually unprecedented." Is that = like being VIRTUALLY pregnant? Regardless, it is an inaccurate claim. = Per several sources, judicial filibusters are not unprecedented. = Republicans INSIST that judicial filibusters never happened before. = Frist put it this way: "In February 2003 the minority radically broke = with tradition and precedent and launched the first-ever filibuster of a = judicial nominee who had majority support." The historical record is = clear that both parties have conducted filibusters against judicial = nominees over the decades. For example, Republicans used the filibuster = to prevent the confirmation of Abe Fortas as Chief Justice of the United = States in 1968. In truth, no one should understand the legitimacy of = judicial filibusters better than Bill Frist. As recently as 2000, = cloture votes were necessary to obtain votes on President Clinton's = nominations of both Richard Paez and Marsha Berzon to the Ninth Circuit. = On March 9, 2000, Frist participated in a filibuster of Richard Paez. = When confronted about his vote late last year, Frist claimed he = filibustered Paez for "scheduling" purposes. A press release by former = Senator Bob Smith titled "Smith Leads Effort to Block Activist Judicial = Nominees" plainly states that the intent of the filibuster was to = "block" the Paez nomination. President Clinton's nomination of Lee = Sarokin to the Third Circuit was openly filibustered as well. The fact = that these filibusters ultimately failed does not mean that they did not = take place.

In fact, Paez was only one of at least six filibusters Republicans = attempted during the Clinton years. Senator Orrin Hatch and others argue = that these filibusters don't count because they ultimately weren't = successful in blocking the nominees. All that proves, however, is that = Clinton's nominees were moderate enough to secure sixty votes. It also = suggests the remedy to Bush's problem: Stop nominating extremist judges = to the federal bench.=20

The legitimacy of the filibuster as a check upon presidential power has = been acknowledged by none other than Senator Hatch, who in 1994 said in = defense of a Republican-led filibuster of a judicial nominee that the = filibuster is "one of the few tools that the minority has to protect = itself and those the minority represents." However, now that the current = Senate minority is using this legitimate tool, Republicans are falsely = claiming that its use is unprecedented and improper.

It is particularly shameless for Republicans to level this charge, not = only because they themselves have acknowledged the legitimacy of the = filibuster and have used it in the case of judicial nominees, but also = because, during the Clinton Administration, they blocked dozens of = Clinton nominees with much less open and accountable procedures like = secret holds. One-third of President Clinton's appeals court nominees = from 1995 through 2000 were kept off the bench, many without even a = hearing or a committee vote, while others were delayed for as long as = four years. Sixty-three of President Clinton's judicial nominees never = even made it out of the Judiciary Committee.

2) You openly complain about the use of the term "nuclear option," when in fact it was Republican Trent Lott who coined the phrase. Maybe he should have thought about it a little longer before he said it. Not that he hasn't spoken before thinking before...

<http://mediamatters.org/items/200504260001>

3) You claim that somehow this is an unconstitutional act. Not true. While Frist and other Republicans adamantly argue that efforts to challenge Bush's judicial nominees via filibuster are unconstitutional, they should get their facts straight. There is nothing in the Constitution requiring the Senate to "confirm or reject appointments by a simple majority vote." The Appointments Clause of the Constitution requires the consent of the Senate before judicial nominees are appointed. The Rules of Proceedings Clause gives the Senate the power to determine the method of consent. It doesn't matter how many times Frist says it: There is no requirement for the Senate to confirm or reject a nomination. No vote means no consent: And that's OK.=20

In 2003 Judicial Watch, a conservative advocacy group, filed an ultimately unsuccessful lawsuit against the Senate, claiming that the judicial filibuster was unconstitutional. Although no text supports its argument, Judicial Watch argued that it's implied that the Senate's "advice and consent" power must be exercised by a simple majority vote, because it's consistent with the "ordinary principle of majority rule." Nice try, but that position is actually antithetical to the intent of the Framers, who were careful to make sure the majority didn't always rule. James Madison wrote in The Federalist Papers that "measures are too often decided, not according to the rules of justice and the rights of the minor party, but by the superior force of an interested and overbearing majority." The Senate was created, in part, to prevent the problems associated with the tyranny of the majority.=20

The real culprit here is Bush, who has ripped the "advice" out of "advice and consent." He has stubbornly refused to substantively communicate with any senators who oppose his nominees. When the Senate fails to confirm his nominees, Bush just reappoints them or, worse, bypasses the Senate altogether and installs them on the bench during a recess. This kind of toxic environment makes judicial filibusters more likely.

Thanks to the hard work of those out there who have taken the time to find the answers to these most inaccurate claims. One would hope more people would take the time to take advantage of their hard work. And to speak of the average American not understanding the issue when there are so many educated, un-average Americans who fall into the same category, well, I should think that's an entirely different issue to address. Our responsibility as researchers isn't to educate the public on these issues; it's to measure what they do know, and then to report that.

To give credit where credit is due:

<http://hnn.us/roundup/comments/10675.html>

<http://www.pfaw.org/pfaw/general/default.aspx?oid=3D16955>

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of G. Ray Funkhouser

Sent: Thursday, May 12, 2005 8:11 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Filibuster polls bias empty heads

It would be nice if someone, somewhere in this discussion, would at least note that this particular use of the filibuster -- preventing judicial nominees from getting an up-or-down vote in the senate -- had been virtually unprecedented until the Democrats started using it recently. The Constitution stipulates that a simple majority vote one way or the other is appropriate in these cases, whereas the "filibuster" requires a super-majority in favor. Hence, while the media delight in terming abolishing THIS PARTICULAR APPLICATION OF the filibuster the "nuclear option", conservatives call it the "constitutional option." I do not understand why anyone would ask, as Jeanne Anderson wants to, this question:

What do you think the President should do when opposition to his nomination for an office is so strong that the nominee cannot win the approval of 2/3 of the U.S. Senate?

Press hard for approval in spite of opposition**

Try to come to an agreement with the opposition

Withdraw that nomination in favor of another nominee

when a 2/3 vote is absolutely irrelevant to the current situation, and nowhere is the option given for changing the rules (not that this is even a rule, right now). Another option might be "Call the Democrats' bluff and make them actually get up there and filibuster."

There are many different ways to approach this issue in an opinion =
survey,=20
but given vast public ignorance and inattention regarding the nuances of =

Congressional procedure, an adequate explanation would be difficult in =
this context. =20

Perhaps a split sample, one half getting a wording favorable to liberal=20
interpretation and the other a wording favorable to conservative =
viewpoints=20

(provided anyone in AAPOR could conceive of a wording favorable to =
conservative=20
viewpoints), would at least simulate fairness.

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

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, 12 May 2005 09:43:31 -0400
Reply-To: Auden Thomas <adt121@PSU.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Auden Thomas <adt121@PSU.EDU>
Subject: survey research textbook
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Can anyone recommend books for use as a text for a course on survey research
(questionnaire construction,
sampling, scaling, factor analysis, etc.)? You may reply directly to me.

Thanks,

Auden Thomas

Auden D. Thomas, Ph.D.
Director, Center for Survey Research
Penn State Harrisburg
777 West Harrisburg Pike
Middletown, PA 17057-4898
Office: 717-948-6435
Fax: 717-948-6306
E-mail: adt121@psu.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: Thu, 12 May 2005 10:19:42 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: More on that cable poll in LA
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

When Push Comes to Shove
By Steve May | 5/11/2005
<http://www.theind.com/editorial2.asp?CID=1871592428>

We fired The Independent Weekly's pollster, Verne Kennedy, last week.

For the past four months he and his firm, Market Research Insight of Pensacola, Fla., had been doing research for us, polling consumer attitudes and behavior in the market area for our Acadiana Consumer Confidence Index editorial section.

SNIP

So why is something so seemingly foolish so offensive to us? Consider its dark side. Think about the unsuspecting recipient of a call who believes he or she is actually participating in a genuine and straightforward "information gathering" exchange with the caller. Push polling slyly attempts to switch off our political message "defense filter" by convincing us the purpose of the call is to get our opinion on the topic. But, of course, that's not why they're calling.

The greatest danger from the practice is its capacity to spread lies and disinformation about candidates or issues without the perpetrator having to take ownership of the lie. Consider some of the questions from last week's poll:

"Since LUS rations water, how would you feel about receiving your cable 2-3 days a week?"

"Since the law separates church and state, how would you feel about losing your cable-based religious programming?"

"Do you want Big Brother watching your Internet and email usage?"

When negative political advertising runs on TV, as disgusting as it often is, campaign finance laws require disclosure of the source of the ad, and we can measure the disinformation with the credibility of the opposing

candidate or camp.

Push polling tries to deny us, as voters, the ability to connect the dots between the lie and those who benefit from its telling. It should have no place in Lafayette.

--

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: Sat, 14 May 2005 16:16:17 -0700
Reply-To: Shapard Wolf <shapwolf@MSN.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Shapard Wolf <shapwolf@MSN.COM>
Subject: Website Regarding Cell Phone Survey Sampling
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; format=flowed

Paul has been having trouble posting this message so I thought I'd give it a try:

From: P J Lavrakas [<mailto:paul.lavrakas@NIELSENMEDIA.COM>]

The following website provides access to detailed information from the Cell Phone Survey Sampling II meetings held in February 2005 in NYC.

<http://www.nielsenmedia.com/cellphonesummit/cellphone.html>

The information on this website is essentially final with the exception of a few very minor cosmetic edits coming next week.

Please feel free to send out information about the availability of this to whomever you believe would find it of value.

Thanks, PJL

Shapard Wolf
AAPOR Publications & Information Associate Chair

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 16 May 2005 07:26:22 -0500

Reply-To: "Morris, Joyce B." <JoyceMo@HEALTH.OK.GOV>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Morris, Joyce B." <JoyceMo@HEALTH.OK.GOV>
Subject: Native Americans et al with telephones
Comments: To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: QUOTED-PRINTABLE

I am looking for the proportion of Native Americans and other minority = groups who have telephones. My preference would be for Oklahoma but if = I cannot get that I can use national data.

I also would be interested in any studies which may have looked at why = these various groups do or do not have telephones. That is, is it = economics [I cannot afford to pay my bill], a conscious choice, or some = other reason?

Joyce Morris, PhD
Disparity and Assessment Coordinator
Tobacco Use Prevention Service
Oklahoma State Department of Health
1000 NE 10th St
Oklahoma City OK 73117-1299
(405) 271-3619 Fax: (405) 271-9053

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Mon, 16 May 2005 09:18:37 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: For those of us who didn't go to Miami
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Ohio Exit Polls 'Not a Smoking Gun' for Fraud, Study Says
Saturday May 14, 6:54 pm ET
<http://biz.yahoo.com/prnews/050514/nysa019.html?.v=3&printer=1>

MIAMI, May 14 /PRNewswire/ -- A just released analysis confirms pollster Warren Mitofsky's assertion that the exit polls that put John Kerry ahead of George Bush in Ohio on Election Day 2004 do not necessarily indicate that there was fraud in the Ohio election.

Exit polls estimated that Senator John Kerry was leading for Ohio's electoral votes, but not by a large enough margin to be called the winner. Had he won Ohio, he would have won the Presidency. However, the official result was a victory for President George W. Bush. The discrepancy between

the polls and the results gave rise to widespread accusations of systematic election fraud.

The new study, commissioned by the Election Science Institute (ESI), was presented on Saturday at the annual conference of the American Association for Public Opinion Research in Miami. It looked at the results of the exit polls, which were conducted by Edison Media Research and Mitofsky International, and compared them to official results from 2004 and 2000.

The research team, led by Dr. Fritz Scheuren, used more detailed information from the exit polls than previous studies. The team was able to use this precinct-level information while preserving ballot secrecy at a local level.

"The more detailed information allowed us to see that voting patterns were consistent with past results and consistent with exit poll results across precincts. It looks more like Bush voters were refusing to participate and less like systematic fraud," Dr. Scheuren said.

Dr. Scheuren is the current President of the American Statistical Association, and Vice President for Statistics at NORC, a research institute based at the University of Chicago.

Steven Hertzberg, project director at the Election Science Institute, spoke to the broader implications.

"We need to develop better tools to monitor our elections. The fact that there is debate over this at all shows that we need elections to be more transparent, more accountable, more auditable," he said. "To increase public confidence in the system ESI has begun working with election officials in Ohio to help publish more timely election data so the public may verify for themselves that the voting and the counting is done accurately."

The Election Science Institute (ESI) is a non-profit, non-partisan scientific organization based in San Francisco and founded in 2002 under the name Votewatch. ESI monitors public elections in the U.S. to identify voting anomalies which impact election results, and works with election officials to help them improve voting and election systems. ESI conducted its own exit polls in New Mexico for the purpose of assessing voters' experiences.

The paper is being presented at AAPOR 2005's Saturday lunch plenary. The conference is at the Fontainebleau Hilton Resort, 4441 Collins Ave, Miami. See <http://www.aapor.org>.

For more information on the Election Science Institute, see <http://www.electionscience.org>.

Source: Election Science Institute

--

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: Mon, 16 May 2005 11:03:31 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: More AAPOR News From Miami
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Pollsters left out in wireless world
How to gage public opinion in cell-phone-only households

The Associated Press

MIAMI BEACH, Fla. - The rapid growth in cell-phone-only households is pressuring public opinion researchers to adapt their surveying methods, which are based heavily on telephone interviews of people with traditional landline phones.

The number of households using only a mobile phone doubled in less than two years, with the rate rising faster among certain groups, researchers found. "The polling community needs to come up with a strategy sooner rather than later," said Stephen Blumberg, a senior scientist at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Blumberg presented his survey findings about cell phone use at the annual meeting this weekend of the American Association for Public Opinion Research.
<http://msnbc.msn.com/id/7871779/>

Pollster calls for training to aid exit poll accuracy

BY WILL LESTER

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

MIAMI BEACH, Fla. -- Better training of interviewers to get a proper sample of voters after they cast ballots will be key to improving the performance

of exit polls, one pollster who handled the 2004 election surveys said Saturday.

<http://159.54.227.3/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20050515/NEWS/505150316>

--

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: Mon, 16 May 2005 11:43:12 -0400
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@JWDP.COM>
Organization: Jan Werner Data Processing
Subject: Re: More AAPOR News From Miami
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <0IGL00EVQ8FCUQ@chimmx03.algx.net>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

More readable complete versions of both AP articles about the AAPOR Conference can be found on the Washington Post web site:

Pollsters Left Out in Mobile-Phone World:

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/05/16/AR2005051600237_pf.html

Better Interviews Said Key to Exit Polls:

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/05/14/AR2005051400704_pf.html

(Note, if these URLs wrap around in your email reader, you may need to cut and paste in order to link to them).

Jan Werner

Leo Simonetta wrote:

> Pollsters left out in wireless world
> How to gage public opinion in cell-phone-only households

> The Associated Press

> MIAMI BEACH, Fla. - The rapid growth in cell-phone-only households is
> pressuring public opinion researchers to adapt their surveying methods,
> which are based heavily on telephone interviews of people with traditional
> landline phones.

> The number of households using only a mobile phone doubled in less than two
> years, with the rate rising faster among certain groups, researchers found.
> "The polling community needs to come up with a strategy sooner rather than
> later," said Stephen Blumberg, a senior scientist at the Centers for
> Disease Control and Prevention.

> Blumberg presented his survey findings about cell phone use at the annual
> meeting this weekend of the American Association for Public Opinion
> Research.

> <http://msnbc.msn.com/id/7871779/>

> Pollster calls for training to aid exit poll accuracy

> BY WILL LESTER

> THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

> MIAMI BEACH, Fla. -- Better training of interviewers to get a proper sample
> of voters after they cast ballots will be key to improving the performance
> of exit polls, one pollster who handled the 2004 election surveys said
> Saturday.

> <http://159.54.227.3/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20050515/NEWS/505150316>

> --
> 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: Mon, 16 May 2005 11:35:03 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Iran releases pollster accused of passing info to U.S.
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Iran releases pollster accused of passing info to U.S.
5/15/2005 6:28:00 AM GMT
http://www.aljazeera.com/cgi-bin/news_service/middle_east_full_story.asp?service_id=8359

Iran's Supreme Court has released a prominent pollster whom it previously accused of passing classified information to foreign intelligence agencies, his lawyer said Saturday.

In February 2003 Pro-reform activist Abbas Abdi, a senior member of the Islamic Iran Participation Front, Iran's largest reformist party, was convicted and was serving an eight-year prison sentence.

According to his lawyer Saleh Nikbakht, the Supreme Court overturned the conviction on May 2.

In November 2002, Abdi was jailed after conducting a poll showing strong public support for dialogue with the U.S.

Iran's Supreme Court ruled that surveying was not an example of passing classified information, the lawyer said.

The U.S. and Iran have not had diplomatic relations since the 1979 takeover of the U.S. Embassy in Tehran by Iranian students, among which was Abdi.

But later, Abbas turned into a key supporter of President Mohammad Khatami's program of democratic reforms in Iran.

Abdi was on a two-week leave from prison when the court made its ruling. According to the Iranian law, peaceful inmates are permitted to take short breaks to visit their families.

--
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: Mon, 16 May 2005 09:19:38 -0700
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Subject: Re: For those of us who didn't go to Miami
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <0IGL00CSI3KIAT@chimmx04.algx.net>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The article posted by Leo (I'm not blaming him for this, since he's just posting it) uses a sleight of hand technique to misrepresent the debate and thus ignore certain realities. Though pollsters may not care, the evidence that the Ohio outcome was manipulated came via a number of investigations backed by other evidence of a quality admissible in a court of law. The Ohio malfeasance argument does not depend up, nor is it mainly based upon, the exit poll data or analysis.

On the other hand, the many critiques of the NEP exit polls that everyone on this list are aware of pertain to analyses of the overall exit poll data, with particular concentration on the unexplained differences between that data and the actual outcome in many, especially "battleground", states (as opposed to a single state). Whether or not Fritz Scheuren's work proves what is claimed about over-representation of Kerry voters in the exit polling is of interest, but less relevant in the Ohio context than the fact that the article misrepresents what the debate in Ohio has been about (ie. vote suppression and voter intimidation affecting many tens of thousands of votes). The article (and the posting on the ESI web site) conflate two issues that should be kept distinct. Anyone interested in my detailed comments on the exit polls can find them within an article on the election at our web site (www.retropoll.org).

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

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2005 5:19 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: For those of us who didn't go to Miami

Ohio Exit Polls 'Not a Smoking Gun' for Fraud, Study Says
Saturday May 14, 6:54 pm ET
<http://biz.yahoo.com/pnews/050514/nysa019.html?.v=3&printer=1>

MIAMI, May 14 /PRNewswire/ -- A just released analysis confirms pollster Warren Mitofsky's assertion that the exit polls that put John Kerry ahead of George Bush in Ohio on Election Day 2004 do not necessarily indicate that there was fraud in the Ohio election.

Exit polls estimated that Senator John Kerry was leading for Ohio's electoral votes, but not by a large enough margin to be called the winner. Had he won Ohio, he would have won the Presidency. However, the official result was a victory for President George W. Bush. The discrepancy between the polls and the results gave rise to widespread accusations of systematic election fraud.

The new study, commissioned by the Election Science Institute (ESI), was presented on Saturday at the annual conference of the American Association for Public Opinion Research in Miami. It looked at the results of the exit polls, which were conducted by Edison Media Research and Mitofsky International, and compared them to official results from 2004 and 2000.

The research team, led by Dr. Fritz Scheuren, used more detailed information from the exit polls than previous studies. The team was able to use this precinct-level information while preserving ballot secrecy at a local level.

"The more detailed information allowed us to see that voting patterns were consistent with past results and consistent with exit poll results across precincts. It looks more like Bush voters were refusing to participate and less like systematic fraud," Dr. Scheuren said.

Dr. Scheuren is the current President of the American Statistical Association, and Vice President for Statistics at NORC, a research institute based at the University of Chicago.

Steven Hertzberg, project director at the Election Science Institute, spoke to the broader implications.

"We need to develop better tools to monitor our elections. The fact that there is debate over this at all shows that we need elections to be more transparent, more accountable, more auditable," he said. "To increase public confidence in the system ESI has begun working with election officials in Ohio to help publish more timely election data so the public may verify for themselves that the voting and the counting is done

accurately."

The Election Science Institute (ESI) is a non-profit, non-partisan scientific organization based in San Francisco and founded in 2002 under the name Votewatch. ESI monitors public elections in the U.S. to identify voting anomalies which impact election results, and works with election officials to help them improve voting and election systems. ESI conducted its own exit polls in New Mexico for the purpose of assessing voters' experiences.

The paper is being presented at AAPOR 2005's Saturday lunch plenary. The conference is at the Fontainebleau Hilton Resort, 4441 Collins Ave, Miami.

See <http://www.aapor.org>.

For more information on the Election Science Institute, see <http://www.electionscience.org>.

Source: Election Science Institute

--

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: Mon, 16 May 2005 12:19:53 -0400
Reply-To: Michael Bocian <michael_bocian@HOTMAIL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Michael Bocian <michael_bocian@HOTMAIL.COM>
Subject: RDD vs. voter files
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <0IGL0065Q9VW47@chimmx04.algx.net>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; format=flowed

Can anyone point me to studies that have been conducted comparing random

digit dialing samples to voter file samples? If so, are the unweighted results reported, so we can see the differences in age, race and other demographics based on which type of sample was used?

Mike Bocian

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 16 May 2005 11:20:17 -0500
Reply-To: David Tewksbury <tewksbur@UIUC.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: David Tewksbury <tewksbur@UIUC.EDU>
Subject: 2005 MAPOR Call for Submissions
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

The following is the call for submissions to the
2005 MAPOR conference:

Messages for the Masses:
Measuring Public Opinion in Modern Democracies
[]

November 18-19, 2005
Radisson Hotel & Suites, Chicago

Annual Conference of the
Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research

In a time of apparent turmoil and change, information flows continue to have a central place in public discourse. Indeed, it may be that in such times our attention to how information reaches the population and how public opinion reaches elites assume even more importance than usual. The conference theme is designed to encourage participants to consider their research in terms of the ways that our current social, political, and economic environment is shaping communication processes and opinion formation. MAPOR invites proposals addressing any interpretation of the conference theme, as well as any area related to public opinion methodology, theory, and analysis of data. MAPOR is a chapter of the American Association for Public Opinion Research.

Research Papers
Submissions must be abstracts no longer than two typed, double-spaced pages. No full-length papers will be reviewed. Please list the name(s) of the author(s) and affiliation on a separate page (for blind reviewing). Include your full mailing address, telephone number, and e-mail address. Student submissions should be identified as such on the separate

page. Indicate if you would prefer to present your paper in the poster session. You will receive notification of the action on your proposal by August 15.

Student authors are encouraged to participate in the MAPOR Fellow Student Paper Competition. (See the Web site for more details, www.mapor.org.)

Panel Proposals

Submit a written proposal (up to two double-spaced pages). Proposals should identify the topic, explain its importance, and list the potential panelists and their areas of expertise. Panels related to the conference theme are especially encouraged.

Submission Information

All abstracts must be received no later than June 30, 2005, 5pm CDT. Please submit abstracts as electronic attachments in MS Word or PDF format via e-mail to tewksbur@uiuc.edu. If you are unable to send attachments, send the abstract by regular mail. Mail submissions should include four copies of the abstract.

David Tewksbury
MAPOR Program Chair
Department of Speech Communication
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
702 S. Wright St.
Urbana, IL 61801
e-mail: tewksbur@uiuc.edu
Fax: 217-244-1598, Phone: 217-244-7001
[]

Check the MAPOR web site for conference news:
<http://www.mapor.org>

David Tewksbury
Associate Professor
Department of Speech Communication
Department of Political Science
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

244 Lincoln Hall
702 S. Wright St.
Urbana, IL 61801
217-244-7001 (phone)
217-244-1598 (fax)

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Mon, 16 May 2005 12:48:36 -0400
Reply-To: Joe Lenski <jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joe Lenski <jlenski@EDISONRESEARCH.COM>
Subject: Re: RDD vs. voter files
Comments: To: Michael Bocian <michael_bocian@HOTMAIL.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Mike:

The paper that Warren Mitofsky, Joel Bloom et.al. wrote and presented at =
AAPOR on the Oregon Survey hybrid sample combining both RBS and RDD is =
available on the following web site - <http://www.exit-poll.net> and I =
believe at the University of Oregon Survey Research Center web site as =
well although I don't have the exact web site address.

There is data in this paper about the differences in age, race and =
gender between the RBS and RDD portions of the sample. The entire =
sample covers the registered voter population but the RBS and =
modified-RDD samples each cover only part of the population so this may =
not be exactly what you are looking for.

Joe Lenski
Edison Media Research

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Michael Bocian
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2005 12:20 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: RDD vs. voter files

Can anyone point me to studies that have been conducted comparing random
digit dialing samples to voter file samples? If so, are the unweighted
results reported, so we can see the differences in age, race and other
demographics based on which type of sample was used?

Mike Bocian

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, 16 May 2005 09:55:30 -0700

Reply-To: Michael Alexander <michaelcalexander@YAHOO.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
Comments: DomainKeys? See <http://antispam.yahoo.com/domainkeys>
From: Michael Alexander <michaelcalexander@YAHOO.COM>
Subject: Re: RDD vs. voter files-Green/Gerber paper
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <6667@post3.inre.asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Enough Already with Random Digit Dialing:
Can Registration-Based Sampling Improve the Accuracy
of

Election Forecasts?

Donald P. Green

Yale University

Alan S. Gerber

Yale University

<http://www.vcsnet.com/pdf/RegistrationBasedSampling.pdf>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Mon, 16 May 2005 10:13:05 -0700
Reply-To: egodard@csun.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Ellis Godard <ellis.godard@CSUN.EDU>
Subject: AAPOR on AUT?
Comments: To: AAPORNet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I'm surprised that the AUT boycott, and the many responses to it, have not received attention on this list - perhaps I should have raised it earlier. This is an issue on which AAPOR ought to take a stand, defending free inquiry in the face of overt ideology and explicit politicalization.

-eg

<http://hnn.us/blogs/entries/11931.html>

CLIOPATRIA: A Group Blog (History News Network)
Sunday, May 15, 2005

Condemning the Boycott of Israeli Academics ...

The on-line petition created by Penn's Jeff Weintraub asks academic and scholarly associations to support the American Association of University Professors' (AAUP) condemnation of the British Association of University Teachers' (AUT) boycott of two Israeli universities, Haifa and Bar-Ilan, and

blacklisting of their faculty members. Mechal Sobel, one of Cliopatria's Contributing Editors, is a faculty member at Haifa. I have signed the petition and urge others to consider doing so.

Among the 4200 persons who have signed the petition are:
Robert Abzug, Joyce Appleby, Stanley Aronowitz, Omer Bartov, Gail Bederman, David Beito, Robert Bellah, Peter Berkowitz, David Bernstein, Michael Berube, Harold Bloom, Miriam Elizabeth Burstein, Ian Buruma, Oscar Chamberlain, Juan Cole, David Brion Davis, Morris Dickstein, Sherman Dorn, Jonathan Dresner, Ellen Carol DuBois, Jean Bethke Elshtain, Cynthia Fuchs Epstein, Henry Farrell, John Lewis Gaddis, Herbert Gans, Norm Geras, Todd Gitlin, Nathan Glazer, Steven Horwitz, KC Johnson, Tony Judt, Ira Katznelson, Michael Kazin, Margaret L. King, Harvey Klehr, Mark A. R. Kleiman, Jacob T. Levy, Deborah Lipstadt, Ralph E. Luker, Charles Maier, Elaine Tyler May, Joanne Meyerowitz, Richard Rorty, Roy Rosenzweig, Vicki Ruiz, Hugo Schwyzer, Christine Stansell, Michael Walzer, Jon Wiener, Leon Wieseltier, and Alan Wolfe.

The Middle East Studies Association (MESA) has issued a statement condemning the AUT boycott/blacklist. The American Political Science Association (APSA) has done the same, explicitly endorsing the AAUP statement. Jon Wiener and I have asked the executive committees of the AHA and the OAH to support the AAUP's position. In Sunday's Washington Post is one of the first pieces covering this issue in the American press. See also: Juan Cole at Informed Comment, Chris Bertram at Crooked Timber, David Velleman at Left2Right, Hugo Schwyzer, and Sharon Howard and KC Johnson at Cliopatria.

Posted by Ralph E. Luker on Sunday, May 15, 2005 at 11:54 PM

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, 16 May 2005 13:43:27 -0400
Reply-To: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>
Subject: Re: For those of us who didn't go to Miami
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <000601c55a33\$11d6f820\$9116bc43@RetroPoll>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

At 12:19 PM 5/16/05, Marc Sapir wrote:

>The article posted by Leo (I'm not blaming him for this, since he's just
>posting it) uses a sleight of hand technique to misrepresent the debate
>and thus ignore certain realities.

Well, look, there is more than one debate. ESI didn't just make up the argument that the Ohio exit polls evince fraud -- that argument is out there. Certainly that debate isn't the same as the one about vote suppression and voter intimidation.

Mark Blumenthal just posted an excellent round-up of the exit poll panel at <http://www.mysterypollster.com>, another great resource for those of us who didn't go to Miami. (It's fresh, so it is subject to copy-editing.)

Mark Lindeman

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Mon, 16 May 2005 13:43:38 -0700
Reply-To: Jon Ebeling <pols331@ROCKO.LAB.CSUCHICO.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jon Ebeling <pols331@ROCKO.LAB.CSUCHICO.EDU>
Subject: Hello all
Comments: To: aapornet <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Does anyone know of some firms that might sell registration based samples for telephone interviewing?

I have generally used rdd samples, but now it might be necessary to use registration based sample frames.

Please send the responses to this address:

pols331@rocko.csuchico.edu

thanks for your help. If you wish a list of the responses, send me a note and I will gather them and send them to you.

jon ebeling

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Mon, 16 May 2005 17:29:58 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: More AAPOR presentation links

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

While reading the Mystery Pollster's summary of the exit poll presentation:
http://www.mysterypollster.com/main/2005/05/aapor_exit_poll.html

I noted that he had a link to Fritz Scheuren's AAPOR presentation in PDF format.
http://www.electionscience.org/Members/StevenHertzberg/report.2005-05-14.4978140903/report_contents_file/

Poking around at the electionscience.org website I also stumbled across this:

Exit Polling about the Voting Experience: Outcomes and Lessons Learned
http://www.electionscience.org/Members/StevenHertzberg/report.2005-05-14.0536994625/report_contents_file/

--

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: Mon, 16 May 2005 19:38:55 -0500
Reply-To: jankiley@soltec.net
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Kiley <jankiley@SOLTEC.NET>
Subject: Re: BCBSA Director of Brand and Market Research Opportunity
Comments: To: Aapornet <AAPORNET@asu.edu>,
"Henkel, Amanda" <Amanda.Henkel@es.ATKearney.com>
In-Reply-To: <980DF0DC126DCC4F843C293060EF99FA1FB193@wwexch03.atkearney.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

BCBSA Director of Brand and Market Research Opportunity AAPORNET--Please consider this position or pass it on to others. Hope it "fits" someone.

Jan Kiley
Research Survey Service, Inc.
Champaign, Illinois 61820
217-239-7880

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

From: Henkel, Amanda [mailto:Amanda.Henkel@es.ATKearney.com]
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2005 7:38 PM
To: jankiley@soltec.net

Subject: BCBSA Director of Brand and Market Research Opportunity

Jan,

Many thanks for briefly speaking with me this afternoon. As discussed I am working on a Director of Brand and Market Research search for the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association and would appreciate you posting this opportunity on the AAPOR web site. I have attached a position description to give you greater insight into the BCBSA and the role itself. A few attractive aspects of this position include:

- Leading company in the health care space
- Role involves exposure to and interaction with forward-thinkers and innovators that shape health care initiatives
- Strategic, consultative role that draws upon quantitative and qualitative skills

Feel free to contact me directly if you have any questions.

Regards,
Amanda Henkel

Amanda Henkel
Consultant
A.T. Kearney Executive Search
222 West Adams
Chicago, IL 60606
312-223-6042 (o)
312-925-3345 ©

<<BCBSA PD5.18.05.doc>>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Mon, 16 May 2005 20:53:11 -0500
Reply-To: jankiley@soltec.net
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jan Kiley <jankiley@SOLTEC.NET>
Subject: Job opening--originally sent to Jan Kiley, member
Comments: To: Aapornet <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=Windows-1252
Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT

Blue Cross Blue Shield Association

A.T. KEARNEY EXECUTIVE SEARCH

POSITION SPECIFICATION

TITLE: Director of Brand and Market
Research

COMPANY: Blue Cross Blue Shield Association
(BCBSA)

LOCATION: Chicago, Illinois

COMPANY

DESCRIPTION: The Blue Cross story began in 1929 when Justin Ford Kimball, an official at Baylor University in Dallas, introduced a plan to guarantee school teachers 21 days of hospital care for \$6 a year. Other groups of employees in Dallas soon joined the plan, and the idea quickly attracted nationwide attention.

In 1933, E.A. van Steenwyk, an executive with the forerunner of Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Minnesota, began to identify his hospital care program with a blue-colored cross design. Other groups elsewhere in the country followed suit, and in 1939 the Blue Cross symbol was officially adopted by a commission of the American Hospital Association (AHA) as the national emblem for Plans that met certain guidelines.

In 1960, the commission was replaced by the Blue Cross Association, which was independent of the AHA. All formal ties with the AHA were severed in 1972.

The Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association, created in 1982, is the result of a merger of the Blue Cross Association and the National Association of Blue Shield Plans.

Today, Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association is a membership organization of many independent, locally operated companies called Member Plans located in 50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, as well as Canada, England, Jamaica, and affiliates in Argentina, Belgium, Taiwan and Uruguay, and offer health insurance products to all segments of the population. The Association is the owner of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield trade name and service marks, and licenses their use to the independent Member Plans.

BCBSA functions like a large company, with services to offer to Member Plans. BCBSA is a leading supplier of business strategy, technical support, health care services, and consulting expertise. Blue Cross and Blue Shield Plans have provided the highest quality healthcare financing services that today are dependent on more than 70 million consumers nationwide. Approximately 40 percent of the Plans are managed care and 60 percent indemnity.

REPORTING

RELATIONSHIPS: The Director of Brand and Market Research will report to the Senior Research Executive. He/She will have a staff of 7.

EDUCATION: An advanced degree is desirable. A PhD/Master's (or equivalent work experience) in one of the following – Statistical Analysis, Evaluation Research, Applied Statistics, Economics or applied social science highly desirable.

POSITION CHARTER: The Director of Brand and Market Research is responsible for the planning, goal setting, and research initiatives to maximize the Association's effectiveness with and services to Plans. He/she will lead the development and implementation of research strategies and programs in these areas to ensure they are consistent with and support the system business objectives.

RESPONSIBILITIES: Responsibilities include:

- Direct survey research to business decisionmakers in Human Resources, Plans and Providers. Relate research outcomes in a relevant manner to the business unit.
- Manage the development, implementation, and monitoring of a survey research program to meet the strategic needs of the Association and its member Plans. Assure research is meeting expectations and planned deadlines.
- Ensure that the reports, analysis and studies meet business objectives. Responsible for the daily oversight and measurement of target levels of success. Develop tools to enable the continual analysis of these levels to ensure the achievement of business objectives. Direct the development of contractual relationships with research consultants and vendors for the survey research.
- Ensure successful operation of the department by selecting, supervising and evaluating the activities of subordinate staff, measuring the effectiveness of their efforts in meeting departmental objectives.
- Develop and maintain a network of key contacts and research experts and groups to share best practices and emerging business trends.

QUALIFICATIONS AND

CHARACTERISTICS:

- Requires consistent interaction with BCBSA senior management and Plan senior management. Develop and maintain working relations with Plan research executives, Association management, Office of Personnel Management, and professionals in the health services industry.
- Good experience and extensive background in Healthcare Services, Economic or Survey Analysis Research is required.
- Project management experience in survey development and analyses that demonstrates an ability to establish and manage multiple priorities is critical. The ability to assume accountability for outcomes and end results is key. The ability to formulate and implement research strategy and define and manage the work/actions necessary to accomplish set business objectives is essential.

- A demonstrated ability to relate survey and other research findings to strategic decisions and translate business needs into researchable questions is imperative.
- Demonstrated organizational, budgeting and project management skills of both people and resources are required.
- Excellent verbal, presentation and written communication skills, as well as the ability to establish and manage multiple priorities are key.
- The ability to gain various viewpoints and arrive at critical decisions is imperative.
- The ability to develop and implement strategic initiatives is key.
- The ability to quickly develop and maintain excellent working relationships building on mutual trust and professional credibility with internal and external constituents is essential.
- Academy of Health Management within first year of employment is highly desired.

COMPENSATION: Compensation is commensurate with experience and will include a base plus a bonus. Relocation costs will be reimbursed.

For further information contact:

Amanda Henkel, Consultant

Telephone: (312) 223-6042

E-Mail:

amanda.henkel@atkearney.com

A.T. Kearney Executive Search

222 West Adams Street

Suite 2500

Chicago, IL 60606

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Tue, 17 May 2005 00:40:37 -0400
Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: Re: For those of us who didn't go to Miami
Comments: To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <000601c55a33\$11d6f820\$9116bc43@RetroPoll>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Marc Sapir once again is talking without knowing what was said in Miami. The exit polls do nothing to establish or disprove the claim of fraud in Ohio. The so-called unexplained questions I thought were answered in Miami. The other fraud arguments were never discussed. Only five of the original 20+ something who made up the group that raised the questions about the exit polls signed their current release. Their own members don't believe their arguments any longer -- just Marc.
warren mitofsky

At 12:19 PM 5/16/2005, Marc Sapir wrote:

>The article posted by Leo (I'm not blaming him for this, since he's just
>posting it) uses a sleight of hand technique to misrepresent the debate
>and thus ignore certain realities. Though pollsters may not care, the
>evidence that the Ohio outcome was manipulated came via a number of
>investigations backed by other evidence of a quality admissible in a
>court of law. The Ohio malfeasance argument does not depend up, nor is
>it mainly based upon, the exit poll data or analysis.

>
>On the other hand, the many critiques of the NEP exit polls that
>everyone on this list are aware of pertain to analyses of the overall
>exit poll data, with particular concentration on the unexplained
>differences between that data and the actual outcome in many, especially
>"battleground", states (as opposed to a single state). Whether or not
>Fritz Scheuren's work proves what is claimed about over-representation
>of Kerry voters in the exit polling is of interest, but less relevant in
>the Ohio context than the fact that the article misrepresents what the
>debate in Ohio has been about (ie. vote suppression and voter
>intimidation affecting many tens of thousands of votes). The article
>(and the posting on the ESI web site) conflate two issues that should be
>kept distinct. Anyone interested in my detailed comments on the exit
>polls can find them within an article on the election at our web site
>(www.retropoll.org.).

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

>
>-----Original Message-----
>From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
>Sent: Monday, May 16, 2005 5:19 AM
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>Subject: For those of us who didn't go to Miami
>
>Ohio Exit Polls 'Not a Smoking Gun' for Fraud, Study Says
>Saturday May 14, 6:54 pm ET
><http://biz.yahoo.com/prnews/050514/nysa019.html?.v=3&printer=1>
>
>MIAMI, May 14 /PRNewswire/ -- A just released analysis confirms pollster
>Warren Mitofsky's assertion that the exit polls that put John Kerry
>ahead
>of George Bush in Ohio on Election Day 2004 do not necessarily indicate
>that there was fraud in the Ohio election.
>
>Exit polls estimated that Senator John Kerry was leading for Ohio's
>electoral votes, but not by a large enough margin to be called the
>winner.
>Had he won Ohio, he would have won the Presidency. However, the official
>result was a victory for President George W. Bush. The discrepancy
>between
>the polls and the results gave rise to widespread accusations of
>systematic
>election fraud.
>
>The new study, commissioned by the Election Science Institute (ESI), was
>presented on Saturday at the annual conference of the American
>Association
>for Public Opinion Research in Miami. It looked at the results of the
>exit
>polls, which were conducted by Edison Media Research and Mitofsky
>International, and compared them to official results from 2004 and 2000.
>
>The research team, led by Dr. Fritz Scheuren, used more detailed
>information from the exit polls than previous studies. The team was able
>to
>use this precinct-level information while preserving ballot secrecy at a
>local level.
>
>"The more detailed information allowed us to see that voting patterns
>were
>consistent with past results and consistent with exit poll results
>across
>precincts. It looks more like Bush voters were refusing to participate
>and
>less like systematic fraud," Dr. Scheuren said.
>
>Dr. Scheuren is the current President of the American Statistical
>Association, and Vice President for Statistics at NORC, a research
>institute based at the University of Chicago.
>
>Steven Hertzberg, project director at the Election Science Institute,

>spoke
>to the broader implications.
>
>"We need to develop better tools to monitor our elections. The fact that
>there is debate over this at all shows that we need elections to be more
>transparent, more accountable, more auditable," he said. "To increase
>public confidence in the system ESI has begun working with election
>officials in Ohio to help publish more timely election data so the
>public
>may verify for themselves that the voting and the counting is done
>accurately."
>
>The Election Science Institute (ESI) is a non-profit, non-partisan
>scientific organization based in San Francisco and founded in 2002 under
>the name Votewatch. ESI monitors public elections in the U.S. to
>identify
>voting anomalies which impact election results, and works with election
>officials to help them improve voting and election systems. ESI
>conducted
>its own exit polls in New Mexico for the purpose of assessing voters'
>experiences.
>
>The paper is being presented at AAPOR 2005's Saturday lunch plenary. The
>conference is at the Fontainebleau Hilton Resort, 4441 Collins Ave,
>Miami.
>See <http://www.aapor.org>.
>
>For more information on the Election Science Institute, see
><http://www.electionscience.org>.
>
>
>
>
>-----
>---
>-----
>Source: Election Science Institute
>
>--
>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: Mon, 16 May 2005 22:03:47 -0700
Reply-To: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Marc Sapir <marcsapir@COMCAST.NET>
Subject: Re: For those of us who didn't go to Miami
Comments: To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <6.2.1.2.2.20050517003542.0349c618@pop.mindspring.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Warren,

You must really be upset. I totally agree with your comment that the exit polls "do nothing to establish or disprove the claim of fraud." That was my point. I didn't make any explicit criticism about the exit polls in my post and my reference to papers critiquing the exit polls were just that, references, not necessarily an opinion about their validity, just to point out that answering a critique of the exit polls might have been better done with an analysis that avoided Ohio, because the main issue there is different.

I wrote my comment after receiving a press release posted on the AAPOR list. I was critiquing a press release that seems to conflate two issues into one. My main concern in this post had nothing to do with your work or with the veracity of Sheuren's analysis of that work, although I did refer to a critical paper I wrote. I can't understand how you would let your hostility cause you to respond without carefully reading my e-mail over a few times. To react that way isn't healthy. ("Marc Sapir is once again.") My post just isn't about what you claim it is and in taking it personally you have missed the point.

marc

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

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

From: Warren Mitofsky [mailto:mitofsky@mindspring.com]
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2005 8:41 PM
To: Marc Sapir; AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: For those of us who didn't go to Miami

Marc Sapir once again is talking without knowing what was said in Miami. The exit polls do nothing to establish or disprove the claim of fraud in Ohio. The so-called unexplained questions I thought were answered in Miami. The other fraud arguments were never discussed. Only five of the original 20+ something who made up the group that raised the questions

about the exit polls signed their current release. Their own members don't believe their arguments any longer -- just Marc.
warren mitofsky

At 12:19 PM 5/16/2005, Marc Sapir wrote:

The article posted by Leo (I'm not blaming him for this, since he's just posting it) uses a sleight of hand technique to misrepresent the debate and thus ignore certain realities. Though pollsters may not care, the evidence that the Ohio outcome was manipulated came via a number of investigations backed by other evidence of a quality admissible in a court of law. The Ohio malfeasance argument does not depend up, nor is it mainly based upon, the exit poll data or analysis.

On the other hand, the many critiques of the NEP exit polls that everyone on this list are aware of pertain to analyses of the overall exit poll data, with particular concentration on the unexplained differences between that data and the actual outcome in many, especially "battleground", states (as opposed to a single state). Whether or not Fritz Scheuren's work proves what is claimed about over-representation of Kerry voters in the exit polling is of interest, but less relevant in the Ohio context than the fact that the article misrepresents what the debate in Ohio has been about (ie. vote suppression and voter intimidation affecting many tens of thousands of votes). The article (and the posting on the ESI web site) conflate two issues that should be kept distinct. Anyone interested in my detailed comments on the exit polls can find them within an article on the election at our web site (www.retropoll.org <<http://www.retropoll.org>>).

Marc Sapir MD, MPH
Executive Director
Retro Poll
www.retropoll.org <<http://www.retropoll.org>>

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

From: AAPORNET [<<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>> <mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2005 5:19 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: For those of us who didn't go to Miami

Ohio Exit Polls 'Not a Smoking Gun' for Fraud, Study Says
Saturday May 14, 6:54 pm ET
<http://biz.yahoo.com/prnews/050514/nysa019.html?.v=3>
<<http://biz.yahoo.com/prnews/050514/nysa019.html?.v=3&printer=1>>
&printer=1

MIAMI, May 14 /PRNewswire/ -- A just released analysis confirms pollster Warren Mitofsky's assertion that the exit polls that put John Kerry ahead of George Bush in Ohio on Election Day 2004 do not necessarily indicate that there was fraud in the Ohio election.

Exit polls estimated that Senator John Kerry was leading for Ohio's electoral votes, but not by a large enough margin to be called the winner.

Had he won Ohio, he would have won the Presidency. However, the official result was a victory for President George W. Bush. The discrepancy between the polls and the results gave rise to widespread accusations of systematic election fraud.

The new study, commissioned by the Election Science Institute (ESI), was presented on Saturday at the annual conference of the American Association for Public Opinion Research in Miami. It looked at the results of the exit polls, which were conducted by Edison Media Research and Mitofsky International, and compared them to official results from 2004 and 2000.

The research team, led by Dr. Fritz Scheuren, used more detailed information from the exit polls than previous studies. The team was able to use this precinct-level information while preserving ballot secrecy at a local level.

"The more detailed information allowed us to see that voting patterns were consistent with past results and consistent with exit poll results across precincts. It looks more like Bush voters were refusing to participate and less like systematic fraud," Dr. Scheuren said.

Dr. Scheuren is the current President of the American Statistical Association, and Vice President for Statistics at NORC, a research institute based at the University of Chicago.

Steven Hertzberg, project director at the Election Science Institute, spoke to the broader implications.

"We need to develop better tools to monitor our elections. The fact that there is debate over this at all shows that we need elections to be more transparent, more accountable, more auditable," he said. "To increase public confidence in the system ESI has begun working with election officials in Ohio to help publish more timely election data so the public may verify for themselves that the voting and the counting is done accurately."

The Election Science Institute (ESI) is a non-profit, non-partisan scientific organization based in San Francisco and founded in 2002 under the name Votewatch. ESI monitors public elections in the U.S. to identify

voting anomalies which impact election results, and works with election officials to help them improve voting and election systems. ESI conducted its own exit polls in New Mexico for the purpose of assessing voters' experiences.

The paper is being presented at AAPOR 2005's Saturday lunch plenary. The conference is at the Fontainebleau Hilton Resort, 4441 Collins Ave, Miami.

See <http://www.aapor.org> <<http://www.aapor.org>> .

For more information on the Election Science Institute, see <http://www.electionscience.org> <<http://www.electionscience.org>> .

Source: Election Science Institute

--

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: Tue, 17 May 2005 10:48:16 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: No Quick Fix for Exit Polls - Business Week
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

COMMENTARY
By Peter Coy

No Quick Fix for Exit Polls

The media group that oversees these surveys analyzed past mistakes, but the proposed changes look difficult to implement

Exit polls that were either flawed or misused caused problems in each of the last three national elections. On Election Night 2000, the networks picked Al Gore to win Florida, even though the actual results were a virtual dead heat. In 2002, computer snafus prevented the exit pollsters from reporting data to subscribers. In 2004, exit polls produced sometimes-unreliable results -- and were leaked to the Internet, where overeager bloggers concluded that John Kerry was poised to win the Presidency.

SNIP

On May 14 in Miami Beach, the pollsters laid out their plan of action in a forum at the annual meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research. They said they hope to prevent leaks of exit-poll data, shrink the exit-poll questionnaire so more voters will be willing to complete it, get permission for interviewers to stand closer to the exits to catch more voters on their way out, and improve the recruiting and training of the interviewers.

SNIP

EMERGING PROBLEMS. Still, all those problems pale in comparison with the difficulty of recruiting and training reliable interviewers. To ensure a random selection of voters, interviewers are supposed to approach and interview every, say, fifth voter who emerges from the polling place. But if that fifth voter happens to look unwilling to chat, the interviewer may pick someone else -- spoiling the randomness that's crucial to accurate polling.

One solution is to change the demographic mix of interviewers so they more closely match the ages of the voting public. But older interviewers are more expensive to hire, Joe Lenski, co-founder and executive vice-president of Edison Media Research, tells BusinessWeek Online. Lenski's firm is one of those hired by the National Election Pool. Also, he says, the demographic mismatches that caused problems in 2004 might not be the same ones that cause problems in 2006 -- because a lot depends on who the candidates are.

The organizations that constitute the National Election Pool are among the biggest names in media: ABC, Associated Press, CBS, CNN, Fox, and NBC. They're trying to get it right. But it seems like every two years, some new problem reaches up and bites them.

In Miami Beach this past weekend, they came clean about what went wrong last time and vowed to do better in 2006. The world will be watching.

--

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, 17 May 2005 15:13:42 -0400
Reply-To: Steve Freeman <steven.f.freeman@VERIZON.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Steve Freeman <steven.f.freeman@VERIZON.NET>
Organization: U Penn
Subject: Exit poll-election questions were NOT answered in Miami
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear Warren and members of the AAPOR community:

The fact that the original authors of the USCountVotes papers, myself included, did not sign the current release does NOT imply that we no longer believe the arguments, just that we lack time and resources to uphold our end of a fruitless non-debate.

The recent fuss over WPE and alternative analyses is about whether the E/M model proposed to account for unprecedented differences between their exit polls and the recorded vote is impossibly implausible or just highly implausible.

The bottom line remains that there is no evidence - or even theory - of differential response. There has never been any. The E/M data itself fails to substantiate the claim, and may, in fact, undermine the claim entirely. Without access to the data, it's difficult to know.

The unexplained questions about the exit poll and the election have certainly NOT been answered, either in Miami or anywhere else. In a system where campaign managers serve as election supervisors, where voting machines provide no assurance that votes are counted as cast, where a wide array of "irregularities" (a.k.a. vote suppression, vote manipulation, and mistabulation) were documented, and where counts and "recounts" are conducted in secret, the exit poll results stand out as conspicuously suspicious. The exit poll data, for all its limitations, is one of the only means to gain both national and local insights into whether, in fact, the official reported results of the presidential election were even in the ballpark.

That the relevant data has not been made available for independent analysis

is inconsistent with the principles of a scientific community - or, for that matter, a democracy.

Indeed of all the multitude of unanswered questions, perhaps the most puzzling is how highly intelligent, decent people can take the position that the data ought not be independently analyzed.

Steve Freeman

Steven F. Freeman * Center for Organizational Dynamics * University of Pennsylvania * (215) 898-6967 * Fax: (215) 898-8934 * stfreema@sas.upenn.edu * www.organizationaldynamics.upenn.edu/center * www.appliedresearch.us/sf/

2004 presidential election research/writing:
www.appliedresearch.us/sf/epdiscrep

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

From: Warren Mitofsky
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2005 00:41
Subject: Re: For those of us who didn't go to Miami

Marc Sapir once again is talking without knowing what was said in Miami. The exit polls do nothing to establish or disprove the claim of fraud in Ohio. The so-called unexplained questions I thought were answered in Miami.

The other fraud arguments were never discussed. Only five of the original 20+ something who made up the group that raised the questions about the 20+ exit polls signed their current release. Their own members don't believe their arguments any longer -- just Marc.

warren mitofsky

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Tue, 17 May 2005 10:44:29 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Wardy phone polls unethical, mayoral challenger Cook says
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Wardy phone polls unethical, mayoral challenger Cook says
<http://www.borderlandnews.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20050517/NEWS0201/505170326/1001>
David Crowder
El Paso Times

Northeast city Rep. John Cook, who is running for mayor, accused Mayor Joe Wardy at a news conference Monday of launching a deceptive and unethical push-poll against him last Friday.

Such polls, Cook said, trick people into listening to attacks on an opponent in what is initially characterized by the caller as a legitimate poll.

SNIP

Wardy said the poll, by TDM Research and Communication of Birmingham, Ala., is legitimate.

He said he would provide information about the poll, including the questions, but could not be reached later in the day. TDM's owner did not return phone calls.

"All I can say is we are conducting a poll to understand the issues and illustrating the very big differences between myself and Mr. Cook, which is in my rights as a candidate," Wardy said. "I'm going to win this race. And so I'm going to play hardball now like Mr. Cook has and (how he has) criticized my record for six months."

SNIP

Roger Tourangeau, the former standards chairman of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, said the group disapproves of push-polls.

"They're more intent on changing opinions than on measuring them," he said.

Copyright C 2004 El Paso Times

--

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, 17 May 2005 07:49:42 -0700
Reply-To: Election Science Institute <forum@VOTEWATCH.US>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Election Science Institute <forum@VOTEWATCH.US>
Subject: Re: For those of us who didn't go to Miami
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <6.2.1.2.2.20050517003542.0349c618@pop.mindspring.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

ESI can comment on the other issues that Marc addresses, namely that, vote suppression and voter intimidation affected many tens of thousands of votes. While these specific issues were not discussed at the conference, Fritz Scheuren did say that ESI was not able to find systemic fraud sufficient to alter the outcome of the presidential race in Ohio. This statement was based upon various analyses that we've conducted since the election. Our reports will be issued over the next several months.

But let me make a few comments here to try to address Marc's email. First, it is clear that Secretary of State Blackwell issued a number of directives prior to the election that caused confusion in Ohio amongst voters and that this may have directly caused some disenfranchisement. Second, we do not yet see evidence that the long wait times by voters in Ohio was caused by an intentional mis-allocation of voting machines. Wait times in the central city is a factor of numerous variables, including the availability of adequate polling locations. We are currently studying the machine allocation issues from 2004 and will be using our findings to develop a model for optimizing machine allocation in future election. We'll issue a report later this year on this which will help us understand whether machine allocation was in fact related in any way to race, socioeconomic status or political preference.

In general, ESI is working to address all of the major issues, keeping them distinct and separate. Our exit polling study was simply the first analysis to be released. We've also evaluated the back office operations of election officials, accuracy of ballot accounting, various election data and more. These studies are providing us with real insights into the election system that we can leverage to develop and implement appropriate improvements.

Steven Hertzberg
Election Science Institute
2269 Chestnut Street, 611
San Francisco, California 94123
T: 650-373-4960

<http://www.electionscience.org>
Improving the American Election Process

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2005 9:41 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: For those of us who didn't go to Miami

Marc Sapir once again is talking without knowing what was said in Miami. The exit polls do nothing to establish or disprove the claim of fraud in Ohio. The so-called unexplained questions I thought were answered in Miami. The other fraud arguments were never discussed. Only five of the original 20+ something who made up the group that raised the questions about the exit polls signed their current release. Their own members don't believe

their arguments any longer -- just Marc.
warren mitofsky

At 12:19 PM 5/16/2005, Marc Sapir wrote:

>The article posted by Leo (I'm not blaming him for this, since he's
>just posting it) uses a sleight of hand technique to misrepresent the
>debate and thus ignore certain realities. Though pollsters may not
>care, the evidence that the Ohio outcome was manipulated came via a
>number of investigations backed by other evidence of a quality
>admissible in a court of law. The Ohio malfeasance argument does not
>depend up, nor is it mainly based upon, the exit poll data or analysis.

>
>On the other hand, the many critiques of the NEP exit polls that
>everyone on this list are aware of pertain to analyses of the overall
>exit poll data, with particular concentration on the unexplained
>differences between that data and the actual outcome in many,
>especially "battleground", states (as opposed to a single state).
>Whether or not Fritz Scheuren's work proves what is claimed about
>over-representation of Kerry voters in the exit polling is of interest,
>but less relevant in the Ohio context than the fact that the article
>misrepresents what the debate in Ohio has been about (ie. vote
>suppression and voter intimidation affecting many tens of thousands of
>votes). The article (and the posting on the ESI web site) conflate two
>issues that should be kept distinct. Anyone interested in my detailed
>comments on the exit polls can find them within an article on the
>election at our web site (www.retropoll.org).

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

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

>From: AAPORNET [<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
>Sent: Monday, May 16, 2005 5:19 AM
>To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
>Subject: For those of us who didn't go to Miami

>
>Ohio Exit Polls 'Not a Smoking Gun' for Fraud, Study Says Saturday May
>14, 6:54 pm ET
><http://biz.yahoo.com/prnews/050514/nysa019.html?.v=3&printer=1>

>
>MIAMI, May 14 /PRNewswire/ -- A just released analysis confirms
>pollster Warren Mitofsky's assertion that the exit polls that put John
>Kerry ahead of George Bush in Ohio on Election Day 2004 do not
>necessarily indicate that there was fraud in the Ohio election.

>
>Exit polls estimated that Senator John Kerry was leading for Ohio's
>electoral votes, but not by a large enough margin to be called the
>winner.
>Had he won Ohio, he would have won the Presidency. However, the
>official result was a victory for President George W. Bush. The
>discrepancy between the polls and the results gave rise to widespread

>accusations of systematic election fraud.

>

>The new study, commissioned by the Election Science Institute (ESI),
>was presented on Saturday at the annual conference of the American
>Association for Public Opinion Research in Miami. It looked at the
>results of the exit polls, which were conducted by Edison Media
>Research and Mitofsky International, and compared them to official
>results from 2004 and 2000.

>

>The research team, led by Dr. Fritz Scheuren, used more detailed
>information from the exit polls than previous studies. The team was
>able to use this precinct-level information while preserving ballot
>secrecy at a local level.

>

>"The more detailed information allowed us to see that voting patterns
>were consistent with past results and consistent with exit poll results
>across precincts. It looks more like Bush voters were refusing to
>participate and less like systematic fraud," Dr. Scheuren said.

>

>Dr. Scheuren is the current President of the American Statistical
>Association, and Vice President for Statistics at NORC, a research
>institute based at the University of Chicago.

>

>Steven Hertzberg, project director at the Election Science Institute,
>spoke to the broader implications.

>

>"We need to develop better tools to monitor our elections. The fact
>that there is debate over this at all shows that we need elections to
>be more transparent, more accountable, more auditable," he said. "To
>increase public confidence in the system ESI has begun working with
>election officials in Ohio to help publish more timely election data so
>the public may verify for themselves that the voting and the counting
>is done accurately."

>

>The Election Science Institute (ESI) is a non-profit, non-partisan
>scientific organization based in San Francisco and founded in 2002
>under the name Votewatch. ESI monitors public elections in the U.S. to
>identify voting anomalies which impact election results, and works with
>election officials to help them improve voting and election systems.
>ESI conducted its own exit polls in New Mexico for the purpose of
>assessing voters'
>experiences.

>

>The paper is being presented at AAPOR 2005's Saturday lunch plenary.
>The conference is at the Fontainebleau Hilton Resort, 4441 Collins Ave,
>Miami.

>See <http://www.aapor.org>.

>

>For more information on the Election Science Institute, see
><http://www.electionscience.org>.

>

>

>

>

>-----
>
>---
>-----
>Source: Election Science Institute
>
>--
>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.

=====
Date: Tue, 17 May 2005 17:59:02 -0400
Reply-To: AmyRSimon@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Amy Simon <AmyRSimon@AOL.COM>
Subject: Other valuable conference for survey researchers?
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Dear AAPOR folks,

Having just returned from Miami I am busy reviewing various presentations and thinking about how to incorporate findings into our own approaches and best practices. I find the AAPOR conference to be both thought-provoking and valuable in terms of exploring and evaluating a wide variety of methodological approaches and issues.

I'm wondering if there are other conferences that survey researchers out there also find valuable.

Any thoughts are welcome.

Thank you,

Amy

Amy R.Simon
Goodwin Simon Strategic Research
870 Market Street, Suite 1074
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 835-9889
f: (415) 835-9993
www.goodwinsimon.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Wed, 18 May 2005 10:03:46 -0400
Reply-To: Diane Bowers <dbowers@casro.org>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Diane Bowers <dbowers@CASRO.ORG>
Organization: CASRO
Subject: Research & Regulation
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

For your information and review, the most recent issue of Research & Regulation, CASRO's Government & Public Affairs newsletter, is available on our website -- www.casro.org. Please let me know if you have any questions.
Thanks, Diane

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, 18 May 2005 08:59:03 -0600
Reply-To: Corinne Kirchner <corinne@AFB.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Corinne Kirchner <corinne@AFB.NET>
Subject: FW: BOGUS CENSUS SURVEY
Comments: To: AAPORnet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Here's a truly extreme example of "sugging" -- maybe it needs a label =
unto itself.

=20

Corinne

From: Terriann2K@aol.com [mailto:Terriann2K@aol.com]
Sent: Wed 5/18/2005 8:49 AM
To: Terriann2K@aol.com
Subject: BOGUS CENSUS SURVEY

Hello, census stakeholders.

=20
Officials at Census Bureau headquarters have asked me to alert =
stakeholders to a phony survey making the rounds, that misappropriates =
the U.S. Census Bureau's name, logo, and home page. The fake survey was =
discovered by Bureau staff in the Charlotte Regional Office. It =
contains questions about the Iraq war and offers \$5.00 for completing =
the survey; when recipients click on the link, they are asked for bank =
account numbers.

=20
We wanted you to know about this problem in case you receive any =
inquiries from your constituencies. Obviously, the Census Bureau will =
refer this case to appropriate law enforcement authorities.

=20
A "cut and paste" copy of the "survey" is below my signature, for your =
reference.

=20
Thanks,
=20
Terri Ann
=20
Terri Ann Lowenthal
Legislative & Policy Consultant
1250 4th St., SW
Apt. W615
Washington, DC 20024
(tel.) 202-484-3067
TerriAnn2K@aol.com

=20
Operation Iraqi Freedom 2005 Survey - \$5 Instant Cash Reward =
=20

=

=20
The U.S. Census Bureau in association with participating banks will =

=20
instantly credit \$5 to your account - =

=20
Just for taking part in our quick & easy 5 question survey! =

=20
=

=20
=

=20
Why do we care? =

=20
Iraq has endured decades of collapsing hopes and accumulating tragedy. =

It=20
is numbing to consider the waste of so much human and resource =
potential.=20
Saddam's ambitions conflicted with the region and the international =
=20
community. True to his name, he too often chose confrontation over =
=20
cooperation. Ultimately these decisions led to total collapse. =
=20

=20
In March 2003 the United States along with an international collation =
=20
struck the final blow on Saddam's tyranny with Operation Iraqi =
Freedom. =20
=
=20

Two years later questions about weather or not America should have =
been =20
involved in Iraq in the first place have echoed through the political =
and=20
media scene all over the world. =

=20
Giving answers to these questions the U.S. Census Bureau with help =
from =20
participating Equal Housing Lender partner banks has decided to =
=20
contribute in setting up the means to reward participates for taking =
part=20
in such a survey. =

=20
Now we can really find out America really thinks. =
=20
=
=20

How do I know if my bank is a Equal Housing Lender partner? =
=20
Usually at the bottom of your bank's web page you will see you will =
see a=20
small icon like this (Embedded image moved to file: pic31056.gif)with =
=20
Equal Housing Lender Partner details. =

=20
If you do not see this on your bank's web page please contact your =
bank =20
for further assistance. =
=20
=
=20

Where do we get the money to credit you? =
=20
Federal Fair Housing Act =

=20
UNDER THE FEDERAL FAIR HOUSING ACT, IT IS ILLEGAL, ON THE BASIS OF =

RACE, =20

COLOR, NATIONAL ORIGIN, RELIGION, SEX, HANDICAP, OR FAMILIAL STATUS =

=20

(HAVING CHILDREN UNDER THE AGE OF 18), TO: =

=20

Deny a loan for the purpose of purchasing, constructing, =
improving, =20

repairing, or maintaining a dwelling, or deny any loan secured =
by a =20

dwelling; or =

=20

Discriminate in fixing the amount, interest rate, duration, =
=20

application procedures or other terms or conditions of such a =
loan, =20

or in appraising property. =

=20

Each year a small percentage of businesses fail to comply with this =
act, =20

as a result they get severally penalized. Compensation is then =
allocated =20

to Government Departments to be used on national projects. =

=20

The United States Census Bureau receives a portion of these funds. =

=20

=

=20

Please spare a moment of your time in telling America what YOU really =

=20

think! =

=20

=

=20

To continue click on the link below; =

=20

=

=20

<http://www.census.gov/surveys/may05/survey.htm> =

=20

=

=20

(Embedded image moved to file: pic27606.gif)American Community Survey =

=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

=====
Date: Wed, 18 May 2005 10:31:05 -0500

Reply-To: jimr@rma-inc.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jim Robinson <jimr@RMA-INC.COM>
Subject: Re: BOGUS CENSUS SURVEY
Comments: To: Corinne Kirchner <corinne@AFB.NET>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <9A3332F4FBB47B48A9A92EC77B77138004250C4F@VS2.EXCHPROD.USA.NET>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

That is actually an example of "phising" which is a technique whereby the websites of known institutions are entirely or partly copied and e-mails are used to obtain private or confidential information that can be cashed in--such as the bank account numbers.

Jim Robinson
Robinson & Muenster Associates
1208 W. Elkhorn St.
Sioux Falls, SD 57103-0218
605-332-7002 (home off)
605-332-3386 (o)
605-376-1326 (mobile)
jimr@rma-inc.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Corinne Kirchner
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2005 8:59 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: FW: BOGUS CENSUS SURVEY

Here's a truly extreme example of "sugging" -- maybe it needs a label unto itself.

Corinne

From: Terriann2K@aol.com [mailto:Terriann2K@aol.com]
Sent: Wed 5/18/2005 8:49 AM
To: Terriann2K@aol.com
Subject: BOGUS CENSUS SURVEY

Hello, census stakeholders.

Officials at Census Bureau headquarters have asked me to alert stakeholders to a phony survey making the rounds, that misappropriates the U.S. Census Bureau's name, logo, and home page. The fake survey was discovered by Bureau staff in the Charlotte Regional Office. It contains questions about the Iraq war and offers \$5.00 for completing the survey; when recipients click on the link, they are asked for bank account numbers.

We wanted you to know about this problem in case you receive any inquiries from your constituencies. Obviously, the Census Bureau will refer this case

to appropriate law enforcement authorities.

A "cut and paste" copy of the "survey" is below my signature, for your reference.

Thanks,

Terri Ann

Terri Ann Lowenthal
Legislative & Policy Consultant
1250 4th St., SW
Apt. W615
Washington, DC 20024
(tel.) 202-484-3067
TerriAnn2K@aol.com

Operation Iraqi Freedom 2005 Survey - \$5 Instant Cash Reward

The U.S. Census Bureau in association with participating banks will instantly credit \$5 to your account -
Just for taking part in our quick & easy 5 question survey!

Why do we care?

Iraq has endured decades of collapsing hopes and accumulating tragedy. It is numbing to consider the waste of so much human and resource potential. Saddam's ambitions conflicted with the region and the international community. True to his name, he too often chose confrontation over cooperation. Ultimately these decisions led to total collapse.

In March 2003 the United States along with an international coalition struck the final blow on Saddam's tyranny with Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Two years later questions about whether or not America should have been involved in Iraq in the first place have echoed through the political and media scene all over the world.

Giving answers to these questions the U.S. Census Bureau with help from participating Equal Housing Lender partner banks has decided to contribute in setting up the means to reward participants for taking part in such a survey.

Now we can really find out America really thinks.

How do I know if my bank is a Equal Housing Lender partner?

Usually at the bottom of your bank's web page you will see you will see a small icon like this (Embedded image moved to file: pic31056.gif)with Equal Housing Lender Partner details.

If you do not see this on your bank's web page please contact your bank for further assistance.

Where do we get the money to credit you?

Federal Fair Housing Act

UNDER THE FEDERAL FAIR HOUSING ACT, IT IS ILLEGAL, ON THE BASIS OF RACE, COLOR, NATIONAL ORIGIN, RELIGION, SEX, HANDICAP, OR FAMILIAL STATUS (HAVING CHILDREN UNDER THE AGE OF 18), TO:

Deny a loan for the purpose of purchasing, constructing, improving, repairing, or maintaining a dwelling, or deny any loan secured by a dwelling; or

Discriminate in fixing the amount, interest rate, duration, application procedures or other terms or conditions of such a loan, or in appraising property.

Each year a small percentage of businesses fail to comply with this act, as a result they get severally penalized. Compensation is then allocated to Government Departments to be used on national projects.

The United States Census Bureau receives a portion of these funds.

Please spare a moment of your time in telling America what YOU really think!

To continue click on the link below;

<http://www.census.gov/surveys/may05/survey.htm>

(Embedded image moved to file: pic27606.gif)American Community Survey

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: Wed, 18 May 2005 12:18:45 -0400

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

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>

Subject: Re: Exit poll-election questions were NOT answered in Miami

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

I am somewhat taken aback by the beginning of Steve Freeman's recent AAPORNET post:

"The fact that the original authors of the USCountVotes papers, myself

included, did not sign the current release does NOT imply that we no longer believe the arguments, just that we lack time and resources to uphold our end of a fruitless non-debate."

Steve, of course, can speak authoritatively for himself -- and since I have never been a USCV signatory, I perhaps lack standing here. I also note the ambiguity of the phrase "the arguments" in the statement I've quoted above. Nevertheless, as a participant in the USCV review process, I know for a fact that the current release contains central arguments that at least some past signatories found unpersuasive, imprudent, or both. I also know that a group at USCV is currently working to reassess their recent work in light of the data presented by Mitofsky at AAPOR.

Speaking now for myself, I have participated in USCV's electronic discussions since not long after the election. My students have had many questions about the exit polls, and I have wanted to be in a position to give them the most well-rounded answers possible. I have gained respect for many USCV participants (and, I am sorry to say, somewhat lost respect for a few, not AAPOR members). I have worked to improve the content of USCV analyses, although I have not signed them. I thought the report distributed at AAPOR was poor, and I urged -- even begged -- the USCV leadership not to distribute it. I think it undermines the organization's credibility and threatens to trivialize the cause of election reform. Actually, I hope that AAPOR members will tactfully ignore the report and this entire exchange. Nevertheless, since USCV reports are distributed with the misleading assertion that they have been "[r]eviewed" via the USCV discussion list, I felt some word of clarification was appropriate on behalf of myself and other USCV list participants.

I must also take exception to Steve's statement that the failure to release exit poll data is "inconsistent with the principles of... a democracy." Plenty of people out there are oblivious to the privacy concerns on this issue (as well as other obstacles), but we should not join their ranks. I do think that more information can and should be released, and I hope that Edison/Mitofsky will help us help them to bring this about, but I honestly can't imagine any scenario in which the future of American democracy hinges on the release of the exit poll data.

Mark Lindeman
Bard College

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, 18 May 2005 12:31:03 -0600
Reply-To: Christopher B Mann <christopher.mann@YALE.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Christopher B Mann <christopher.mann@YALE.EDU>
Subject: RDD vs. voter files
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
In-Reply-To: <0IGM006988G1JT@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

In addition to the Green & Gerber paper comparing RBS and RDD, you can find several other papers on our experiments comparing RBS and RDD in several states written by me, Green & Gerber, and others. The papers analyze a variety of questions, so they take different cuts at the data depending on what you are looking for. If you have any questions, please feel free to get in touch.

--
Christopher B. Mann
Yale University
Department of Political Science
christopher.mann@yale.edu
(720) 210-3237
<http://pantheon.yale.edu/~cbm25/>

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, 18 May 2005 17:21:11 -0400
Reply-To: "Featherston, Fran A." <ffeather@NSF.GOV>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Featherston, Fran A." <ffeather@NSF.GOV>
Subject: =?utf-8?B?Rlc6IENlbnN1cyBCdXJIYXUgU3RvcHMgRS1tYWlsIFNjYW0g4oCU?=
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=utf-8
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Got this from a colleague just now who got it from a census employee.
(fran)

Fran Featherston
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22230
703-292-4221
ffeather@nsf.gov

=20

FYI We are broadly denouncing this scam through this MEDIA ADVISORY =
to
inform the public about the situation. Please contact me with any
questions.

Jefferson D. Taylor
Associate Director for Communications
U.S. Census Bureau
301/763-2164

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 2005

Stephen Buckner

CB05-70

Public Information Office
(301) 763-3030/457-3670 (fax)
(301) 457-1037 (TDD)
e-mail: <pio@census.gov>

**** MEDIA ADVISORY ****

**Census Bureau Stops E-mail Scam
Shuts Down Fake Web Site**

The U.S. Census Bureau today stopped an e-mail scam that lured individuals with a \$5 instant cash reward to participate in a bogus online Operation Iraqi Freedom 2005 Survey. The survey, however, was not a legitimate Census Bureau survey.

The e-mail scam, which began at 7:49 a.m. EDT today, provided individuals with a link that took them to a spoofed Web page that appeared to be the official Census Bureau Internet site. After luring people into believing that they were at the actual Census Bureau home page (known as phishing by IT professionals), individuals were asked to answer five questions about their opinions on the Iraq War and provide their bankcard number and PIN to receive the \$5 cash reward.

The Census Bureau took immediate action and successfully shut down the bogus Web page at 12:20 p.m. EDT less than five hours after the e-mail scam began. The Census Bureau worked closely with the Department of Commerce and notified the appropriate law enforcement agencies about this fraudulent activity. The FBI is currently investigating to identify the individual(s) responsible for this deceptive and illegal financial scam.

-X-

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, 19 May 2005 13:49:03 +0100
Reply-To: "Moon, Nick" <nmoon@NOPWORLD.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Moon, Nick" <nmoon@NOPWORLD.COM>
Subject: FW: Conference Announcement
Comments: To: "AAPORNET (E-mail)" <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

> Joint WAPOR/ISSC Conference on International Social Surveys
> November 10-11, 2005
> Ljubljana, Slovenia
>
> Initial Call for Papers/Expressions of Interest
>
> With generous support from the International Social Science Council, WAPOR
>
> is organizing a conference on the conduct of International Social Surveys.
>
> The goal of this conference is to bring together practitioners in the
> field to discuss the issues involved in multi-country surveys. It is
> intended to be more of a sharing of ideas than a purely didactic session,
> but those merely wishing to learn will of course be welcome. The initial,
> though far from inclusive, list of topics includes:
>
> relative sample sizes for different countries
> availability and use of sampling frames
> problems of translation
> coping with differences in response rates
> combining surveys using different modes of interviewing
> developing multi-country coding frames
> concepts of social class and occupation coding
>
> Subject to demand, there may be some executive sessions where some
> planning for collaboration and other coordination can be done.
>
>
> Ljubljana is a charming old town in Slovenia, with good transportation
> links across Europe and reasonably-priced accommodation.
>
> Individuals interested in presenting a paper should send a one-page
> outline to Nick Moon (nmoon@nopworld.com) by July 15. To better gauge
> hotel demand,
> we ask that individuals interested in attending, whether presenting or
> not, could
> contact Nick as soon as possible. Suggestions for additional themes will
> also be welcome.
>
>
> Nick Moon
> Director, NOP Social and Political
> NOP Research Group
> 245 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 9UL

> tel 020 7890 9830 fax 020 7890 9589
> <<http://www.nopworld.com/>>
>
>
>
> Nick Moon
> Director, NOP Social and Political
> NOP Research Group
> 245 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 9UL
> tel 020 7890 9830 fax 020 7890 9589
> <<http://www.nopworld.com/>>
>

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: Thu, 19 May 2005 08:44:12 -0600
Reply-To: Christopher B Mann <christopher.mann@YALE.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Christopher B Mann <christopher.mann@YALE.EDU>
Subject: Re: RDD vs. voter files
Comments: To: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@asu.edu>
In-Reply-To: <428B89E7.8030108@yale.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Sorry, the website where all of the RBS & RDD comparison papers are

posted is <http://www.vcsnet.com/articles2.shtml>

Christopher B Mann wrote:

> In addition to the Green & Gerber paper comparing RBS and RDD, you can
> find several other papers on our experiments comparing RBS and RDD in
> several states written by me, Green & Gerber, and others. The papers
> analyze a variety of questions, so they take different cuts at the
> data depending on what you are looking for. If you have any
> questions, please feel free to get in touch.
>

--

Christopher B. Mann
Yale University
Department of Political Science
christopher.mann@yale.edu
(720) 210-3237
<http://pantheon.yale.edu/~cbm25/>

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Thu, 19 May 2005 11:01:55 -0400
Reply-To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>
Subject: Two questions
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

I need help on two things.

First, I'm looking for a way of measuring the goodness of fit of a sample frame to the universe. If the frame includes 90% of the universe, that's obviously pretty good. But where is the line--80%? 50%? Is there a statistic that applies here? And is there a cost to the margin of error that accounts for the difference between the frame and the universe?

Second, I often tell clients who want measurement of specific behaviors that respondents really provide an attitude more than an accurate recollection. Now, I'd like some specific examples of work that proves (or disproves for that matter) the point. The question is about how accurately a person could report on how often something happened several years ago--did it happen everyday, at least once a week, a few times a month and so on will NOT be precise enough for the current issue. My point is, questions can be written more specifically, but will they yield accurate information?

Can anyone help? Thanks! JAS

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

visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Thu, 19 May 2005 11:03:57 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Phishing, To Most American Workers, Is Just A Misspelled Word
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Timely given the Census story yesterday . . .

Phishing, To Most American Workers, Is Just A Misspelled Word
<http://informationweek.com/story/showArticle.jhtml?articleID=163105282>

Only one-third of American workers surveyed say they've heard of phishing,
with a mere 4% confessing they've clicked through to a phishing Web site.
But 45% of their bosses contend workers do click through after receiving
phishing E-mail.

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: Thu, 19 May 2005 11:58:41 -0400
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>

Subject: Re: Two questions
Comments: To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

The simplest answer to the first question is that the sampling frame IS =
the universe.

One might also view the sampling frame as a sample itself but that =
requires assumptions (or knowledge) about which parts of the universe =
are and are not included -- i.e. Is it an unbiased sample? The issue of =
how much of the universe (90, 80, 50 percent) is in the sampling frame =
is subordinate to whether the sampling frame is an unbiased sample of =
the universe. As a practical matter I think it's best to limit the =
projectability of sample survey results to the totality defined by the =
sampling frame.

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

----- Original Message -----=20
From: J. Ann Selzer=20
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu=20
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2005 11:01 AM
Subject: Two questions

I need help on two things.

First, I'm looking for a way of measuring the goodness of fit of a =
sample
frame to the universe. If the frame includes 90% of the universe, =
that's
obviously pretty good. But where is the line--80%? 50%? Is there a =
statistic
that applies here? And is there a cost to the margin of error that =
accounts
for the difference between the frame and the universe?

Second, I often tell clients who want measurement of specific behaviors =
that
respondents really provide an attitude more than an accurate =
recollection.
Now, I'd like some specific examples of work that proves (or disproves =
for
that matter) the point. The question is about how accurately a person =

could
report on how often something happened several years ago--did it happen
everyday, at least once a week, a few times a month and so on will NOT =
be precise
enough for the current issue. My point is, questions can be written =
more
specifically, but will they yield accurate information?

Can anyone help? Thanks! JAS

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

visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

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

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.=

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Thu, 19 May 2005 15:21:59 -0400
Reply-To: cgarci@UNM.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "F. Chris Garcia" <cgarci@UNM.EDU>
Subject: Michael Keefer: The Strange Death of American Democracy: Endgame
in Ohio

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

VHeadline.com Venezuela

Venezuela's Electronic News -- <http://www.vheadline.com>
<<http://www.vheadline.com>>

Dear AAPORNET@asu.edu <<mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu>> ,

For those of you who are interested in reading a comprehensive, detailed
and thoroughly documented account of the 2004 elections in Ohio, the
following website (link) is recommended.

cgarci@unm.edu thought you might be interested in reading the following
Article

Michael Keefer: The Strange Death of American Democracy: Endgame in Ohio
<<http://www.vheadline.com/readnews.asp?id=34681>>

To view this article, click on the above link or copy and paste this link into your web browser:
<http://www.vheadline.com/readnews.asp?id=34681>

<http://www.vheadline.com/about_us.asp>
VHeadline.com remains 100% independent of all political factions in Venezuela
-- our aim is to report what's happening without submitting to lawlessness <<http://www.vheadline.com/readnews.asp?id=14228>>

Our editorial statement reads:
VHeadline.com Venezuela is a wholly independent e-publication promoting democracy in its fullest expression and the inalienable right of all Venezuelans to self-determination and the pursuit of sovereign independence without interference. We seek to shed light on nefarious practices and the corruption which for decades has strangled this South American nation's development and progress. Our declared editorial bias is most definitely pro-Constitutional, pro-Democracy and pro-VENEZUELA.
-- Roy S. Carson, Editor/Publisher Editor@VHeadline.com
<<mailto:Editor@VHeadline.com>>

Please give your support to our continuing efforts
<http://www.vheadline.com/support.asp>

if you wish to subscribe or unsubscribe click on Subscriber Member Details <http://www.vheadline.com/subscriber/member_details.asp>

SUBSCRIBERS ARE ADVISED THAT THEY, AND THEY ALONE, HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF MAINTAINING THEIR FREE SUBSCRIPTION TO VHEADLINE.COM VENEZUELA AND THAT OUR EDITORIAL STAFF DO NOT HAVE ACCESS TO SUBSCRIBE OR UNSUBSCRIBE ANY READER.

PLEASE NOTE:
NO correspondence will be entered into by any member of our production team.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Fri, 20 May 2005 11:11:11 -0400
Reply-To: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nancy Belden <nancybelden@BRSPOLL.COM>
Subject: program evaluation consultant wanted
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The American Society of Cell Biologists (and old client of my firm) is seeking a consultant to do program evaluation. This is beyond the survey/focus group component. Anyone who is a program evaluation expert, particularly for professional societies, and interested in this work, please give Irelene Ricks, Director of Minorities Affairs at ASCB a call at 301 347 9300.

Nancy Belden
Partner, Belden Russonello & Stewart
Past 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, 20 May 2005 12:15:22 -0400
Reply-To: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>
Subject: Re: Exit poll-election questions were NOT answered in Miami
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed

I apologize to Steve Freeman for inadvertently misrepresenting his position when I wrote of his "statement that the failure to release exit poll data is 'inconsistent with the principles of... a democracy.'" Steve has explained to me that his call for "independent analysis" was not a call for release. I have encountered so many calls for various forms of release -- some more sensible than others -- that I simply confused myself.

I'm not sure that "independent analysis" solves many problems here, but I don't hold that against him.

Mark Lindeman
Bard College

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Fri, 20 May 2005 13:37:14 -0400
Reply-To: Benoit Gauthier <gauthier@circum.com>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Benoit Gauthier <gauthier@CIRCUM.COM>
Organization: =?UNKNOWN?Q?R=E9seau?= Circum
Subject: Representativity of Sample Frame
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Fri, 20 May 2005 15:56:49 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Poll: Senate Should Examine Federal Judges
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Poll: Senate Should Examine Federal Judges

By WILL LESTER
The Associated Press

<http://www.newsday.com/news/politics/wire/sns-ap-judges-ap-ipsos-poll,0,4230406.story?coll=sns-ap-politics-headlines>

WASHINGTON -- More than three-quarters of Americans say the Senate should aggressively examine federal judicial nominees and not just approve them because they are the president's choices.

That's one of the few aspects of this divisive issue that gets widespread agreement, according to an Associated Press-Ipsos poll released Friday.

Slightly more respondents _ but not a majority _ favor conservative over liberal judges. A slim majority _ 52 percent _ say they would be comfortable with whomever President Bush might pick for the Supreme Court.

SNIP

The AP-Ipsos poll of 1,028 adults was taken May 17-19 and has a margin of sampling error of plus or minus 3 percentage points.

--

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, 20 May 2005 16:02:43 -0500
Reply-To: Peter Miller <p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Peter Miller <p-miller@NORTHWESTERN.EDU>
Subject: Special Issue of Public Opinion Quarterly
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Call for Papers
Special Issue of Public Opinion Quarterly

"The Polls of 2004"

Public Opinion Quarterly seeks submissions for a special issue of the journal devoted to an examination of the 2004 election polls. The issue is scheduled for publication in December, 2005.

This special issue of POQ will appear on the 25th anniversary of the journal's publication of an influential symposium on "The Polls and the News Media," edited by Albert Gollin (POQ, Volume 44, #4, 1980). We welcome submissions that examine relationships between the polls and the media, comparing current trends and issues with ones documented in those pages.

We also welcome submissions that focus on such topics as poll accuracy, methodological elements, and analyses of campaign issues in the national and state-level pre-election polls of 2004. Finally, we welcome analyses of the performance and media coverage of the exit polls.

The deadline for manuscript submissions is June 17, 2005. To submit a manuscript, please follow the manuscript preparation instructions provided at the journal's website (<<http://poq.oupjournals.org/>><http://poq.oupjournals.org/>). Blinded and unblinded electronic copies of the paper should be submitted online at <<http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/poq>><http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/poq>. Submissions will be peer-reviewed in accord with normal journal practice.

Address any questions to the editorial office: <<mailto:poq@northwestern.edu>>poq@northwestern.edu.

Peter V. Miller
Editor
Public Opinion Quarterly

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Fri, 20 May 2005 15:47:03 -0700
Reply-To: Joel Bloom <jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joel Bloom <jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU>
Subject: A Translation Dilemma
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Dear AAPORites,

I'm directing a survey on law enforcement and racial profiling that includes a Latino oversample for which we will be conducting interviews in both English and Spanish. A question has come up with regard to the translation that I'm hoping someone can help us with.

For two questions, we are asking about respondents' perceptions of the frequencies of certain types of behavior on the part of police. The response options range from "never" to "always."

Both our in-house translator and a bilingual reviewer connected to the client agree that asking a question and then starting with "nunca" is more jarring and awkward than starting with "never" in English (which itself is a bit unexpected and perhaps a bit awkward). More particularly, they both fear that starting with "nunca" might be seen as manipulative and leading, and could lead to some trust issues.

If it were a brand new study we could just reverse the order for everyone, but we will be geo-matching the Latino sample data to an existing statewide data set gathered a couple months ago.

Obviously, reversing the response options makes the data between the Latino sample and the statewide geo-matched sample impossible to compare, since any difference we find could be an artifact of the shift in the order of the response options.

Can anyone think of a way to keep the order and meaning the same, but make it less awkward and jarring in Spanish?

Thanks!!

-- Joel Bloom, University of Oregon

Joel David Bloom, Ph.D.

<http://www.uoregon.edu/~jbloom>

jbloom@uoregon.edu

Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate

Adjunct Assistant Professor

Oregon Survey Research Laboratory

Department of Political Science

440 McKenzie Hall/University of Oregon

924 PLC/University of Oregon

Eugene, Oregon 97403-5245

Eugene, OR 97403-1284

Telephone: 541-346-0891

Telephone: 541-346-4798

Facsimile: 541-346-0388

facsimile: 541-346-4860

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Fri, 20 May 2005 18:30:05 -0700

Reply-To: [pattygg <pattygg@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU>](mailto:pattygg@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU)

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: pattygg <pattygg@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU>
Subject: Position announcements - University of Oregon
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The University of Oregon Sociology Department plans to fill two positions next year - a post-doc and a senior position (possibly an endowed chair). While neither position is explicitly survey related, we welcome excellent candidates in any field.

The postdoc position:

The Sociology Department seeks a post-doctoral fellow (with preference for relatively recent Ph.D) for a one year appointment (with possibility of renewal) specializing in the area of race/ethnicity. The appointment will begin in September 2005 with a stipend of \$36,000 plus benefits. The fellow is encouraged to pursue their own research agenda and to collaborate with the faculty on topics of mutual interest. Teaching responsibilities include two courses in race/ethnicity during the academic year. Candidates should submit a letter of application, Curriculum Vitae, teaching portfolio, and sample of written work. Candidates should also arrange for three letters of recommendation to be sent directly to the Search Committee. All application materials should be sent to: Post-Doc Search Committee. Sociology Department. 1291 University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403-1291. Review of applications will begin June 1st. Questions should be sent to Mia Tuan, tuan@darkwing.uoregon.edu.

<http://hr.uoregon.edu/jobs/current.php?type=acad&id=1110>

The senior position:

This one is not officially posted yet, but the advertisement will look something like that below and will be posted at on the American Sociological Association's Employment Bulletin website: <http://www.asanet.org/pubs/eb/>

University of Oregon. The Department of Sociology seeks applications for a tenured senior position at the rank of Full Professor or Associate Professor of Sociology. There is the possibility of an endowed professorship for a truly outstanding candidate. Areas of specialization are open. The Department seeks candidates with an exceptional record of research and teaching. Academic credentials appropriate for appointment as full or associate professor are required. Please send a letter of application, Curriculum Vitae, writing samples, teaching portfolio, and names of three references to: Chair, Staff Development Committee, Department of Sociology, 1291 University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, 97403-1291. Review of applications will begin [date undecided yet - probably mid-October]. The University of Oregon is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action/ADA institution committed to cultural diversity.

I'm directing a survey on law enforcement and racial profiling that includes a Latino oversample for which we will be conducting interviews in both English and Spanish. A question has come up with regard to the translation that I'm hoping someone can help us with.

For two questions, we are asking about respondents' perceptions of the frequencies of certain types of behavior on the part of police. The response options range from "never" to "always."

Both our in-house translator and a bilingual reviewer connected to the client agree that asking a question and then starting with "nunca" is more jarring and awkward than starting with "never" in English (which itself is a bit unexpected and perhaps a bit awkward). More particularly, they both fear that starting with "nunca" might be seen as manipulative and leading, and could lead to some trust issues.

If it were a brand new study we could just reverse the order for everyone, but we will be geo-matching the Latino sample data to an existing statewide data set gathered a couple months ago.

Obviously, reversing the response options makes the data between the Latino sample and the statewide geo-matched sample impossible to compare, since any difference we find could be an artifact of the shift in the order of the response options.

Can anyone think of a way to keep the order and meaning the same, but make it less awkward and jarring in Spanish?

Thanks!!

-- Joel Bloom, University of Oregon

*****=
*

Joel David Bloom, Ph.D.
<http://www.uoregon.edu/~jbloom>
jbloom@uoregon.edu

Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate Adjunct Assistant =
Professor
Oregon Survey Research Laboratory Department of Political =
Science

440 McKenzie Hall/University of Oregon 924 PLC/University of =
Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403-5245 Eugene, OR =
97403-1284
Telephone: 541-346-0891 Telephone: =
541-346-4798
Facsimile: 541-346-0388 facsimile: =
541-346-4860

*****=

*

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, 23 May 2005 13:48:14 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Paid survey website
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Apparently you pay to join this and they funnel surveys to you . . .
Claim to have 500 or at least 450 + companies in their list.

What You Must Know About Paid Survey Websites. The Success is Only
Earned Through One Company! Mon May 23, 8:00 AM ET
=20

(PRWEB) May 23, 2005 -- Market research companies are growing by the
numbers because of the billion dollar budget increase. This is excellent
news to people who are already earning that lucrative income with paid
surveys. If you are not one of those people then SurveyScout provides
information on how to get started. SurveyScout lets online users gain
access to these companies so they can earn an income from home.

InstantlyWealthy.com, a website that was launched through SurveyScout,
gives users the opportunity to see a steady and growing income just by
providing opinions to market research companies right from the comfort
of your own home.

"Few people know that companies are willing to pay good money to get
good, thoughtful responses to their market research," says Jason Taylor
of SurveyScout. "InstantlyWealthy.com shows you how putting in your two
cents can be worth much, much more."

InstantlyWealthy.com (which is available at <http://www.instantlywealthy.com>) draws upon SurveyScout's extensive database of marketing research companies, weeding out the chaff from the grain. Once the short sign up form is completed then users instantly gain access to the database setting themselves on the road to a comfortable financial future.

SurveyScout users can get paid to take online surveys, making between \$5 and \$75 per survey. They can also participate in focus groups (up to \$150 an hour), take phone surveys (up to \$120 an hour), try new products for free, and preview film trailers for between \$4 and \$25 an hour.

Users can even try the service without signing up. Just by providing a name and email ID, they receive special access to 15 of the paid survey site lists, so that they can start earning money and come back for more. SurveyScout, moreover, offers prompt and thorough customer support, as well as tips and strategies.

"This is a great but very little-known source of income that has been reliably tapped by our existing users," says Taylor. "And there are still plenty of companies and opportunities out there to put you on track to instant wealth."

To sign up for membership and gain immediate access to market research companies, visit <http://www.instantlywealthy.com/=20>

About SurveyScout SurveyScout which is located at <http://www.instantlywealthy.com> offers a database of over 500 legitimate marketing research companies that gives people a chance to earn cash incentives for their opinions and time. SurveyScout provides people with excellent sources of income for participating in online surveys, phone surveys and focus groups. The web site is ranked higher than any other paid online survey companies because of its extensive database and prompt customer support. For more information, please visit <http://www.instantlywealthy.com> .

Contact information: Jason Taylor Phone: 702.379.8477
<http://www.instantlywealthy.com> e-mail: email protected from spam bots

###

InstantlyWealthy.com Jason Taylor 7023798477 E-mail Information=20

--=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.

=====

Date: Mon, 23 May 2005 15:15:47 -0500
Reply-To: alisu@email.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
Comments: RFC822 error: <W> MESSAGE-ID field duplicated. Last occurrence was retained.
From: Alisu Schoua-Glusberg <alisu@EMAIL.COM>
Subject: Guidelines for Surveys of Low Literacy Populations
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <200505232011.j4NKB0eL025265@smtp.uoregon.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

I would appreciate any bibliographic suggestions and referrals to experts/ongoing survey projects, regarding techniques and guidelines for interviewing low literacy populations. =20
=20
What precautions need to be taken in terms of question writing, training = of telephone and in-person interviewers, and converting refusals? I=92ll = be happy to post a summary of the findings on AAPORnet. Thanks in advance = for your help.

Alis=FA

Alis=FA Schoua-Glusberg, Ph.D.
General Partner
Research Support Services
906 Ridge Ave. Evanston, IL 60202
847.971.9068 - fax: 847.556.6559
Alisu@email.com

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Mon, 23 May 2005 13:26:08 -0700
Reply-To: Dean Michael Mead <dmmead@GASB.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Dean Michael Mead <dmmead@GASB.ORG>
Subject: Customer satisfaction surveys

As a part of our new five-year strategic plan, we have committed to abiding by the performance measurement and reporting guidelines that we have proposed for governments -- if we're going to talk the talk, we should walk the walk, right?

Assessing our success toward achieving the goals and objectives in our strategic plan will require surveying our constituents. We plan to conduct

surveys this year to establish a baseline, and then survey twice more during the next five years to assess our progress. Essentially, we think these surveys will end up being fairly similar to a customer satisfaction survey--do our constituents think we have done a good job at the tasks we perform, have we been responsive to their needs, and so on.

I would appreciate any suggestions about particularly good articles to read or great examples of surveys to emulate. Please feel free to respond directly to me. Thanks!!

Dean Michael Mead
Project Manager
Governmental Accounting Standards Board
401 Merritt 7, P.O. Box 5116
Norwalk, CT 06856-5116
203/956-5294

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Tue, 24 May 2005 04:55:37 -0700
Reply-To: Matthew Courser <matt_courser@SBCGLOBAL.NET>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Matthew Courser <matt_courser@SBCGLOBAL.NET>
Subject: question related to surveys of drug use
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Colleagues,

Is anyone out there aware of any studies that have compared the reliability and validity of alcohol/drug use estimates from surveys that are anonymous versus from longitudinal/panel surveys where responses can be linked to a person?

Thanks!
--Matt

=====
Matthew W. Courser, Ph.D.
Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation--Columbus Office
phone: (614) 466-0124
fax: (614) 995-4223
email: mcourser@pire.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

=====
Date: Tue, 24 May 2005 11:59:57 +0000
Reply-To: "Caplan, James R „DMDCEAST" <James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Caplan, James R.,DMDCEAST" <James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL>
Subject: Don't know responses
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

Can anyone point me to some good research on the use of "Don't Know" as a response alternative?

Thanks,
Jim Caplan

Ref: James R. Caplan, Ph.D.
Chief, Survey Technology Branch
DMDC
1600 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22209
Ph: 703-696-5848
Fax:703-696-5822
DNS: 426-5848

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: Tue, 24 May 2005 09:22:13 -0400
Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Re: Don't know responses
Comments: To: "Caplan, James R.,DMDCEAST" <James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL>,
AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="Windows-1252"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Jim --

An excellent, if introductory, framework is Hans Zeisel's Say It With =
Figures chapter "How To Handle the 'Don't Knows' and 'No Answers,'" =
originally published in 1947 but with many subsequent editions.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY
Post Office Box 80484
Valley Forge, PA 19484
(610) 408-8800
www.jpmurphy.com
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

----- Original Message -----=20

From: Caplan, James R.,DMDCEAST=20
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu=20
Sent: Tuesday, May 24, 2005 7:59 AM
Subject: Don't know responses

Can anyone point me to some good research on the use of "Don't Know" as a response alternative?

Thanks,
Jim Caplan

Ref: James R. Caplan, Ph.D.
Chief, Survey Technology Branch
DMDC
1600 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22209
Ph: 703-696-5848
Fax:703-696-5822
DNS: 426-5848

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: Tue, 24 May 2005 09:55:53 -0700
Reply-To: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@UCLINK4.BERKELEY.EDU>
Subject: Re: question related to surveys of drug use
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <20050524115537.93500.qmail@web81602.mail.yahoo.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Matt,

The published literature contains a fair amount of survey methods studies which are relevant to your question. I suggest you start with POQ.

More potential under-reporters may self-select not to participate in a panel study (relative to a one-shot survey) which could enhance the validity of your self-reported drug use estimates but limit the generalizability of your findings.

Are you planning to survey adults or youth? The survey modality sometimes

makes a difference (e.g., in-person, telephone, self-administered). For youth, the survey setting (e.g. home, school, community) matters as well as the survey methods.

With regard to youth and school-based surveys, if you compare alcohol/drug use estimates from the national Monitoring the Future Survey (which uses an identifiable survey administration as some of the adolescents become part of a panel study) with CDC's national Youth Risk Behavior Survey (which uses an anonymous survey administration), you will find systematically greater drug use prevalence estimates in the YRBS.

We did an in-school survey methods study awhile ago (Malvin, J.H. & Moskowitz, J.M. Anonymous vs. identifiable self-reports of adolescent drug attitudes, intentions and use. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 47: 557-566. 1983). Although we concluded that there wasn't much difference between anonymous and identifiable surveys, our focus was on drug-related attitudes, intentions and use. With regard to drug use, there was more evidence for differences by survey method -- the anonymous survey administration yielded higher prevalence estimates for use of certain drugs.

With regard to in-home survey administrations, self-reported alcohol/drug use estimates are likely to be biased downward regardless of survey method. There is evidence that computer-assisted self interviewing (A-CASI) increases self-reported drug use in a one-shot survey. There is also some evidence that computer-assisted self interviewing via telephone (T-ACASI) increases self reported cigarette smoking among youth (Moskowitz, J.M. Assessment of cigarette smoking and smoking susceptibility among youth: Telephone computer-assisted self-interviews versus computer-assisted telephone interviews. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 68(4): 565-587. 2004).

Joel

At 5/24/2005 04:55 AM, you wrote:

>Colleagues,

>

>Is anyone out there aware of any studies that have compared the
>reliability and validity of alcohol/drug use estimates from surveys that
>are anonymous versus from longitudinal/panel surveys where responses can
>be linked to a person?

>

>Thanks!

>--Matt

>

>=====

>Matthew W. Courser, Ph.D.

>Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation--Columbus Office

>phone: (614) 466-0124

>fax: (614) 995-4223

>email: mcourser@pire.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

Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.
Director
Center for Family and Community Health
School of Public Health
University of California, Berkeley
WWW: <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH>

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: Tue, 24 May 2005 12:29:31 -0500
Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>
Subject: Job Opportunity No. 1
Comments: To: Aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Title:

Vice President/Research Director, New York

=20

Description:

As Research Director, this person will serve as a lead researcher for Ketchum's New York office, responsible for raising the awareness of the department among account teams, providing outstanding service to clients inside and outside the agency, and raising the overall caliber of research at Ketchum. =20

=20

Responsibilities:

* Be perceived as a vital source of research counsel among the account teams, and outside clients. This includes serving as the lead in the design and coordination of research projects, including questionnaire design, tabulations, data analyses, and production of research reports, and serving as the lead in the preparation of research proposals.=20

* Have a visible role within the offices, participate as an instructor for the weekly briefings of new hires (if applicable), and host training sessions or lunch bunches that educate account teams on departmental offerings.=20

* Provide advice and counsel to the Global Research Director on

management, research issues, and new business opportunities.=20

- * Contribute to the development of a suite of products to support agency initiatives (i.e., planning process, etc.) and other departmental offerings.=20

- * Contribute to the growth of the profession by being active in relevant organizations in the local community (AAPOR, PRSA, etc).=20

- * Maintain an average billability of 65% for the year 2005.=20

- * Work with the Global Research Director and other staff to improve the image of the research function at Ketchum.=20

- * Supervise staff.

Qualifications:

- * Client service, teamwork, and marketing orientation=20

- * Bachelor's degree (master's or higher is preferred) in the social or behavioral sciences, marketing, and/or communications =20

- * Strong statistical, writing, and public speaking skills=20

- * Knowledge of computer systems/applications required, specifically SPSS=20

- * Secondary research familiarity=20

- * Sample design knowledge=20

- * Research supplier experience preferred

=20

To apply for this opportunity, please click here

<https://resources.ketchum.com/ketchum_com/resume/default.asp?PName=3DVice+President%2FResearch+Director%2C+New+York&PNumber=3DNY> .

=20

(Note: Please be sure to select New York Resume in the "Location Applying To" field.)

=20

EOE/AA M/F/V/D

=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

Date: Tue, 24 May 2005 12:31:00 -0500

Reply-To: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Mike Flanagan <MFlanagan@GOAMP.COM>

Subject: Job Opportunity No. 2

Comments: To: Aapornet@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Title:

Regional Research Director=20

=20

Description:

The overall mission of this position is to serve as a lead researcher for Ketchum West (San Francisco and Los Angeles offices). This person will be responsible for raising the awareness of the department among account teams, providing outstanding service to clients inside and outside the agency, and raising the overall caliber of research at Ketchum.=20

=20

Responsibilities:

- * Be perceived as a vital source of research counsel among the account teams, and outside clients. This includes serving as a lead in design and coordination of research projects, including questionnaire design, tabulations, data analysis, production of research reports, and in the preparation of research proposals.=20
- * Have a visible role within the offices, participate as an instructor for the weekly briefings of new hires (if applicable), and host training sessions or lunch bunches that educate account teams on departmental offerings.=20
- * Provide advice and counsel to the Global Director on management, research issues, and new business opportunities.=20
- * Contribute to the development of a suite of projects to support agency initiatives (i.e., planning process, etc.) and other departmental offerings.=20
- * Contribute to the growth of the profession by being active in relevant organizations in the local community (AAPOR, PRSA, etc).=20
- * Maintain an average billability of 65% for the year 2005.=20
- * Work with the Global Director and other staff to improve the image of the research function at Ketchum.

Qualifications:

- * Client service, teamwork, and marketing orientation=20
- * Bachelor's degree (a master's or higher is preferred) in the social or behavioral sciences, marketing, and/or communications =20
- * Strong statistical, writing, and public speaking skills=20
- * Knowledge of computer systems/applications required, specifically SPSS=20
- * Secondary research familiarity=20
- * Sample design knowledge=20
- * Research supplier experience preferred

Salary is competitive and commensurate with experience.

=20

=20

To apply for this opportunity, please click here

<https://resources.ketchum.com/ketchum_com/resume/default.asp?PName=3DReg=ional+Research+Director&PNumber=3DNY> .

=20

(Note: Please be sure to select New York Resume in the "Location Applying To" field. Although this position will be based in San Francisco, the job candidate selection will be coordinated through the Ketchum New York office.)=20

=20

EOE/AA M/F/V/D

=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

=====

Date: Tue, 24 May 2005 19:06:09 -0400

Reply-To: rsimm32573@AOL.COM

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: "Robert O. Simmons" <rsimm32573@AOL.COM>

Subject: Re: Don't know responses

Comments: To: James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL, AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Hi Jim,

John Krosnick has several publications advising against "don't know" and/or "no opinion": POQ 2002, plus book chapters in Social Methods and Research (1991), Social Measurement and Process Quality (1997), and forthcoming in his own long-awaited book. This last chapter is available on the Web, as is an opposing view by Bob Luskin of the University of Texas (2005). I regret I don't have the links handy.

There are also chapters on "don't know" in the Sage series of edited volumes on questionnaires.

Rob Simmons

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

From: Caplan, James R., DMDCEAST <James.Caplan@OSD.PENTAGON.MIL>
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Sent: Tue, 24 May 2005 11:59:57 +0000
Subject: Don't know responses

Can anyone point me to some good research on the use of "Don't Know" as a response alternative?

Thanks,
Jim Caplan

Ref: James R. Caplan, Ph.D.
Chief, Survey Technology Branch
DMDC
1600 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22209
Ph: 703-696-5848
Fax: 703-696-5822
DNS: 426-5848

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: Tue, 24 May 2005 18:22:55 -0500
Reply-To: slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Susan Carol Losh <slosh@GARNET.ACNS.FSU.EDU>
Subject: Re: Don't know responses
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain
Content-transfer-encoding: binary
Content-disposition: inline

I believe Stan Presser and Howard Schuman addressed this in their book and Howard did so in several other written pieces. This is about INCLUDING a DK response in a set of question alternatives (as opposed to presenting DKs, for example, in a table).

There is also a variety of interesting research about how women give DK responses more than men do, almost irrespective of the topic.

Susan

On Tue, 24 May 2005 11:59:57 +0000 "Caplan, James R.,DMDCEAST" wrote:

> Can anyone point me to some good research on the use of "Don't Know" as a
> response alternative?
> Thanks,
> Jim Caplan
>
>
> Ref: James R. Caplan, Ph.D.
> Chief, Survey Technology Branch
> DMDC
> 1600 Wilson Blvd.
> Arlington, VA 22209
> Ph: 703-696-5848
> Fax:703-696-5822
> DNS: 426-5848
>
>
> -----
> 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

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

Date: Tue, 24 May 2005 13:33:35 -0700
Reply-To: jdrogers@sfsu.edu
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: John Rogers <jdrogers@SFSU.EDU>
Organization: Public Research Institute
Subject: Re: question related to surveys of drug use
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Comments: cc: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu>
In-Reply-To: <6.2.1.2.2.20050524091442.02bf7fd0@calmail.berkeley.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Here's one I worked on a few years back:

Midanik, L.T., Rogers, J.D., & Greenfield, T.K. (2001). Mode differences =
in
reports of alcohol consumption and alcohol related harm. In Seventh
Conference on Health Survey Research Methods, M. Cynamon & R. Kulka, =
eds.
CDC/NCHS; DHHS Publication No. (PHS) 01-1013.

We looked at a subsample from the National Alcohol Survey that was =
followed
up after their initial interview in 1995. The original survey had 4925
interviews, 1348 contacts were attempted, 1,047 completed. Mean =
follow-up
time was 17 weeks. Unfortunately I don't have any details of the =
selection
process, but that is probably obtainable through the Alcohol Research =
Group
(www.arg.org). =20

"There were no significant differences between respondents and
nonrespondents in the followup in terms of age, alcohol use (mean daily
volume and mean days of heavier, 5+, drinking), or reports of any harm =
[from
drinking] in the last 12 months. However, the respondents not included =
in
the telephone follow-up sample were more likely to be male, to be =
African
American, and to have lower educational levels. Respondents in the
telephone sample were more likely to have income levels below the =
median."

Of course there are many factors affecting response to the follow up, =
but
the self-selection hypothesis would be consistent with higher reported
consumption in the second interview. That is not what we found. =20

We have some research underway that might be able to further address =
your
question if you check back in a couple of years :)

John Rogers

John Rogers, PhD
Associate Director
Public Research Institute
San Francisco State University
jdrogers@sfsu.edu
(415)405-3800
<http://pri.sfsu.edu>=20

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Joel Moskowitz
Sent: Tuesday, May 24, 2005 8:56 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Re: question related to surveys of drug use

Matt,

The published literature contains a fair amount of survey methods = studies which are relevant to your question. I suggest you start with POQ.

More potential under-reporters may self-select not to participate in a = panel study (relative to a one-shot survey) which could enhance the validity = of your self-reported drug use estimates but limit the generalizability of = your findings.

Are you planning to survey adults or youth? The survey modality = sometimes makes a difference (e.g., in-person, telephone, self-administered). For youth, the survey setting (e.g. home, school, community) matters as well = as the survey methods.

With regard to youth and school-based surveys, if you compare = alcohol/drug use estimates from the national Monitoring the Future Survey (which uses = an identifiable survey administration as some of the adolescents become = part of a panel study) with CDC's national Youth Risk Behavior Survey (which = uses an anonymous survey administration), you will find systematically greater = drug use prevalence estimates in the YRBS.

We did an in-school survey methods study awhile ago (Malvin, J.H. & Moskowitz, J.M. Anonymous vs. identifiable self-reports of adolescent = drug attitudes, intentions and use. Public Opinion Quarterly. 47: 557-566. = 1983). Although we concluded that there wasn't much difference between = anonymous and identifiable surveys, our focus was on drug-related attitudes, intentions and use. With regard to drug use, there was more evidence = for differences by survey method -- the anonymous survey administration = yielded

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, 25 May 2005 09:10:20 -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: Latest Gotham Gazette Column on NYC Demographic Trends
Comments: To: CUNY UFS Discussion Forum <SENATE-FORUM@LISTSERV.CUNY.EDU>, qsoclis@qc.edu
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu, Community Urban List <comurb_r21@email.rutgers.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Topic of the Day...

Demographics

Four demographic trends "define New York City's unique political landscape," Andrew Beveridge writes, "all of which the candidates must understand, even if they have little power to change them."

<http://www.gothamgazette.com/article/demographics/20050525/5/1426>

The first few paragraphs.

Four Trends That Shape The City's Political Landscape by Andrew Beveridge
May, 2005

The election of Antonio Villaraigosa as Mayor of Los Angeles encouraged Fernando Ferrer's campaign to rally Hispanic support. But it is not a strange kind of vanity that turned Michael Bloomberg into Miguel in some recent ads, as the billionaire's mayoral campaign started in earnest with television commercials in Spanish.

New York City is not like Los Angeles, where nearly 85 percent of all Hispanics are Mexican. There is a dizzyingly diverse mix of Hispanic immigrants in New York, and the various groups may not all respond to one ethnic appeal.

This diverse wave of immigrants to the city is one of four demographic trends that define New York City's unique political landscape, all of which the candidates must understand, even if they have little power to change them.

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
=====

Date: Wed, 25 May 2005 16:48:08 -0400

CihWb0IQLCBXaXJlbgVzcyApIGFuZCBpbmZvcmlhdGlvbiB0aGVvenkuIFNwb3J0cy4NCk1haW5s
eSBzd2ltbWluZyBhbmQgc25vd2JvYXJkaW5nLiBBbHNvIG1vdW50YWluIGJpa2UNCnJpZGluZy4g
TXVzaWMuIFBsYXlpbmcgZ3VpdGFyIGFuZCB1bmpveWluZyAgcXVhbG10eQ0KY29uY2VydhMuIEJv
b2tzLiBSZWNIbnQgcmlhZGluZ3MgaW5jbHVkZTog4oCcRS1nb3YsDQplLWJ1c2luZXNzIHNoemF0
ZWdpZXMgZm9yIGdvdmlhbnRz4oCdIGJ5IERvdWdsYXMNCKhvbG1lcyBhbmQgIOkAnFRoZSBN
Y0RvbmFsZG16YXRpb24gb2Ygc29jaWV0eeKAnSBieSBHZW9yZ2UNCiJpdHplci4NCg0KukVjb21l
bmRhdGlvbiBsZXR0ZXIgzZnJvbSBhIGZvcml1ciBVUyBlbXBsb3llciBhbmQNCldhcnNhdydzIFNj
aG9vbCBvZiBTb2NpYWwgUHN5Y2hvbG9neSBhbmQgbXkgdGhlc2lzdDQpzdXB1cnZpc29yIHVwb24g
cmVxdWVzdC4NCg0K

Date: Wed, 25 May 2005 14:19:28 -0700
Reply-To: Jennifer Franz <jdfranz@jdfranz.com>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jennifer Franz <jdfranz@JDFRANZ.COM>
Subject: Use of Weighted Data
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

One of my clients wants to use weighted data in a report without =
indicating that the data are weighted and how this was done. My belief =
is that this is unethical and that any weighting procedures should be =
clearly detailed. Am I right or wrong? Please reply to me off-list and =
I will summarize responses for the list. Thanks!

Jennifer D. Franz, Ph.D.
President
JD Franz Research, Inc.
(916) 440-8777 Voice
(916) 440-8787 Fax=

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Thu, 26 May 2005 11:31:59 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: U.S. Voter Turnout Up in 2004, Census Bureau Reports
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

U.S. Voter Turnout Up in 2004, Census Bureau Reports=20

Sixty-four percent of U.S. citizens age 18 and over voted in the 2004 presidential election, up from 60 percent in 2000, the U.S. Census Bureau reported today. Tables from a November survey also show that of 197 million citizens, 72 percent (142 million) reported they were registered to vote. Among those registered, 89 percent (126 million) said they voted. In the 2000 election, 70 percent of citizens were

registered; and among them, 86 percent voted.

Other highlights from the Voting and Registration in the Election of November 2004 online tables pertaining to the voting-age citizen population:

In 2004, turnout rates for citizens were 67 percent for non-Hispanic whites, 60 percent for blacks, 44 percent for Asians and 47 percent for Hispanics (of any race). These rates were higher than the previous presidential election by 5 percentage points for non-Hispanic whites and 3 points for blacks. By contrast, the voting rates for Asian and Hispanic citizens did not change. These data pertain to those who identified themselves as being of a single race. (See Table 1. [Excel])

SNIP

<http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/voting/004986.html>
--=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.

=====
Date: Thu, 26 May 2005 12:28:00 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Re: U.S. Voter Turnout Up in 2004, Census Bureau Reports
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Microsoft wants to break the URL on the census link I sent as a colleague has kindly pointed out, however this should work.

<<http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/voting/004986.html>>

--=20
Leo (Mea Culpa) Simonetta
Research Director
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101
Baltimore MD 21209
=20

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

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

> Sent: Thursday, May 26, 2005 11:32 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: U.S. Voter Turnout Up in 2004, Census Bureau Reports

>=20

> U.S. Voter Turnout Up in 2004, Census Bureau Reports=20

>=20

> Sixty-four percent of U.S. citizens age 18 and over voted=20

> in the 2004 presidential election, up from 60 percent in=20

> 2000, the U.S. Census Bureau reported today. Tables from a=20

> November survey also show that of

> 197 million citizens, 72 percent (142 million) reported they=20

> were registered to vote. Among those registered, 89 percent=20

> (126 million) said they voted. In the 2000 election, 70=20

> percent of citizens were registered; and among them, 86 percent voted.

>=20

> Other highlights from the Voting and Registration in the=20

> Election of November 2004 online tables pertaining to the=20

> voting-age citizen

> population:

>=20

> In 2004, turnout rates for citizens were 67 percent for=20

> non-Hispanic whites, 60 percent for blacks, 44 percent for=20

> Asians and 47 percent for Hispanics (of any race). These=20

> rates were higher than the previous presidential election by=20

> 5 percentage points for non-Hispanic whites and

> 3 points for blacks. By contrast, the voting rates for Asian=20

> and Hispanic citizens did not change. These data pertain to=20

> those who identified themselves as being of a single race.=20

> (See Table 1. [Excel])

>=20

> SNIP

>=20

> [http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/voti](http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/voting/004986)

> [ng/004986](http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/voting/004986).

> html

> --

> Leo G. Simonetta

> Research Director

> Art & Science Group, LLC

> 6115 Falls Road, Suite 101

> Baltimore MD 21209

>=20

> -----

> 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, 26 May 2005 12:43:19 -0400

Reply-To: JoyceR@cfmc.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joyce Rachelson <jrachels@CONCENTRIC.NET>
Subject: Re: U.S. Voter Turnout Up in 2004, Census Bureau Reports
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Comments: cc: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To:
<3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E5216848848@exchange.local.artscience.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Hi Leo,

It was still cut off on your last post.

If I might make a suggestion, there is a wonderful site called
<http://www.tinyurl.com>

It turned your long url into the following:

<http://tinyurl.com/bpkr5>

A remarkable site and it does it for free.

Regards,
Joyce

Leo Simonetta wrote:

> Microsoft wants to break the URL on the census link I sent as a
> colleague has kindly pointed out, however this should work.
>
> <[http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/voting/004986](http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/voting/004986.html)
> .html>
>
>

--

Joyce Rachelson
VP, Director of Product Sales
CfMC
915 Broadway, Suite 609
New York, NY 10010-7108
(212) 777-5120 Phone
(212) 777-5217 FAX

Nonstop Support

<http://www.cfmc.com>
Web Survey demonstrations <http://survey.cfmc.com>

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail, including any attachments,
is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain

confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message including any attachments

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

=====
Date: Thu, 26 May 2005 16:15:37 -0500
Reply-To: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Nick Panagakis <mail@MARKETSHARESCORP.COM>
Organization: Market Shares Corporation
Subject: Re: U.S. Voter Turnout Up in 2004, Census Bureau Reports
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <4295FCA7.1000004@concentric.net>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Here is the Census page with release and excel tables.

<http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/voting.html>

Nick

Joyce Rachelson wrote:

> Hi Leo,
>
> It was still cut off on your last post.
>
> If I might make a suggestion, there is a wonderful site called
> <http://www.tinyurl.com>
>
> It turned your long url into the following:
>
> <http://tinyurl.com/bpkr5>
>
> A remarkable site and it does it for free.
>
> Regards,
> Joyce
>
> Leo Simonetta wrote:
>
>> Microsoft wants to break the URL on the census link I sent as a
>> colleague has kindly pointed out, however this should work.
>>
>> <[http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/voting/004986](http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/voting/004986.html)
>> .html>
>>

>>
>
> --
> Joyce Rachelson
> VP, Director of Product Sales
> CfMC
> 915 Broadway, Suite 609
> New York, NY 10010-7108
> (212) 777-5120 Phone
> (212) 777-5217 FAX
>
> Nonstop Support
>
> <http://www.cfmc.com>
> Web Survey demonstrations <http://survey.cfmc.com>
>
> Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail, including any attachments,
> is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain
> confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review,
> use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the
> intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail
> and destroy all copies of the original message including any
> attachments
>
> -----
> 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, 26 May 2005 17:36:00 -0400
Reply-To: jtanur@NOTES.CC.SUNYSB.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Judith Tanur <jtanur@NOTES.CC.SUNYSB.EDU>
Subject: Follow up on internship request
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
Comments: cc: grzywaczmikolaj@yahoo.com
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Hi All,
Mikolaj Grzywacz has realized that the posting he gave me for the list yesterday did not really describe the program he's involved in. So he sent me the following follow-up. If you have any ideas for him, please contact him directly at the above address. Thanks, Judy Tanur

"
Training Internship Program is a initiative designed to enrich both the company which decides to be a trainee internship provider and the professional live of aspiring university graduate by bringing the second

mentioned to work for USA based company . The program organizing company also referred to as a sponsor is licensed under USA Department of State and manages all visa procedures. ITP may last up to 18 months and that is the duration I am aiming for. The sponsoring organization has to ensure that the internship matches the university program attended by prospective intern as this is US government requirement. The internship providing company is not required to have an existing internship program for fully enrolled students or graduates. Furthermore the desired duration (18 months) resembles entry level contract position, timewise and skillwise as I am a graduate.

More information may be found at:

<http://exchanges.state.gov/education/jexchanges/private/trainee.htm>"

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Thu, 26 May 2005 16:36:01 -0700
Reply-To: Jennifer Franz <jdf Franz@jdf Franz.com>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jennifer Franz <jdf Franz@JDFRANZ.COM>
Subject: Weighting of Data
Comments: To: aapornet@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

If you are interested ... Perhaps no need to summarize, but I promised, =
so here it is. =20

Any weighting procedures should be reported. In addition, if the =
weighting methodology is uncommon or has a substantial effect, it should =
be detailed. Technical material is probably not necessary; if provided, =
it could be included in an appendix, depending on the audience. =20

Several helpful members pointed out that this issue is addressed in the =
code of ethics. I guess I'm not sufficiently current in my reading!

Thanks to all who weighed in on this issue - and there were many. I'm =
very grateful.

Jennifer D. Franz, Ph.D.
President
JD Franz Research, Inc.
(916) 440-8777 Voice
(916) 440-8787 Fax=

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Thu, 26 May 2005 23:02:30 -0400
Reply-To: MMBlum@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Mark Blumenthal <MMBlum@AOL.COM>
Subject: Job Opportunity: Elon University
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Dr. Chalmers Brumbaugh, the Chair of the Department of Political Science=20
asked me to post this job listing (please send email queries directly to D=
r.=20
Brumbaugh at cbrumbaugh@elon.edu): =20

The Department of Political Science and Public Administration at Elon =20
University in NC invites applications for the position of Director of the El=
on =20
University Poll, a tenure-track position starting August, 2005. We are loo=
king=20
for an individual with a solid background in survey research theory, =20
methodology and polling lab experience, able to work effectively with studen=
ts and=20
journalists. The Elon University Poll conducts six to eight surveys on pol=
itics=20
and public policy each academic year. The poll releases survey results to=20
national and state news media and provides data for scholarly research by E=
lon=20
faculty. The poll moved into a state-of-the-art, 40 station CATI center in=
=20
Fall, 2004. Primary teaching responsibility is in the area of American=20
Government, Public Opinion Polling and Political Behavior in a nine-member=20
department with 170 majors. Ph.D preferred. Applicants should have a stro=
ng=20
commitment to teaching undergraduate students in a liberal arts environmen=
, be=20
willing to engage in service to the institution and maintain an active scho=
larly=20
agenda. Candidates must also be willing to teach in Elon=E2=80=99s=20
interdisciplinary program in General Studies. Elon is a dynamic,
private,=20=
co-educational,=20
comprehensive institution that is a national model for actively engaging=20
faculty and students in teaching and learning. To learn more about Elon, p=
lease=20
visit our website at www.elon.edu. Review will begin June 15, 2005 and=20
continue until position is filled. Send letter of application, vita, trans=
cripts,=20
evidence of teaching effectiveness and three letters of recommendation
to:=20=
=20
Dr. Chalmers Brumbaugh, Chair, Department of Political Science, 2103 Campus=

=20
Box, Elon University, Elon, NC 27244. Elon University is an equal opportun=
ity=20
employer committed to a diverse faculty, staff and student body. Candidate=
s=20
from under-represented groups are encouraged to apply. =20

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.
=====

Date: Fri, 27 May 2005 09:50:03 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Not suitable for the Vox
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Building Civic Trust: Questions for Dan Yankelovich

Along with a new mayor, San Diego could use a psychologist. Like partners in a bad divorce, the city and its public stopped communicating a while back -- and now they stand divided by court cases and a chasm of distrust. If there's anyone who knows the value of good communication, it's Dan Yankelovich, a nationally known pollster who made a 40-plus year career of monitoring the public mind and innovating ways to better comprehend its innermost hopes and fears. His firm, Viewpoint Learning, founded upon his move to San Diego a few years ago, specializes in developing dialogues to help business and public policy organizations understand the public on topics from land use to good governance. Yankelovich talks about taking time, facing facts and bridging the disconnect.

SNIP

<http://www.voiceofsandiego.org/site/apps/nl/content2.asp?c=3DeuLTJbMUKvH&=b=3D468669&ct=3D887491>

Tiny URL version
<http://tinyurl.com/8r9dv>

--=20
Leo G. Simonetta
Research Director
Art & Science Group, LLC
6115 Falls Road, Suite 101
Baltimore MD 21209

Conference photos and Kohut AAPOR Award video at: <http://www.aapor.org/Archives>: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Fri, 27 May 2005 09:30:46 -0500
Reply-To: bzolling@FHSU.EDU
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Brett Zollinger <bzolling@FHSU.EDU>
Subject: applied political scientist position
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8
Content-transfer-encoding: base64
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cmVjdG9y
c2FzIFN0YXRlIFVuaXZlcnNpdHkuDQpBcHBsaWNhdGlvbnMgc2hvdWxkIGJlIHBlcnNpdG9yIGRlcnNpdG9y
ICBUaGFua3MuDQoNCkYzXR0IFpvcG9pbmRlcnRlcmVzdGVkIGFuZCBxdWFsIGRlcnNpdG9yIGRlcnNpdG9y
c3RpdHV0ZSBvZiBQdWJsaWMgQWZmYWlycw0KYW5kIEFzc29jaWF0ZSBQcm9mZXNzb3Igb2YgU29j
aW9sb2d5DQpG3J0IEhheXMgU3RhdGUgVW5pdmVyc2l0eQ0KNjAwIFBhemsgU3RyZWV0DQpIYXlz
LCBLYW5zYXMGnJc2MDENCjc4NS02MjgtNTg4MQ0KNzg1LTYYMy0wMzU4IGNlbGwNCjc4NS02Mjgt
NDE4OCBmYXgNCmh0dHA6Ly93d3cuZmhzdS5lZHUvZG9ja2luZw0KDQoqKioqKioqKioqKioqKioq
KioqKioqKg0KRg9ja2luZyBjbnN0aXR1dGUgby2YgUHVibGljIEFmZmFpcnMvRGVwYXJ0bWVudCBv
ZiBQb2xpdGlyYWwgU2NpZW5jZSBhbmQNCkp1c3RyY2UgU3R1ZGllcw0KRm9ydCBiYXlzIFN0YXRl
IFVuaXZlcnNpdHkuDQpBcHBsaWNhdGlvbnMgc2hvdWxkIGJlIHBlcnNpdG9yIGRlcnNpdG9yIGRlcnNpdG9y
cyB0aGUgQXNzaXN0YW50IERpcmVjdG9yIGluIHRoZSBEB2NraW5nIEluc3RpdHV0ZSBvZg0KUHVi
bGljIEFmZmFpcnMgYW5kIEFzc2lzdGFudCBQcm9mZXNzb3IgaW4gdGhIIERlcGFydG1lbnQgb2Yg
UG9saXRpY2FsDQpTY2llbmNIIGFuZCBkXN0aWNIIFN0dWRpZXMgYXQgRm9ydCBiYXlzIFN0YXRl
IFVuaXZlcnNpdHkuDQpBcHBsaWNhdGlvbnMgc2hvdWxkIGJlIHBlcnNpdG9yIGRlcnNpdG9yIGRlcnNpdG9y
SW5zdG10dXRlIHByb24gb2YgdGhIIERpcmVjdG9yIGluIG1vc3QNCmFzcGVjdHMgb2YgSW5zdG10
dXRlIGFjdG12aXRpZXMuIFByaW1henkgam9iIHJlc3BvbnpYmlsaXRpZXMgaW5jbHVkZT0NCmNv
bmR1Y3Rpbmcgc29jaWFsIHJlcnNpdG9yIGluIG1vc3QNCmFzcGVjdHMgb2YgSW5zdG10dXRlIHBlcnNpdG9y
dGluZyYyY29udHJhY3QNCmFuZCBncmFudCBwcm9wb3NhbCB3cm10aW5nLCBjb2xsYWJvcnF0aW9u
IHdpdGggSW5zdG10dXRlIHBlcnNpdG9yIGluIG1vc3QNCmFzcGVjdHMgb2YgSW5zdG10dXRlIHBlcnNpdG9y
dGF0aW9uIG9mIHJlc2VhemNoIGZpbmRpbmdzIHRvIGNsaWVudHMsdQpzdHJhdGVnaWMgcGxhbm5p
bmcgZm9yIGdvdmVybml1bnRhbCBhbmQgbm9uLXByb2ZpdCBlnRyZXByZW5ldXJpYWwgZW52aXJvbm1lbnQuICAgSSBzaG91bGQg
bW9kZXJhdGlvbiBvZiBwb2xpdGlyYWwgZm9ydW1zLCBzaW11bHRhbmVvdXNseSBtYW5hZ2luZyBt
dWx0aXBsZSBwcm9qZW50cw0KaW4gdmFyaW91cyBzdGFuZXMuICBFeHBleml1bnNIIHVzaW5nIHNV
Y2lhbCBzY2llbmNIIHJlc2VhemNoIG1ldGhvZHMsdQpzbmFseXppbmcgc29jaWFsIHBlcnNpdG9yIGluIG1vc3QNCmFzcGVjdHMgb2Yg
b25kYXJlIHFlY29udHJhY3QNCmFuZCBncmFudCBwcm9wb3NhbCB3cm10aW5nLCBjb2xsYWJvcnF0aW9uIGRlcnNpdG9yIGRlcnNpdG9y
c2VudGluZyByZXNlYXJjaCBmaW5kaW5ncyBiZWZvcmlzY29udHJhY3QNCmFuZCBncmFudCBwcm9wb3NhbCB3cm10aW5nLCBjb2xsYWJvcnF0aW9u
Lg0KRXhwZXJpZW5jZSB1c2luZyBTUFTLClBzdXBlenZpc2luZyBvdGhlcmlzIGRlcnNpdG9yIGRlcnNpdG9yIGRlcnNpdG9y
dHJhY3Qgb3Igb2YgdGhIIERpcmVjdG9yIGluIG1vc3QNCmFzcGVjdHMgb2YgSW5zdG10dXRlIHBlcnNpdG9yIGRlcnNpdG9y
ciBmb2N1cyBncm91cHMsdQpzdHJhdGVnaWMgcGxhbm5p
cnJlZC4gICBLbm93bGVkZ2Ugby2YgZW50aW9uLg0KT2YgdGhIIHByZXZpb3VzIHRocmVlIGRpcmVjdG9yIGRlcnNpdG9yIGRlcnNpdG9y

Date: Fri, 27 May 2005 13:57:33 -0700
Reply-To: Shapard Wolf <shapwolf@MSN.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Shapard Wolf <shapwolf@MSN.COM>
Subject: AAPORnet outage tonight
Comments: To: aapornet <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

AAPORnet will be out from 5pm-9pm MST Friday, May 27th 2005. The outage = is necessary for ASU's IT staff to apply patches to the servers that = host AAPORnet at Arizona State University. Though the actual duration = may be shorter, the entire period is reserved for servicing.

During that time, users will be affected as follows:

(1) Users will not be able to access the Listserv interface at = <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html><about:blank>.=20

(2) Commands and postings sent to Listserv and AAPORnet respectively = will be not be processed until after the lists.asu.edu server is = available again. No messages will be lost; they will be queued and sent = when the servers are restarted.

If you have any questions, please email the list managers at = aapornet-request@asu.edu<about:blank> (before or after the outage, = obviously!).

Shap Wolf
Chair, AAPOR Publications and Information Committee

Conference photos and Kohut AAPOR Award video at: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Tue, 24 May 2005 14:38:12 -0400
Reply-To: Lori Kaplan <LKaplan@NPR.ORG>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Lori Kaplan <LKaplan@NPR.ORG>
Subject: audio analysis
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Hi all:

I would appreciate any suggestions or recommendations for a = consultant/organization for an audio analysis project. We're seeking a = third-party to perform an audio audit of NPR's non-music based = programming. The purpose of this audit is to estimate the annual amount = of music contained in all NPR news, information and entertainment =

programming, excluding music intensive programs such as Performance =
Today. The audit information will assist NPR in its negotiations with =
music rights holders. The process used must be defensible in a court of =
law.=20

NPR will provide whatever audio is necessary to perform the analysis.=20

I've entertained the idea of perhaps contacting academic centers with =
expertise in sampling and access to student labor such as the Joint =
Program for Survey Methodology for this project. If anyone representing =
that type of organization would care to weigh in regarding interest in =
this type of work, I would be happy to hear from you.=20

Best regards,
Lori

Lori Kaplan | Research Manager | npr
635 Massachusetts Ave NW | Washington DC 20001=20
lkaplan@npr.org | p: 202.513.2811 | f: 202.513.3041=20

Conference photos and Kohut AAPOR Award video at: <http://www.aapor.org/Archives>: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 23 May 2005 13:20:23 -0400
Reply-To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>
Subject: Multilingual Exit Polls Show How Asian Americans Voted in 2004
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Multilingual Exit Polls Show How Asian Americans Voted in 2004

In the 2004 national election, Asian American voters, despite diverse backgrounds and languages, voiced common concerns across ethnic lines, citing the economy /jobs as the most important factor in their vote for President and civil liberties as the most important civil rights issue. More than one-third (38%) of those polled were first-time voters, and almost one-half (46%) needed language assistance in order to vote.

<http://baltimorechronicle.com/052305AsianVote.shtmlvote>.

Full report
http://www.aaldef.org/images/04-20-05_exit_poll_report.pdf
--=20

Leo G. Simonetta
Research Director
Art & Science Group, LLC

6115 Falls Road, Suite 101
Baltimore MD 21209

Conference photos and Kohut AAPOR Award video at: <http://www.aapor.org/Archives>: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

Date: Mon, 23 May 2005 13:28:29 -0500
Reply-To: jimr@rma-inc.com
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Jim Robinson <jimr@RMA-INC.COM>
Subject: Re: Paid survey website
Comments: To: Leo Simonetta <Simonetta@ARTSCI.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
In-Reply-To: <3248A9B21DD5574785FE5E2C8E5216848717@exchange.local.artsience.com>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

The internet sites that Leo Simonetta mentions have been looked at by CASRO and other organizations for sometime and appear to be internet scams for the most part. No reputable company that belongs or ascribes to the CASRO Code has participated in this to gain respondents. The fact that you have to pay to sign up should be your clue that it is not legitimate.

Jim Robinson
Robinson & Muenster Associates
(CASRO Director of Gov't & Public Affairs)
1208 W. Elkhorn St.
Sioux Falls, SD 57103-0218
605-332-7002 (home off)
605-332-3386 (o)
605-376-1326 (mobile)
jimr@rma-inc.com

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

From: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Leo Simonetta
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2005 11:48 AM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: Paid survey website

Apparently you pay to join this and they funnel surveys to you . . .
Claim to have 500 or at least 450 + companies in their list.

What You Must Know About Paid Survey Websites. The Success is Only
Earned Through One Company! Mon May 23, 8:00 AM ET

(PRWEB) May 23, 2005 -- Market research companies are growing by the numbers because of the billion dollar budget increase. This is excellent news to people who are already earning that lucrative income with paid

surveys. If you are not one of those people then SurveyScout provides information on how to get started. SurveyScout lets online users gain access to these companies so they can earn an income from home.

InstantlyWealthy.com, a website that was launched through SurveyScout, gives users the opportunity to see a steady and growing income just by providing opinions to market research companies right from the comfort of your own home.

"Few people know that companies are willing to pay good money to get good, thoughtful responses to their market research," says Jason Taylor of SurveyScout. "InstantlyWealthy.com shows you how putting in your two cents can be worth much, much more."

InstantlyWealthy.com (which is available at <http://www.instantlywealthy.com>) draws upon SurveyScout's extensive database of marketing research companies, weeding out the chaff from the grain. Once the short sign up form is completed then users instantly gain access to the database setting themselves on the road to a comfortable financial future.

SurveyScout users can get paid to take online surveys, making between \$5 and \$75 per survey. They can also participate in focus groups (up to \$150 an hour), take phone surveys (up to \$120 an hour), try new products for free, and preview film trailers for between \$4 and \$25 an hour.

Users can even try the service without signing up. Just by providing a name and email ID, they receive special access to 15 of the paid survey site lists, so that they can start earning money and come back for more. SurveyScout, moreover, offers prompt and thorough customer support, as well as tips and strategies.

"This is a great but very little-known source of income that has been reliably tapped by our existing users," says Taylor. "And there are still plenty of companies and opportunities out there to put you on track to instant wealth."

To sign up for membership and gain immediate access to market research companies, visit <http://www.instantlywealthy.com/>

About SurveyScout SurveyScout which is located at <http://www.instantlywealthy.com> offers a database of over 500 legitimate marketing research companies that gives people a chance to earn cash incentives for their opinions and time. SurveyScout provides people with excellent sources of income for participating in online surveys, phone surveys and focus groups. The web site is ranked higher than any other paid online survey companies because of its extensive database and prompt customer support. For more information, please visit <http://www.instantlywealthy.com> .

Contact information: Jason Taylor Phone: 702.379.8477
<http://www.instantlywealthy.com> e-mail: email protected from spam bots

###

InstantlyWealthy.com Jason Taylor 7023798477 E-mail Information

--

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.

Conference photos and Kohut AAPOR Award video at: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====
Date: Wed, 18 May 2005 16:50:36 -0700
Reply-To: Election Science Institute <forum@VOTEWATCH.US>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Election Science Institute <forum@VOTEWATCH.US>
Subject: Re: Exit poll-election questions were NOT answered in Miami
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Comments: cc: Mark Lindeman <lindeman@BARD.EDU>
In-Reply-To: <6.2.1.2.2.20050518120520.05c9c8a0@mail.bard.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Mark,

With the gracious help of Warren Mitofsky and his team, Fritz Scheuren showed on Saturday, using a technique called blurring, how one can access precinct level information without compromising the confidentiality of the data and the ethical standards of the community. ESI will soon release the Ohio raw data, that we compiled with Warren's help, and an explanation of our analysis. I would hope that one should be able to replicate this analysis in order to complete the sort of exit polling/actual results comparisons that some are calling for.

Steven

Steven Hertzberg
Election Science Institute
2269 Chestnut Street, 611
San Francisco, California 94123
T: 650-373-4960

<http://www.electionscience.org>
Improving the American Election Process

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

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

Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2005 9:19 AM

To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

Subject: Re: Exit poll-election questions were NOT answered in Miami

I am somewhat taken aback by the beginning of Steve Freeman's recent AAPORNET post:

"The fact that the original authors of the USCountVotes papers, myself included, did not sign the current release does NOT imply that we no longer believe the arguments, just that we lack time and resources to uphold our end of a fruitless non-debate."

Steve, of course, can speak authoritatively for himself -- and since I have never been a USCV signatory, I perhaps lack standing here. I also note the ambiguity of the phrase "the arguments" in the statement I've quoted above. Nevertheless, as a participant in the USCV review process, I know for a fact that the current release contains central arguments that at least some past signatories found unpersuasive, imprudent, or both. I also know that a group at USCV is currently working to reassess their recent work in light of the data presented by Mitofsky at AAPOR.

Speaking now for myself, I have participated in USCV's electronic discussions since not long after the election. My students have had many questions about the exit polls, and I have wanted to be in a position to give them the most well-rounded answers possible. I have gained respect for many USCV participants (and, I am sorry to say, somewhat lost respect for a few, not AAPOR members). I have worked to improve the content of USCV analyses, although I have not signed them. I thought the report distributed at AAPOR was poor, and I urged -- even begged -- the USCV leadership not to distribute it. I think it undermines the organization's credibility and threatens to trivialize the cause of election reform. Actually, I hope that AAPOR members will tactfully ignore the report and this entire exchange. Nevertheless, since USCV reports are distributed with the misleading assertion that they have been "[r]eviewed" via the USCV discussion list, I felt some word of clarification was appropriate on behalf of myself and other USCV list participants.

I must also take exception to Steve's statement that the failure to release exit poll data is "inconsistent with the principles of... a democracy." Plenty of people out there are oblivious to the privacy concerns on this issue (as well as other obstacles), but we should not join their ranks. I do think that more information can and should be released, and I hope that Edison/Mitofsky will help us help them to bring this about, but I honestly can't imagine any scenario in which the future of American democracy hinges on the release of the exit poll data.

Mark Lindeman
Bard College

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

Conference photos and Kohut AAPOR Award video at: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

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

Date: Mon, 23 May 2005 09:22:36 -0400

Reply-To: Dean Mead <DMMEAD@GASB.ORG>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Dean Mead <DMMEAD@GASB.ORG>

Subject: Customer satisfaction surveys

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

As a part of our new five-year strategic plan, we have committed to abiding by the performance measurement and reporting guidelines that we have proposed for governments -- if we're going to talk the talk, we should walk the walk, right?

Assessing our success toward achieving the goals and objectives in our strategic plan will require surveying of our constituents. We plan to conduct surveys this year to establish a baseline, and then survey twice more during the next five years to assess our progress. Essentially, we think these surveys will end up being fairly similar to a customer satisfaction survey--do our constituents think we have done a good job at the tasks we perform, have we been responsive to their needs, and so on.

I would appreciate any suggestions about particularly good articles to read or great examples of surveys to emulate. Please feel free to respond directly to me. Thanks!!

Dean Michael Mead
Project Manager
Governmental Accounting Standards Board
401 Merritt 7, P.O. Box 5116
Norwalk, CT 06856-5116
203/956-5294

Conference photos and Kohut AAPOR Award video at: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

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

Date: Sat, 21 May 2005 08:23:55 -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: A Translation Dilemma

Comments: To: Joel Bloom <jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU>, AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

I ran into the same issue about 7 years ago. We changed never to "hardly ever" and always to "almost all the time" [and their equivalent Spanish idioms] and had no problems.

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: AAPORNET [mailto:AAPORNET@asu.edu] On Behalf Of Joel Bloom
Sent: Friday, May 20, 2005 6:47 PM
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
Subject: A Translation Dilemma

Dear AAPORites,

I'm directing a survey on law enforcement and racial profiling that includes a Latino oversample for which we will be conducting interviews in both English and Spanish. A question has come up with regard to the translation that I'm hoping someone can help us with.

For two questions, we are asking about respondents' perceptions of the frequencies of certain types of behavior on the part of police. The response options range from "never" to "always."

Both our in-house translator and a bilingual reviewer connected to the client agree that asking a question and then starting with "nunca" is more jarring and awkward than starting with "never" in English (which itself is a bit unexpected and perhaps a bit awkward). More particularly, they both fear that starting with "nunca" might be seen as manipulative and leading, and could lead to some trust issues.

If it were a brand new study we could just reverse the order for everyone, but we will be geo-matching the Latino sample data to an existing statewide data set gathered a couple months ago.

Obviously, reversing the response options makes the data between the Latino sample and the statewide geo-matched sample impossible to compare, since any difference we find could be an artifact of the shift in the order of the response options.

Can anyone think of a way to keep the order and meaning the same, but make it less awkward and jarring in Spanish?

Thanks!!

-- Joel Bloom, University of Oregon

Joel David Bloom, Ph.D.
<http://www.uoregon.edu/~jbloom>
jbloom@uoregon.edu

Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate	Adjunct Assistant Professor
Oregon Survey Research Laboratory	Department of Political Science
440 McKenzie Hall/University of Oregon	924 PLC/University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403-5245	Eugene, OR 97403-1284
Telephone: 541-346-0891	Telephone: 541-346-4798
Facsimile: 541-346-0388	facsimile: 541-346-4860

Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Conference photos and Kohut AAPOR Award video at: <http://www.aapor.org/>
Archives: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu

=====

Date: Fri, 20 May 2005 14:03:16 -0400
Reply-To: JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "J. Ann Selzer" <JAnnSelzer@AOL.COM>
Subject: Re: Representativity of Sample Frame
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="UTF-8"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

=20
=20
I thank the few who have posted to me privately on this subject. I've not=20
yet found a way to calculate the error associated with the misfit between t=
he=20
frame and the universe. The standard margin of error calculates the error=20
between the sample and the frame, but that misses what I'm trying to better=
=20
convey others--that if your frame constitutes less than half the
universe,=20=
say,=20
then . . . what? I expose my ignorance, I suppose, but I've just never se=
en=20
this discussion. =20
=20
At some point, the frame is unacceptable as a gauge of the universe. I'd=20
like to understand that concept from a mathematical basis. JAS
=20
=20
=20

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

visit our website: www.SelzerCo.com

E-mail address for purposes of this list: JAnnSelzer@aol.com; otherwise,=20
contact _JASelzer@SelzerCo.com (mailto:_JASelzer@SelzerCo.com) .
=20
=20

In a message dated 5/20/2005 12:41:28 P.M. Central Daylight Time, =20
gauthier@CIRCUM.COM writes:

(2005.05.19, 13:04)

> One might also view the sampling frame as a sample itself but that
> requires assumptions (or knowledge) about which parts of the
> universe are and are not included -- i.e. Is it an unbiased sample?
> The issue of how much of the universe (90, 80, 50 percent) is in the
> sampling frame is subordinate to whether the sampling frame is an
> unbiased sample of the universe. As a practical matter I think it's
> best to limit the projectability of sample survey results to the
> totality defined by the sampling frame.

> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.

That strikes me as an odd comment. The frame IS the universe? That's
putting a lot of faith in the composition of the frame, isn't it?

In a recent paper published in MRIA's VUE magazine (February 2005,
"Are all samples of telephone numbers created equal"), I studied the
efficiency and the precision of samples produced by five US suppliers
of telephone number samples (paper available upon request). I
concluded:

"So, are all samples of telephone numbers created equal? The clear
answer is no: service quality varies from supplier to supplier, but,
most importantly, the efficiency and precision of the samples are also
variable. Some suppliers emphasize efficiency at the expense of
precision. Others take a more balanced approach. Some suppliers have
developed methodologies that make their samples markedly more
effective than their competitors =E2=80=94 and apparently with a continuing
concern for precision."

Surely, these differences in sampling quality reflect differences in
frame quality.

Beno=C3=AEt [Gauthier, mailto:gauthier@circum.com](mailto:gauthier@circum.com)
R=C3=A9seau Circum inc. / Circum Network Inc.

Nouvelles/News <http://circum.com>

'Phishing'.' NBC Nightly News, setting a new standard for journalistic delay on 2/2/04, called it 'the latest twist on Internet fraud.'"

-eg

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

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

> Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2005 8:04 AM

> To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

> Subject: Phishing, To Most American Workers, Is Just A Misspelled Word

>

>

> Timely given the Census story yesterday . . .

>

> Phishing, To Most American Workers, Is Just A Misspelled Word

> [http://informationweek.com/story/showArticle.j](http://informationweek.com/story/showArticle.jhtml?articleID=163105282)

> [html?articleID=163105282](http://informationweek.com/story/showArticle.jhtml?articleID=163105282)

>

> Only one-third of American workers surveyed say they've heard of

> phishing, with a mere 4% confessing they've clicked through to a

> phishing Web site. But 45% of their bosses contend workers do click

> through after receiving phishing E-mail.

>

> 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.

>

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

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Conference photos and Kohut AAPOR Award video at: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

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

=====
Date: Fri, 20 May 2005 16:34:46 -0400

Reply-To: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@JPMURPHY.COM>
Subject: Re: Representativity of Sample Frame
Comments: To: Benoit Gauthier <gauthier@CIRCUM.COM>, AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Martin and Lester Frankel defined sample frame as "either an explicit = listing of all the elements in the population or a structure convertible = to an explicit list when necessary." Thomas Semon said, "the term frame = refers to any descriptive physical arrangement that can be used for = drawing a sample." The question raised in the post is: What happens when = the available frame accounts for only a fraction of the population or = universe of interest? The late Seymour Sudman noted that, "statistical = inferences from the sample can be made only about the sample population. = To the extent that the sample population differs from the target = population, inferences about the target population must be subjective." = In other words, one is restricted to conclusions about the population = that is defined by the sampling frame. Sudman gives two examples: "Most = studies of criminals are done in prisons, a practice that biases the = sample towards those criminals who are more likely to be arrested and = convicted. Studies of homosexuals usually have been conducted in bars or = with members of organized groups . . . and are biased towards those = members of the population who are most active socially." In these = examples, a study initially defining its universe as "criminals" or = "homosexuals" must either find sampling frames with complete coverage, = or redefine the universe to align with the sampling frame used.

While important, a finding that RDD telephone samples from different = vendors may be of unequal efficiency or precision does not appear to = address theoretically this question of coverage.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
J.P. MURPHY & COMPANY
Post Office Box 80484
Valley Forge, PA 19484
(610) 408-8800
www.jpmurphy.com
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

----- Original Message -----=20
From: Benoit Gauthier=20
To: AAPORNET@asu.edu=20
Sent: Friday, May 20, 2005 1:37 PM
Subject: Representativity of Sample Frame

(2005.05.19, 13:04)

> One might also view the sampling frame as a sample itself but that
> requires assumptions (or knowledge) about which parts of the

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

Date: Thu, 19 May 2005 14:25:01 -0400
Reply-To: "Beach, Scott" <SBeach@UCSUR.PITT.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Beach, Scott" <SBeach@UCSUR.PITT.EDU>
Subject: Survey technology and the elderly
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Hello:

=20

I am working on a proposal that will involve surveys with elderly respondents (i.e., 65+) on a sensitive topic - abuse/mistreatment by a trusted other (i.e., elder abuse or mistreatment). I was wondering if anyone out there has direct experience with (or knowledge of) previous studies that have employed "privacy enhancement" techniques such as Interactive Voice Response (IVR) in phone surveys, or Audio-Computer Assisted Self Interviewing (A-CASI) with elderly survey respondents.

=20

I am familiar with the studies showing enhanced reporting of sensitive behaviors by younger respondents (or general samples) using such techniques, but have some concerns about the potentially counter-balancing effects of older respondents unfamiliarity and/or lack of comfort with technology.

=20

Any insights or leads would be greatly appreciated. =20

Thanks.

=20

Scott R. Beach, Ph.D.

Director, Survey Research Program

University Center for Social and Urban Research

121 University Place

University of Pittsburgh

Pittsburgh, PA 15260

=20

e-mail: scottb@pitt.edu

tel: 412-624-7785

fax: 412-624-4810

=20

Conference photos and Kohut AAPOR Award video at: <http://www.aapor.org/Archives>: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Problems?-don't reply to this message, write to: aapornet-request@asu.edu
=====

Date: Tue, 24 May 2005 14:13:13 -0400
Reply-To: "Beach, Scott" <SBeach@UCSUR.PITT.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Beach, Scott" <SBeach@UCSUR.PITT.EDU>
Subject: Survey technology and the elderly
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Hello:

=20

I am working on a proposal that will involve surveys with elderly respondents (65+) on a sensitive topic - abuse/mistreatment by a trusted other (i.e., elder abuse or mistreatment). I was wondering if anyone out there has direct experience with (or knowledge of) previous studies that have employed "privacy enhancement" techniques such as Interactive Voice Response (IVR) in phone surveys, or Audio-Computer Assisted Self Interviewing (A-CASI) with elderly survey respondents.

=20

I am familiar with the studies showing enhanced reporting of sensitive behaviors by younger respondents (or general samples) using such techniques, but have some concerns about the potentially counter-balancing effects of older respondents unfamiliarity and/or lack of comfort with technology.

=20

Any insights or leads would be greatly appreciated

=20

=20

Scott R. Beach, Ph.D.

Director, Survey Research Program

University Center for Social and Urban Research

121 University Place

University of Pittsburgh

Pittsburgh, PA 15260

=20

e-mail: scottb@pitt.edu

tel: 412-624-7785

fax: 412-624-4810

=20

Conference photos and Kohut AAPOR Award video at: <http://www.aapor.org/>

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

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

=====
Date: Sun, 29 May 2005 21:40:33 -0400

Reply-To: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>

Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>

From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@MINDSPRING.COM>

Subject: Request for Italian data

Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu

MIME-version: 1.0

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

Posted for Maxence Gorregues. Please respond directly to Maxence Gorregues
<gorregues.m@neu.edu>

Hello,

My name is Maxence Gorregues and I am working with Professor Andy Baker in the Political Science Department at Northeastern University. We are constructing a cross-national dataset that contains the results of public opinion polls of voter preferences during presidential and parliamentary election campaigns. In other words, we are searching for the time series of vote intentions (poll responses to "if the election were today, who would you vote for") during the few months leading up to each Election Day for as many countries and elections as possible.

Do you know of a source that shows these data for any elections in Italy? Note that we do not necessarily need the original surveys themselves, but simply a report of these results, either as a graph on a webpage or media source, etc. If you do not know where I might find

this data, do you know of someone else I could contact?

I attached you with this email the kind of document we are looking for.

Thank you,

Maxence Gorregues

Conference photos and Kohut AAPOR Award video at: <http://www.aapor.org/Archives>: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Tue, 31 May 2005 11:57:08 -0700
Reply-To: Joel Bloom <jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: Joel Bloom <jbloom@DARKWING.UOREGON.EDU>
Subject: Translation Dilemma Solved
Comments: To: AAPORNET@asu.edu
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Thanks so much to everyone who responded so quickly and so helpfully to my question about translating the "never...always" string from English to Spanish!

Coming from a small survey lab that only does 2-3 Spanish translations a year, it is so wonderful to have the assistance of so many people who deal with these issues much more regularly and systematically than we do.

* The most common piece of advice we got was that starting with "nunca," while a bit jarring, is not a whole lot more jarring in Spanish than it is in English and a number of you have used that wording without any problems a number of times.

That's what we decided to go with, partially because the next most common options were not options for us because we were retro-fitting the Latino oversample to an existing English instrument and geo-matching it to existing statewide data that had already been collected. They are good options, though, that some of you might want to consider (and that I'll certainly consider for future surveys):

* do a split sample experiment in which half start with never/nunca and half start with always/siempre. (Not a bad idea for all-English surveys anyway.)

* replace "never" with "almost never." Again, not necessarily a bad idea, but the meaning of "almost never" is so different from "never" that we didn't feel we could do that and still have results comparable to our English language surveys.

(And Alisu -- thanks for noticing our broader problem of straying too far from the literal translation to the point that the questions meant

different things!)

Of course, the best way to do this is to have a bilingual team work on both instruments from the start to make sure that the questions are asked in ways that enable us to get the same meaning across in both languages, but in the real world that's often not going to be possible.

Thanks again for all the help!

-- Joel

Joel David Bloom, Ph.D.
<http://www.uoregon.edu/~jbloom>
jbloom@uoregon.edu

Postdoctoral Fellow/Research Associate	Adjunct Assistant Professor
Oregon Survey Research Laboratory	Department of Political Science
440 McKenzie Hall/University of Oregon	924 PLC/University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403-5245	Eugene, OR 97403-1284
Telephone: 541-346-0891	Telephone: 541-346-4798
Facsimile: 541-346-0388	facsimile: 541-346-4860

Conference photos and Kohut AAPOR Award video at: <http://www.aapor.org/Archives>: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>
Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.

Date: Tue, 31 May 2005 16:54:55 -0400
Reply-To: "Meekins, Brian - BLS" <Meekins.Brian@BLS.GOV>
Sender: AAPORNET <AAPORNET@ASU.EDU>
From: "Meekins, Brian - BLS" <Meekins.Brian@BLS.GOV>
Subject: FW: TSMII update
Comments: To: "aapornet@asu.edu" <aapornet@asu.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain

- > For those planning to attend the Second International Telephone Survey
- > Methodology Conference in January of 2006:
- >
- > You will be able to book your rooms at the conference hotel, the
- > Hyatt-Regency Miami, beginning in June. We will send you notification as
- > soon as it opens. Depending upon the demand we can block up to 400 rooms.
- > Government rates will be available.
- >
- > Registration for the Conference begins in September. More information
- > about the Conference can be found at:
- > <http://www.amstat.org/meetings/tsmii/2006>
- > <<http://www.amstat.org/meetings/tsmii/2006>>
- >

Conference photos and Kohut AAPOR Award video at: <http://www.aapor.org/Archives>: <http://lists.asu.edu/archives/aapornet.html>

Please ask authors before quoting outside AAPORNET.